

Sport Event Legacies: Implications for Meaningful Legacy Outcomes

Alana Thomson¹, Becca Leopkey², Katie Schlenker³, Nico Schulenkorf⁴,
University of Technology, Sydney^{1&3}, *University of Ottawa*², *Auckland University of Technology*⁴

Corresponding email: alana.thomson@student.uts.edu.au

Abstract

Within the sport and event management context, legacy has emerged as an important justification for public sector involvement and investment since the late 1980s. Legacy is recognised as the long-term economic, tourism, social, and/or environmental outcomes for a host city from staging events (Gratton & Preuss, 2008; Hiller, 2003; Preuss, 2007). Despite the growing popularity, the concept of legacy has largely evaded any meaningful critique for the planning, implementation and evaluation of sport event outcomes. This paper aims to address this gap in the literature by empirically testing five key considerations of legacy, identified in previous work (Thomson, Schlenker, & Schulenkorf, 2009). The five key considerations include:

1. Terminology – use of ‘legacy’ as opposed to another term;
2. Legacy as automatically bestowed or needing to be planned;
3. Temporal nature of legacy – permanent or long-term;
4. Legacy as positive and/or negative; and
5. Legacy as a local and global concept.

This paper presents a document analysis examining how ‘legacy’ has been conceptualised, planned and evaluated within the contemporary Australian and Canadian sport event management contexts. Preliminary findings from the analysis of Australian and Canadian event evaluation documents are presented. In accordance with a rigorous sampling frame, 13 events in total are featured from 1988 to 2007. The paper then discusses these findings against the five key considerations for legacy. Management implications of transparency and accountability measures for sport event managers and policy makers are outlined to demonstrate the importance of legacy issues with regard to sport event management practices and policy development. The authors argue that for legacy to continue as a major policy justification, clarity of legacy conceptualisation and practical management application must be advanced. The paper concludes by suggesting further research surrounding the notion of legacy in the sport event context.

Keywords: sport events, legacy conceptualisation, event policy, legacy planning, legacy evaluation

Biographical Details:

Alana Thomson

Alana Thomson is an ACEM and STCRC PhD Candidate in Event Management in the School of Leisure, Sport and Tourism at the University of Technology, Sydney. Alana's current PhD research focuses on sport development outcomes through sport events. An emphasis of her Thesis is on the stakeholder management and leverage strategies around sport events to achieve sport outcomes.

Becca Leopkey

Becca Leopkey is a PhD Candidate in sport management, specialising in sporting events at the University of Ottawa, Canada. She has participated in numerous national and international sport-related programs such as the International Olympic Academy (IOA) in Greece, the Olympic Academy of Canada (OAC), and presented on several topics including sport event risk management, sport policy, and Olympic legacy at many international conferences. Most recently, she has been awarded a 2009 Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) of Canada Doctoral Scholarship for her research on the democratic governance of Olympic Games legacy.

Katie Schlenker

Dr Katie Schlenker is a Lecturer in the School of Leisure, Sport and Tourism at the University of Technology, Sydney. Katie teaches in both the Tourism Management and Events and Leisure undergraduate programs, as well as in the postgraduate Events Management program. Her research interests and publications are in the areas of social impacts of events, event legacies, events and social capital and urban tourism precincts.

Nico Schlenkorf

Dr Nico Schlenkorf is a Lecturer in Sport and Event Management at Auckland University of Technology (AUT), New Zealand. His research interests are the social and psychological utility of sport and special events. For several years, Nico has been involved in sport-for-development projects in Sri Lanka and Israel and he is the recipient of the 2008 Human Rights Award presented by the University of Technology, Sydney (UTS) / Australia.

Introduction

Public policy planners and event organisers are increasingly promoting potential economic, tourism, social, and/or environmental legacies to justify significant public investments required to host special events. Within this context, legacy is recognised as the long-term economic, tourism, social, and environmental outcomes for a host city from staging events (Gratton & Preuss, 2008; Hiller, 2003; Preuss, 2007). Despite its growing popularity, the concept of legacy has largely evaded any meaningful critique for the planning, implementation and evaluation of sport event outcomes.

This paper presents a document analysis examining how the concept of ‘legacy’ has been included in previous events in terms of planning, implementation and evaluation from the Australian and Canadian sport event management contexts. Preliminary findings from the analysis of Australian and Canadian event evaluation documents are presented. In accordance with a rigorous sampling frame, 13 events in total are featured from 1988 to 2007. The paper discusses the empirical findings against the five key considerations for legacy identified by Thomson, Schlenker and Schulenkorf (2009). The five key considerations include:

1. Terminology – use of ‘legacy’ as opposed to another term;
2. Legacy as automatically bestowed or needing to be planned;
3. Temporal nature of legacy – permanent or long-term;
4. Legacy as positive and/or negative; and
5. Legacy as a local and global concept.

Finally, the paper outlines management implications of transparency and accountability measures for sport event managers and policy makers, to demonstrate the importance of legacy issues with regard to sustainable sport event management practices and policy development.

Literature Review

Sport Events & Legacies

Sport events are unique attractions that lead to different types of impacts and outcomes. Higham (2005) explains that events “are motivated by and therefore associated with rich and diverse visitor experiences, and contribute to uniqueness of tourism destinations” (p. 1). A recent industry publication declares that sport events “can be a significant catalyst for change, elevating the host’s global stature and turbocharging its economic, political, and social development” (Pellegrino & Hancock, 2010, p. 1). Further, sport events attract tourists, capital investment and media attention to the host city, through enhanced economic activity and trickle-down effects (Hall, 2001). These opportunities afforded through sport events have seen them become positioned in our contemporary societies as packaged solutions to economic, social and environmental rejuvenation (Carrière & Demazière, 2002; Smith & Fox, 2007). In many cases they are seen as a favourable policy strategy for overall socio-economic development (Gratton, Shibli, & Coleman, 2005, 2006).

Legacy as a justification for government involvement in special events

Governments around the world invest significantly in bidding and staging large-scale sport events. In particular, events are pursued by neoliberal governments as they are often believed to constitute opportunities for:

- economic impact (Hiller, 2000; Jones, 2001; Whitson & Macintosh, 1996);
- refocusing of the city for leisure and consumption (Essex & Chalkley, 2004; Evans, 2006; Hiller, 2000; Lynch & Veal, 2006; Pyrgiotis, 2003; B. W. Ritchie, 2008; Smith & Fox, 2007; Vaz & Jacques, 2006); and
- place marketing to ‘sell the city’ to investors, residents and tourists (Coalter, 2007; Evans, 2006; Gleeson & Low, 2000; Hall, 2001; Moragas, Moreno, & Kennett, 2003; Shoval, 2002; Vaz & Jacques, 2006).

Allen, O’Toole, Harris and McDonnell (2008) highlight the increased importance of legacy within the event management context, noting that “for some events, particularly large-scale public events, the issue of legacy has become central to the decision to host or create them” (p.115). Since the late 1990s this phenomenon has evolved to the point where legacy is now considered an imperative part of the bid phase with specific emphasis on the benefits to the community as a result of hosting the event (Leopkey & Parent, 2009).

Interestingly, many sport event impact studies have found that in the short-term events have not provided as many positive economic benefits as originally anticipated (Crompton, 1995; Crompton & McKay, 1994). Furthermore, where governments have promoted broader outcomes from sports events, their motivations have been criticised (Carrière & Demazière, 2002; French & Disher, 1997; Smith & Fox, 2007; Vaz & Jacques, 2006). There is an argument that the justification of broader benefits and enduring outcomes, or legacies, are merely public relations exercises by which to gain public sector support for ‘hallmark decision-making’ (Chalip, 2004; Kellett, Hede, & Chalip, 2008; Veal, 2002; Whitson & Macintosh, 1996). Therefore, there is a growing consensus that if special events are to benefit the host community, strategic planning for long-term outcomes is required (Chalip, 2004; Gratton & Preuss, 2008).

Planning for long-term outcomes

Given the increased importance of legacy as a justification for government involvement and investment in sport events, researchers and policy makers have called for a longer-term consideration to conceptualise, plan and evaluate the economic, social and environmental outcomes from events (Bianchi, 2003; Gratton & Preuss, 2008; Hiller, 2003; McIntosh, 2003; Preuss, 2007). Indeed, within the sport event context a paradigm shift has occurred, through which there has been recognition of the need to have strategies and policies in place to plan for broader outcomes from sport events (Bramwell, 1997; Chalip, 2003, 2004, 2006; Gratton & Preuss, 2008; Kellett et al., 2008; Preuss, 2007; J. R. Ritchie, 2000; Smith & Fox, 2007). As part of this process, the need to limit negative event consequences and to sustain, grow

and leverage positive event impacts has been recognised (Chalip, 2004; Gratton & Preuss, 2008; Preuss, 2007; Schulenkorf, 2010). Sport events may provide opportunities for broader outcomes; however, there is a need to consider their positive and negative consequences across the entire event lifecycle. This includes a focus on pre-event, during the event, and post event monitoring for events' appropriateness, effectiveness, and efficiency as a public policy (Hall, 2001). In effect, winning the bid to host a sport event is only half of the process to realising sport event legacies and there must be a strategic and encompassing policy framework in place for host cities to maximise social, economic and environmental outcomes (Kellett et al., 2008; Masterman, 2003; McIntosh, 2003; Preuss, 2007; Smith & Fox, 2007; Taylor & Edmondson, 2007).

Need for clarification of legacy understanding in the sport event context – proposed framework for analysis

Within the planning, implementing and evaluating of sport event legacies, many inconsistencies across academic literature and industry practice do exist (Moragas, 2003). In fact, available legacy literature outlines the problems involved with defining legacy as “a matter of debate and controversy” (Essex & Chalkley, 2003, p. 95). Legacy is regarded as multifaceted (Chalip, 2003), multidimensional (McCloy, 2003; Moragas, Kennett, & Puig, 2003), and elusive (Cashman, 2003). Based on a detailed review of available academic research on legacy, Thomson et al. (2009) identified five key considerations evident in the literature which are considered in theory to be inherent to planning, implementing and evaluating legacy within a sport event context. These key considerations include:

1. Terminology – use of ‘legacy’ as opposed to another term

Using the term ‘legacy’ as opposed to other terminology is an important factor in this growing area of sport event management. It is important that common terminology and conceptual understanding is established (Cashman, 2003; Getz, 2002; Preuss, 2007).

2. Legacy as automatically bestowed or needing to be planned

This is an area that has received a significant amount of attention in recent years. The majority of authors argue that legacies cannot be left to chance, with an anticipation of bestowal, but rather that leveraging strategies need to be put in place around the event to ensure that desired outcomes are achieved (Chalip, 2003, 2004, 2006; O'Brien & Chalip, 2008; Preuss, 2007).

3. Temporal nature of legacy – permanent or long-term

This consideration highlights the importance of understanding the temporal dimension of legacy as being critical in setting boundaries and time lines for evaluation, and to be able to attribute certain legacy outcomes to an event (Barney, 2003; Chalip, 2003; Preuss, 2007).

4. Legacy as positive and/or negative

This consideration highlights the need to acknowledge the positive and negative nature of legacies, with a view to maximise positive, and limit negative legacy outcomes. In doing so, it also needs to be realised that legacies may be subject to perception, and that two stakeholders may take different view points on the same legacy outcome (Chalip, 2004; Dubi, Hug, & Griethuysen, 2003; Preuss, 2007).

5. Legacy as a local and global concept

This consideration suggests that a strategic approach to identifying and managing stakeholder objectives is necessary to ensure that legacies can be realised not only for the host city, but the wider region and nation (Chalip, 2004; McCloy, 2003; Roche, 2003).

There also needs to be recognition that while each event stakeholder has its own agenda, they need to work cooperatively to achieve the desired legacy outcomes.

Thomson et al. (2009) recognised the need to test these five considerations on a number of sport events to analyse how the approaches to planning, implementing and evaluating legacy have been considered from a policy and strategic management angle. This paper aims to address this gap in the literature by empirically testing the five key considerations and applying them to the contemporary Australian and Canadian sport event contexts.

Method

In order to empirically test the five key considerations of legacy introduced above, this research examined key strategic documents from sport events staged in Australia and Canada from 1988 to 2007. Australia and Canada share a history of staging large-scale sport events, both with government investment and involvement as part of democratic policy approaches. Thus the contemporary Australian and Canadian sport event management examples present an appropriate research context in which to examine how ‘legacy’ has been conceptualised, through approaches to planning, implementation and evaluation. To provide the relevant background to the study, a brief overview of the research context and in particular the countries’ development as event destinations will be outlined.

Research Context

Australian Context

In 1956, the Australian city of Melbourne played host to one of the most prestigious international sporting events – the Olympic Games. Yet, it was not until the 1980s that Australia emerged as a major player in the hosting of international events. The 1987 America’s Cup, staged in Fremantle, Western Australia has been acknowledged as the eye-opener event that demonstrated to Australian policy-makers the potential for an event to benefit a city through urban renewal, economic and social impacts (Government of Western

Australia, 2010). The Australian state governments have proceeded with a reputable portfolio of events from the late 1980s until today. However, this has been within an *ad hoc* tourism and leisure policy landscape that reflects the structure of Australian government, whereby the States retain most power for decision making (Veal, 2002).

Within the Australian context, the event planning and delivery stages have traditionally taken most policy focus. This included special legislation for acquisition of necessary resources and the overriding of local democratic planning processes to ensure events could be delivered on time and with (economic) success. However, there were limited policy frameworks in place to strategically coordinate the many government departments at various levels who may consider themselves to be sport event stakeholders, and hence become involved in sport event strategies through cash or in-kind intervention. This means that event agencies, sport departments, tourism departments, economic development units, and in recent cases, health and ageing departments (at either national, state, regional or local government levels) only cooperated if they 'saw fit'. There was simply no obligation for cooperation within the Australian sport event context.

In 2000, the Commonwealth Department of Industry, Science and Resources released a draft strategy document titled "Towards a National Sports Tourism Strategy", which outlined the opportunities and benefits to Australia through pursuing sport tourism and sport event strategies. In the hype of the Sydney 2000 Olympic Games, this document set out recommendations for industry Coordination between "sporting and tourism groups at all levels – regional, state/territory and national" (Commonwealth Department of Industry Science and Resources, 2000, p. 6) by State Event Units. Whilst this may have been a step in the right direction, the document has remained as a draft ever since.

Canadian Context

Canada has been hosting international sporting events for the better part of the century since the first British Empire Games in Hamilton in 1930. A formal sport event hosting policy has been available since the early 1980s, which was developed, in part, as a result of hosting the Montreal 1976 Summer Olympic Games. The Games incurred a large financial loss for the city of Montreal and the province of Quebec, with associated costs reaching 1.5 billion; debts were not paid off in full until 2006 (CBC News, 2006). Many lessons were learned from the Montreal experience and assurance of this not happening again was of utmost importance when dealing with large-scale events in Canada. Many policies and programs were updated or created as a consequence (Koenig & Leopkey, 2009) and the government attempted to strategically plan for realising the benefits associated with hosting large-scale events (e.g., enhancing athlete excellence, increased capacity, and facilitation of social and economic impacts) (Canadian Heritage, 2008; Leopkey, Mutter, & Parent, 2010 in press).

Today, legacy is an important element of a strategic policy framework which aims to "provide a blueprint for governments and the sport community throughout Canada to work together to maximize the sport development, social, cultural, economic and community

benefits derived from hosting international sport events” (Canadian Heritage, 2008, p. 1). Funds provided by the federal government must contribute to the “provision of legacies according to a Government of Canada-approved legacy plan. Franchise holders and host societies must invest directly in the associated sport programming legacies” (Canadian Heritage, 2008, p. 5). The policy clearly states that the Federal Government will not be the only source of funding for the sport legacies. This enforces cooperation between the event hosts and other major event stakeholders within the country including the provincial/territorial and municipal governments (Canadian Heritage, 2008; Leopkey et al., 2010 in press).

Research Approach

The empirical analysis presented in this paper is founded on data collected through key strategic documents from 13 large-scale sport events staged in Australia (7 events) and Canada (6 events) from 1988 to 2007. A qualitative and interpretive approach was used for this research as it is an emerging area of study with limited investigation (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005; Neuman, 2003). Document analysis was chosen as the focus for data analysis, with documents primarily categorised as official documents deriving from the state (Bryman, 2004). The detailed sampling criteria and data collection are now described, followed by a discussion of the data analysis process.

Sampling Criteria and Data Collection

Documents and archival material were the key data sources for the Australian and Canadian events, and all documents were checked against two sampling criteria. The first sampling criterion was developed through reference to the literature in order to identify and select relevant large-scale events with specific characteristics and available documentation:

- Events had to be staged after the mid 1980’s when the term legacy began to be used by event organisers;
- A formal bid process was required;
- There had to be evidence of government involvement for both the Bid and/or Event staging process;
- The event had to demonstrate the notion of an ‘Urban Project’ through:
 - A substantial economic impact for the State economy; and/or
 - refocusing the city through capital investments, or at least an event duration of 5 days; and/or
 - place marketing – national and/or international media coverage, and/or at least 1000 domestic/international participants;
- There had to be access to post-event documentation at the time of analysis.

Adherence to these sampling criteria resulted in the inclusion of 13 events into the sample, 7 events from Australia and 6 events from Canada. Table 1 lists the events that met these criteria and that were therefore included in the sample for data analysis.

Table 1 Sample of Australian & Canadian Sport Events¹

Australia	Year	Canada	Year
World Police and Fire Games	1995	Calgary Winter Olympics	1988
Sydney Olympics	2000	Pan American Games	1999
Sydney Paralympics	2000	FINA World Championships	2005
World Masters Games	2002	World Masters Games	2005
Rugby World Cup	2003	Canada Winter Games	2007
Commonwealth Games	2006	U20 FIFA World Cup	2007
FINA World Championships	2007	1	

A second sampling criterion was set in place to identify and select specific event documents for the analysis. As outlined by Bryman (2004), such documents have to be authentic, credible and representative. The final reports compiled or commissioned by the host committees were used in this analysis as the main source of data as they were considered the most typical and most encompassing reporting documents available for large-scale and mega-sporting events. However, since these documents are written from the perspective of the organisers, it needs to be understood that they are often used to supply positive information on the event to its various stakeholders. The authors acknowledge this as a limitation to objective research.

Final reports included economic impacts statements, triple bottom line reports and post games reports. These documents were collected through web searches where publicly available, or contacting official representatives of organising committees who had access to the documents and agreed to the documentation being made available for the study. All material was then converted to an electronic format, if not already available in that form. Table 2 provides a summary of the document types collected for the data analysis.

¹ The 2010 Vancouver Winter Olympic data has not been included in this paper as the final report is not yet available. However, it will be considered in the extended version of this paper.

Table 2 Summary of Document Types Collected for Data Analysis

Event	Year	Economic Impact Study	Triple Bottom Line Report	Post Games Report
AUSTRALIA				
World Police and Fire Games	1995	✓		
Sydney Olympics	2000			✓
Sydney Paralympics	2000			✓
World Masters Games	2002	✓		
Rugby World Cup	2003	✓		
Commonwealth Games	2006	✓	✓	
FINA World Championships	2007			✓
CANADA				
Calgary Winter Olympics	1988			✓
Pan American Games	1999			✓
FINA World Championships	2005			✓
World Masters Games	2005			✓
Canada Winter Games	2007			✓
U20 FIFA World Cup	2007			✓

Data Analysis

The document analysis undertaken was informed by an interpretive approach to understanding meanings of legacy as evidenced through official reports. Coding softwares NVivo and Atlas.ti were employed in the data analysis process, which followed the descriptive, interpretive and pattern coding as set out by Miles and Huberman (1994). First, an initial broad (i.e. open) coding of all legacy-relevant themes was carried out by reading through each textual source. This was done in order to identify emerging themes that appeared and reoccurred throughout the different event reports. Coding was conducted on passages that referenced legacy specifically, or had connotations of long-term or lasting outcomes. An important factor in the first round of document analysis was the open-mindedness of the researchers and the re-testing of initial interpretations (Stake, 1995). Second, the passages coded to the broad legacy theme were subsequently analysed and framed according to Thomson et al.’s (2009) five key considerations of legacy, as set out in Table 3. Finally, coding categories were checked between co-authors for reliability as recommended by Miles and Huberman (1994).

Table 3 Coding Frame - 5 Key Considerations of Legacy

Consideration	Explanation
Terminology	Use of ‘legacy’ as opposed to another term
Legacy as bestowed or planned	Legacy as automatically bestowed or needing to be planned
Temporal nature of legacy	Permanent or long-term Permanent typically infrastructure-based
Legacy as positive or negative	Legacy as positive and/or negative, same legacy, different perspectives
Legacy as local and global	Contextual and dynamic nature of sport events Stakeholder objectives and perspectives Challenge to balance

Source: Thomson, Schlenker & Schulenkorf (2009)

Findings and Discussion

The following section reviews the findings from the data analysis regarding each of the five key considerations mentioned above. Building on these findings, it will be discussed how legacy has been conceptualized, planned and evaluated in the Australian and Canadian sport event contexts. This is followed by a section outlining the implications for policy and management of sport event legacies.

Terminology

The majority of event reports and documents (11 out of 13) referred to the concept of 'legacy'. Where legacy was mentioned and discussed, it was commonly referred to as:

- legacy outcomes;
- legacy assets;
- legacy contributions;
- legacy obligations; and/or
- legacy aspects.

Additionally, the event documents used a variety of related terms to describe event legacies. Table 4 provides a collection of examples from the event documents which demonstrate the different terms employed that relate to or are synonymous with legacy.

Table 4 Various Terminology used in Event Documents that relates to Legacy

Australian Case	Canadian Case
<p>“A lasting social impact of the Sydney 2000 Games will be the permanent legacy created for the people of New South Wales of new sporting and recreational facilities, venues which families and individuals can enjoy for generations to come. The future operation of these facilities will be monitored to ensure their continued availability to people generally.” (Sydney Organising Committee for the Olympic Games, 2001, p. 7)</p>	<p>“For Alberta, the success of the Olympics represents an ongoing benefit, and the new opportunities which exist to expand and strengthen Alberta’s economy cannot be underestimated” (Canadian Olympic Development Association, 1988, p. 5).</p>
<p>“lasting social, environmental and economic benefits” (Insight Economics, 2006, p. vi)</p>	<p>“Tourism and business development opportunities will be expanded” (World Masters Games Local Games Organization, 2005, p. 6)</p>
<p>“to ensure the Championships left a strong social legacy for Victoria” (Sport and Recreation Victoria, 2007, p. 29)</p>	<p>“Games would provide a targeted set of benefits to Edmontonians, Albertans, Canadians and international visitors” (World Masters Games Local Games Organization, 2005, p. 6)</p>
<p>“legacy will be the further enhancement of the already strong sense of tradition surrounding the World Police and Fire Games” (Ernst & Young, 1996, p. ix)</p>	<p>“Extensive economic impact” (Canadian Soccer Association, 2007, p. 14)</p>

It can be seen from the Australian and Canadian documents that over time, event reports have included increased reference to legacy. For example, the earlier documents (World Police and

Fire Games, Australia, 1995) did not include legacy or referred less commonly to the concept in their reporting, but the later documents have acknowledged the concept regularly (FINA Swimming World Championships, Australia, 2007; 2007 Canada Winter Games). Those that have mentioned legacy have referred to a variety of legacy concepts – assets, contributions, obligations, – which provide limited ability to compare and contrast legacy planning, implementation and/or evaluation.

This consideration highlights the importance of common terminology and legacy concepts in being able to understand and compare how legacy has been conceptualised, planned and evaluated across different events. Whilst the literature has emphasised the need for common terminology and points of reference (Cashman, 2003; Getz, 2002; Preuss, 2007), these findings demonstrate that in practice, a varied application is taking place.

Legacy as Planned or Bestowed

It was found that conceptualisation of legacy as both planned and bestowed was evident across the documents. Table 5 provides a collection of examples from the event documents which demonstrate the two differing conceptualisations of legacy.

Table 5 Examples of Legacy Conceptualisation as Planned and Bestowed

Australian Case	Canadian Case
<p>“it is hoped that many will continue to be involved in volunteering” (Sydney Organising Committee for the Olympic Games, 2001, p. 7).</p>	<p>“With the awarding of the Olympic Games to a city, the vision of its community leaders expands well beyond previous horizons and creative and enterprising people come forward to propose the next big project” (Canadian Olympic Development Association, 1988, p. 5).</p>
<p>“NSW Government legislators sought to avoid this outcome by committing SOCOG to financial discipline” (Sydney Organising Committee for the Olympic Games, 2001, p. 3)</p>	<p>“Once the Games are over, the focus of the Organizing Committee shifts towards demobilization... Calgary prepared for life after the Olympics by providing much-needed operating funding for the two organizations that played major roles in bringing the Games to southern Alberta—the Calgary Olympic Development Association and the Canadian Olympic Association” (Canadian Olympic Development Association, 1988, p. 5).</p>
<p>“OCA’s primary task was to deliver new facilities and venues for use during the Games that also met the long-term social, cultural and sporting requirements of the people of new South Wales” (Sydney Organising Committee for the Olympic Games, 2001, p. 4)</p>	<p>“A corporate sponsorship strategy and plan was developed with the following key objectives: 1) To maximize corporate relationships and revenue generation opportunities. 2) To leverage corporate and government relations to capitalize on public awareness vehicles. 3) To leave a legacy of corporate interest and expertise in corporate sponsorship investment that would benefit future events” (World Masters Games Local Games Organization, 2005, p. 19).</p>
<p>“determine the legacy agency prior to completion of Games” (Sydney Paralympic Organising Committee, 2001, p. 1)</p>	<p>“The Legacy Committee was created by the MONTRÉAL 2005 Board of Directors who wished to receive recommendations pertaining to the disposal of the immovable assets that would remain in the Championships’ wake” (Organising Committee, 2005, p. 17).</p>
<p>“M2002 have provided us with a number of benefits, which they believe will create a lasting legacy of the Games” (Ernst & Young, 2002, p. 17)</p>	<p>“A Legacy Committee was formed many months before the Games commenced to document many of the physical and intangible benefits of hosting the Canada Games” (Whitehorse 2007 Canada Games Host Society, 2007, p. 17).</p>
<p>“As part of the legacy... M2007 developed a Sport Development program in conjunction with VICSWIM. Prior to the event, VICSWIM conducted three five day programs at over 180 locations throughout Victoria, focusing on fun, educational swimming and water safety.” (Sport and Recreation Victoria, 2007, p. 28).</p>	

In Australia, the examples highlight to a certain extent the assumption that flow-on benefits may automatically occur when staging large-scale events. However, State legislation was referred to in the case of the Sydney 2000 Olympics, which planned to limit the financial burden on the people of NSW, therefore avoiding a negative event legacy. Following the Sydney Olympics, the Sydney Olympic Park Authority was assigned the task to manage the Homebush Bay Olympic Precinct and facility legacy. The Sydney Paralympic Post Games Report further alluded to the need to identify a Legacy Agency. However, no further Australian events have followed through with setting up specific Legacy Agencies. Nevertheless, planning for the recent 2007 FINA Swimming Championships has demonstrated a move towards a much clearer scope of activities and efforts to partner with event stakeholders to realise desired outcomes.

The concept of planning legacy was more evident in the Canadian documents and in some cases specific strategies were developed to maximise legacy. For example, as a consequence of the financial woes associated with the Montreal Olympic Games (Koenig & Leopkey, 2009), there is the requirement for events to show a positive return on investment. Furthermore, legacy is a priority for the government of Canada when it decides to support the bids and coordination efforts of various sport events (Canadian Olympic Development Association, 1988). This has seen Canadian sport event management reflect a very proactive and successful approach, which shows the need for legacy to be planned, and for planning to be considered right from the beginning of the bid (cf. Canadian Sport Event Hosting Policy). Further to this, the Canadian case exhibited several specific legacy organisations or agencies across different events. Some were responsible for identifying physical and tangible benefits pre- and during events (such as the Committee for the 2007 Canada Winter Games), while others were responsible for legacy post-event (e.g., Calgary Olympic Development Association and the Canadian Olympic Committee).

In both the Australian and Canadian cases there was a link to long-term developments, such as city planning. For example, Sydney used the 2000 Games as a catalyst to speed up the rejuvenation of the Homebush Bay area,

“The remediation of Homebush Bay was the largest single land renewal exercise ever undertaken in Australia and one of the largest anywhere in the world. The significance of this remediation and Homebush Bay’s transformation from an urban wasteland and dumping ground into a glittering jewel of sporting, recreational, residential and commercial development cannot be overestimated” (Sydney Organising Committee for the Olympic Games, 2001, p. 3).

In Canada, the Yukon utilized the opportunity of hosting the Canada Games to help meet housing needs,

“The Government of Yukon evaluated its long term space needs to determine if it was possible to accelerate construction of facilities that could be utilized initially to accommodate athletes in 2007” (Whitehorse 2007 Canada Games Host Society, 2007, p. 11).

In addition, it becomes evident that following the awarding of an event to the city, bid plans change due to further evaluations and evolving needs of the community. This was evident in

Calgary during the planning phase of the 1988 Olympic Winter Games, as the majority of original locations for the new venues were changed at least once prior to being built,

“In determining the location of sports facilities, three factors should be considered: proximity to the population base, cost of land purchase and construction, and technical suitability. Proximity to population, the most important criterion, ensures facilities will be utilized following the Games” (Canadian Olympic Development Association, 1988, p. 497).

This consideration highlights the importance for legacies to be planned rather than left to chance, or assuming that they are automatically bestowed to a city (Chalip, 2003, 2004, 2006; O'Brien & Chalip, 2008; Preuss, 2007). The policy documents demonstrated consistency with concerns in the literature regarding the ambiguity of how legacies will be realised. Findings also highlight the important role of different coordinated policy contexts, as well as the role of legacy organisations or agencies that help to realise specific legacy outcomes.

Temporal Nature of Legacy

Evidence of the temporal nature of legacy was found across most event documents, as illustrated in Table 6 below. This came through different references to legacy including:

- long-term;
- permanent;
- enduring; and/or
- transferable.

Table 6 Temporal Nature of Legacy

Australian Case	Canadian Case
<p>“only venues that offered the opportunity for a financially viable ongoing operation after the Sydney 2000 Olympic Games were designed and constructed as legacy (permanent) venues.” (Sydney Organising Committee for the Olympic Games, 2001, p. 11)</p> <p>“positive and long-lasting impact on the volunteer movement in Australia” (Sydney Organising Committee for the Olympic Games, 2001, p. 7)</p> <p>“The new Millennium Parklands will undoubtedly evolve further as Sydney’s residential density increases” (Sydney Organising Committee for the Olympic Games, 2001, p. 3)</p> <p>“Works expected to be used for future events” (Insight Economics, 2006, p. xix)</p>	<p>“The coaches and officials that took part in the program will continue to assist in the development of sport within the province long after the completion of the Games” (PAGS, 1999, p. 242).</p> <p>“Venues previously built for the 1978 Commonwealth Games, 1983 University Games, 2001 , World Athletic Championships and 2001 World Triathlon Championships were utilized” (World Masters Games Local Games Organization, 2005, p. 46).</p>
<p>“The pools modular design allowed for them to be relocated as permanent facilities at four community aquatic centres following the Championships” (Sport and Recreation Victoria, 2007, p. 10)</p>	<p>“The transfer of knowledge is an important ingredient to ensure that the Canada Games stay consistent. This transfer also keeps the Canada Games on the leading edge of large scale event management practices in this country” (Whitehorse 2007 Canada Games Host Society, 2007, p. 3).</p> <p>“Yukon people are proud to be hosting the 2007 Canada Winter Games... creating lasting legacies for the benefit of future generations” (Whitehorse 2007 Canada Games Host Society, 2007, p. 4).</p>

Overall, this consideration highlights the importance of boundaries to be set within the specific event or organisational context to allow strategic planning, implementation and evaluation to be carried out (Barney, 2003; Chalip, 2003; Preuss, 2007).

Within this consideration the idea of ‘looking back and looking forward’ became apparent. On the one side this included reference to legacies from previous events, including facilities, volunteers, and expertise that were now available to current events. On the other side references to legacies included benefits that would be available for the staging of future events and future generations. Additionally, the temporal nature of legacy covered the evolving nature of legacies which was commonly associated with the need for facilities and precincts to reflect community interests and needs.

Legacy as Positive and Negative

Findings demonstrated that ‘legacy as positive’ was the predominant theme throughout both the Australian and Canadian events. This was manifested through celebratory discussions of event legacies and minimal critical reflection on legacies within event reports. Table 7 provides a collection of examples from the event documents which demonstrate legacy as positive and – to a minor degree - as negative.

Table 7 Legacy as Positive and Negative

Australian Case	Canadian Case
<p>“Several previous Olympic Games have left host cities and underwriters with an unwelcome legacy in the form of large public debt. NSW Government legislators sought to avoid this outcome. These responsibilities were recognised by SOCOG in its Mission Statement, that pledged fiscal responsibility, public accountability and a ‘lasting, beneficial legacy’” (Sydney Organising Committee for the Olympic Games, 2001, p. 3).</p>	<p>“In reflecting on the planning stages of the village, there could have been a permanent legacy of accommodation had we picked the site earlier” (Canadian Olympic Development Association, 1988, p. 525).</p>
<p>“Olympic Games will have a positive and long-lasting impact on the volunteer movement in Australia.” (Sydney Organising Committee for the Olympic Games, 2001, p. 7)</p>	<p>“The XV Olympic Winter Games were a financial success- a savings was produced and the Games had a positive impact on tax payers” (87Canadian Olympic Development Association, 1988).</p>
<p>“a number of benefits, which they believe will create a lasting legacy” (Ernst & Young, 2002, p. 17)</p>	<p>“The new friendships and better international understanding generated by each competitor's display of courage and dedication helped make the world a better place. That may be the greatest legacy of all” (Canadian Olympic Development Association, 1988, p. 13).</p>
<p>“to deliver lasting social, environmental and economic benefits to the Victorian community” (Insight Economics, 2006, p. vi)</p>	<p>“Good legacy items for most Venues” (PAGS, 1999, p. 96)</p>
<p>“By and large, the public and private investment in infrastructure catalysed by the Games has left a significant and positive legacy to the Victorian community.” (Insight Economics, 2006, p. ix)</p>	<p>“Leave a positive legacy of volunteer involvement in the broader community by developing the volunteer network and encouraging community leadership” (World Masters Games Local Games Organization, 2005, p. 30).</p>

Most apparent from the Canadian perspective is the connection between success and legacy:

“The Olympics were a tremendous success. That success can be attributed to the strong financial commitment made by all levels of government and our corporate partners, the thousands of volunteers who gave freely of their time and energy and a will to deliver the ‘Best-Ever Olympics’. The financial success of the Games will clearly assist in enhancing

sport development throughout Canada and the overall success has fostered a sense of pride and accomplishment in all of those who were involved, or were touched by the Olympics. For Alberta, the success of the Olympics represents an ongoing benefit, and the new opportunities which exist to expand and strengthen Alberta's economy cannot be underestimated” (Canadian Olympic Development Association, 1988, p. 515).

The success of the Games is praised as an element of legacy in itself, which may have an additional impact on other legacy objectives and outcomes. On the other hand, success in the Australian context is often referred to as successful athletic performances, success of ancillary events, host city perception of the event as a success, organisational success in staging the event – not necessarily spoken about in terms of legacy. For example, the final report on the Sydney Olympics highlights:

“The ultimate great success of the Sydney 2000 Games and the budgetary control achieved indicate that the directions chosen and the mechanisms put in place were appropriate and sound” (Sydney Organising Committee for the Olympic Games, 2001, p. 1)

Within the Australian case, ‘legacy as negative’ was only really apparent when event management approaches and outcomes were compared to previous events that may not have achieved expected legacy outcomes. The Sydney 2000 example provides an examples of this, with the statement outlining that previous Games have left other cities in an unfavourable position and because of this, the NSW Government set out to take a specific approach to avoid such outcomes. Within the Canadian case, organisers did reflect on missed opportunities in the earliest event included, the Calgary Games, highlighting a missed opportunity with regards to the athlete village.

This consideration highlights the need to acknowledge the positive and negative nature of legacies, with a view to maximise positive and limit negative event outcomes (Chalip, 2004; Dubi et al., 2003; Preuss, 2007). Findings also demonstrate that in post event reports there is still a limited focus on critical appraisals of legacy outcomes. Although there is an argument that the ‘real value’ of legacies may not be realised for some time until after an event (Preuss, 2007), the legacy planning and stakeholder management processes would be important to report for short-term legacy planning.

Legacy as Local and Global

Findings on legacy as local and global demonstrated a dominant theme that legacies are available to anyone, anywhere. In most event reporting, stakeholders or stakeholder management processes were not clearly defined. Table 8 provides a collection of examples from the event documents which demonstrate legacy as local and global.

Table 8 Legacy as Local and Global

Australian Case	Canadian Case
“Not many Olympic venues double as popular family picnic spots but that is precisely the case with the Sydney International Regatta Centre, set on the Picturesque Penrith Lakes” (Sydney Organising Committee for the Olympic Games, 2001, p. 22)	“ the Olympics also help to bring each level of government together into a single force unified by a high-profile project that captures the imagination and builds pride among people throughout the host nation... All three levels of government

<p>“The social impact work that was undertaken has provided Sydney, and indeed the whole state of New South Wales, with numerous legacies in several fields” (Sydney Organising Committee for the Olympic Games, 2001, p. 7)</p> <p>“benefits for small to medium size venues...in hosting international large-scale events” (Ernst & Young, 2002, p. 18)</p>	<p>cooperate and share in the project and they enjoy their investment of time and money” (Canadian Olympic Development Association, 1988, p. 7)</p>
<p>“the Games provide the opportunity for a host community to promote itself to a wider international audience and to form the deeper relationships which lie at the heart of business and political success in the global economy” (Insight Economics, 2006)</p> <p>“a fantastic legacy for Melbourne and all Victorians” (Sport and Recreation Victoria, 2007, p. 3)</p>	<p>“ before the start of the event, with a view to optimizing the cooperation with the city and the governments two task forces were convened through the Government Relations division coordination committee and the Legacy Committee” (Organising Committee, 2005, p. 18)</p> <p>“a targeted set of benefits to Edmontonians, Albertans, Canadians, and international visitors” (World Masters Games Local Games Organization, 2005, p. 6).</p>

The Australian case provided brief phrases with feel-good statements, but limited accountability to stakeholders for any specific outcomes. This was similar in the Canadian context, although the Canadian excerpts were more substantial than the Australian ones.

Through these examples, it can be seen that the strategic legacy approaches called for in the literature – including a) the importance of defining and bounding legacies within their context in order to establish strategic frameworks (Preuss, 2007), b) considering what each of the stakeholders wants to achieve (Chalip, 2004), and c) setting down strategies to balance objectives and maximise outcomes (Chalip, 2004; McCloy, 2003) – have not been evident in post-event reporting. The context, in terms of stakeholders, time frame or specific nature of the intended outcomes has often not been outlined. Further, instead of considering the objectives by relevant stakeholders (Chalip, 2004; McCloy, 2003), reporting has reflected a celebratory nature rather than a demonstration of strategic approaches to maximise outcomes for relevant stakeholders, be they the event owner or the host city.

Conclusion and Implications

The term ‘legacy’ is increasingly used by policy makers and event organising committees. This paper sought to test five key considerations of legacy, which were identified in previous work by Thomson et al. (2009) as inherent to planning, implementing and evaluating legacy within a sport event context. The five key considerations were tested on 13 large scale sport events in Australia and Canada to analyse how the approaches to planning, implementing and evaluating legacy have been considered from a policy and strategic management angle. The findings of this empirical study illustrate a consistency with tensions identified in the literature across these five considerations, attributable to a lack of transparency and accountability for legacy conceptualisation and practical management applications.

The events included in this study spanned almost 2 decades, however, the reporting of legacy does not reflect an increasing sophistication of planning, implementing and evaluating legacy over time, which one might expect given the increased importance in the bid and policy processes for hosting large scale sport events. In Australia, the limited development of legacy frameworks appears to have been obscured by a preoccupation with successful event delivery and an absence of critical event evaluation. In Canada, the historical context of the Montreal

Games and a coordinated policy approach seems to have encouraged sport event organisers and policy makers to incorporate legacy as a means to sell the benefits to the public. Yet, there were several ambiguous legacy statements included in the Canadian documents and the most recent event, the U20 FIFA World Cup, did not include the term legacy in the document after all.

The inconsistency of terminology and the varied applications of legacy have implications on the ability to compare and contrast legacy planning, implementation and evaluation. As a consequence, ambiguity exists about how legacies will be realised, in terms of both timeframe and/or specific nature of the intended outcome. As the documents featured in this study demonstrate, most event legacy reporting has been celebratory in nature and contained limited accountability to stakeholders and specific outcomes.

Implications for policy and management emerge from this review and are pertinent to the UK context as the world audience anticipates the potential legacies of the London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games. This study has highlighted the need for legacy reporting to move towards clear conceptualisations in order to plan, manage and evaluate legacies. Such a move will lead to accountability and transparency for stakeholders and promises to provide a solid framework for managers to work towards meaningful legacy outcomes. This research suggests several specific areas of concern for policy makers and event organisers, including: a) a clarification of terminology; b) a clear identification of stakeholders; and c) the outline of stakeholder and legacy management processes and evaluation techniques from the outset of event bidding procedures. Through a more comprehensive approach to legacy reporting, events may be capable of demonstrating a clear value to host communities and stakeholders. At the same time, open and critical reporting on legacy management strategies would allow for a process of learning for future events.

Further legacy research will be undertaken by the authors surrounding a more detailed examination and comparison of international cases. The aim will be to better understand differences in the conceptualisation of legacy across planning, implementation and evaluation for sport events, with specific focus on the role of the varying policy contexts. Research will also seek to examine changes in how legacy has been conceptualised over time, comparing approaches in earlier sport events with current legacy thinking.

References

- Allen, J., O'Toole, W., McDonnell, I., & Harris, R. (2008). *Festival and Special Event Management* (4 ed.). : Wiley.
- Barney, R. K. (2003). *The Olympic Legacy of Wealth: A Double Edged Sword*. Paper presented at the Legacy of the Olympic Games 1984-2000, International Symposium.
- Bianchi, C. (2003). *The Role of Archives and Documents in the Legacy of the Olympic Movement*. Paper presented at the Legacy of the Olympic Games 1984-2000, International Symposium.
- Bramwell, B. (1997). Strategic planning before and after a mega-event. *Tourism Management, 18*, 167-176.
- Bryman, A. (2004). *Social Research Methods* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Canadian Heritage. (2008). *Sport Canada policy for hosting international sport events*. Retrieved. from.
- Canadian Olympic Development Association. (1988). *XV Olympic Winter Games: Official Report*. Edmonton, Canada: Jasper Printing Group Ltd.
- Canadian Soccer Association. (2007). *The FIFA U-20 World Cup 2007 Final Report*. Ottawa, Canada: Canadian Soccer Association.
- Carrière, J. P., & Demazière, C. (2002). Urban Planning and Flagship Development Projects: Lessons from EXPO 98, Lisbon. *Planning Practice & Research, 17*(1), 69-79.
- Cashman, R. (2003). *What is "Olympic Legacy"?* Paper presented at the Legacy of the Olympic Games 1984-2000, International Symposium.
- CBC News. (2006). Quebec's Big Owe stadium debt is over. <http://www.cbc.ca/canada/montreal/story/2006/12/19/qc-olympicstadium.html>. Retrieved 16 January, 2009,
- Chalip, L. (2003). *Tourism and the Olympic Games*. Paper presented at the Legacy of the Olympic Games 1984-2000, International Symposium.
- Chalip, L. (2004). Beyond Impact: A General Model for Sport Event Leverage. In B. Ritchie & D. Adair (Eds.), *Sport Tourism: Interrelationships, Impacts and Issues* (pp. 226-252). on-line e-book: Channelview Publications.
- Chalip, L. (2006). Towards Social Leverage of Sport. *Journal of Sport & Tourism, 11*(2), 109-127.
- Coalter, F. (2007). *A Wider Social Role for Sport: Who's keeping the score?* USA: Routledge.
- Commonwealth Department of Industry Science and Resources. (2000). *Towards a National Sports Tourism Strategy (Draft)*: Commonwealth of Australia.
- Crompton, J. (1995). Economic impact analysis of sports facilities and events: eleven sources of misapplication *Journal of Sport Management, 9*(1), 14-35.
- Crompton, J., & McKay, S. (1994). Measuring the economic impacts of festivals and events: some myths, applications and ethical dilemmas. *Festival Management and Event Tourism, 2*(1), 33-43.
- Denzin, N., & Lincoln, Y. (2005). *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (3 ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Dubi, C., Hug, P. A., & Griethuysen, P. (2003). *Olympic Games Management: From the Candidature to the Final Evaluation, an Integrated Management Approach*. Paper presented at the Legacy of the Olympic Games 1984-2000, International Symposium.
- Ernst & Young. (1996). *1995 World Police & Fire Games: Economic Impact Assessment*. Melbourne, Victoria: Ernst & Young.
- Ernst & Young. (2002). *Melbourne 2002 World Masters Games: Economic Impact Assessment*. Melbourne, Australia: Melbourne 2002 World Masters Games Ltd.

- Essex, S., & Chalkley, B. (2003). *The Infrastructural Legacy of the Summer and Winter Olympic Games: A Comparative Analysis*. Paper presented at the Legacy of the Olympic Games 1984-2000, International Symposium.
- Essex, S., & Chalkley, B. (2004). Mega-sporting events in urban and regional policy: a history of the Winter Olympics. *Planning Perspectives*, 19(April), 201-232.
- Evans, G. (2006). Branding the City of Culture - The Death of City Planning? Chapter 11. In F. J. Monclús & M. Guardia (Eds.), *Culture, Urbanism and Planning* (pp. 197-213). England: Ashgate.
- French, S., & Disher, M. (1997). Atlanta and the Olympics. [Editorial]. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 63(3), 379-393.
- Getz, D. (2002). Event Studies and Event Management: On Becoming an Academic Discipline. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 9(1), 12-23.
- Gleeson, B., & Low, N. (2000). *Australian Urban Planning: New Challenges, New Agendas*. St Leonards Australia: Allen & Unwin.
- Government of Western Australia. (2010). Eventscorp. Retrieved 11 May, 2010, from http://www.tourism.wa.gov.au/Events/Pages/Major_Events.aspx
- Gratton, C., & Preuss, H. (2008). Maximizing Olympic Impacts by Building up Legacies. *The International Journal of the History of Sport*, 25(14), 1922-1938.
- Gratton, C., Shibli, S., & Coleman, R. (2005). Sport and Economic Regeneration in Cities. *Urban Studies*, 42(5/6), 985-999.
- Gratton, C., Shibli, S., & Coleman, R. (2006). The economic impact of major sports events: a review of ten events in the UK. In J. Horne & W. Manzenreiter (Eds.), *Sports Mega Events: Social Scientific Analysis of a Global Phenomenon*. Australia: Blackwell Publishing.
- Hall, C. M. (2001). Imaging, tourism and sports event fever. In C. Gratton & I. Henry (Eds.), *Sport in the City: The role of sport in economic and social regeneration* (pp. 166-183). London: Routledge.
- Higham, J. (2005). Sport Tourism Destinations: Issues, Opportunities and Analysis. In J. Higham (Ed.), *Sport Tourism Destinations: Issues, Opportunities and Analysis*. Oxford: Elsevier Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Hiller, H. (2000). Toward an Urban Sociology of Mega-Events. *Research in Urban Sociology*, 5, 181-205.
- Hiller, H. (2003). *Toward a Science of Olympic Outcomes: The Urban Legacy*. Paper presented at the Legacy of the Olympic Games 1984-2000, International Symposium.
- Insight Economics. (2006). *Triple Bottom Line Assessment of the XVIII Commonwealth Games Executive Summary: Report to the Office of Commonwealth Games Coordination*. Melbourne, Australia: Insight Economics.
- Jones, C. (2001). Mega-events and Host-region Impacts: Determining the True Worth of the 1999 Rugby World Cup. *The International Journal of Tourism Research*, 3(3), 241-251.
- Kellett, P., Hede, A. M., & Chalip, L. (2008). Social Policy for Sport Events: Leveraging (Relationships with) Teams from other Nations for Community Benefit. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 8(2), 101-121.
- Koenig, S., & Leopkey, B. (2009). *Canadian sporting events: An analysis of legacy and sports development*. Paper presented at the Administrative Sciences Association of Canada.
- Leopkey, B., Mutter, O., & Parent, M. (2010 in press). Barriers and facilitators when hosting sporting events: Exploring the Canadian and Swiss sport event hosting policies. *International Journal of Sport Policy*.

- Leopkey, B., & Parent, M. (2009). *The evolution of Olympic Games legacy: 1896-2016*. Paper presented at the North American Society for Sport History Conference.
- Lynch, R., & Veal, A. (2006). *Australian Leisure* (3 ed.). Frenchs Forest Australia: Pearson Education Australia.
- Masterman, G. (2003). *The Event Planning Process: Strategies for Successful Legacies*. Paper presented at the Legacy of the Olympic Games 1984-2000, International Symposium.
- McCloy, C. (2003). *Facilities "Sport For All" and the Toronto 2008 Olympic Bid*. Paper presented at the Legacy of the Olympic Games 1984-2000, International Symposium.
- McIntosh, M. J. (2003). *The Olympic Bid Process as the Starting Point of the Legacy Development*. Paper presented at the Legacy of the Olympic Games 1984-2000, International Symposium.
- Miles, M., & Huberman, A. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: an expanded sourcebook*. California: Sage Publications.
- Moragas, M. (2003). *Foreward*. Paper presented at the Legacy of the Olympic Games 1984-2000, International Symposium.
- Moragas, M., Kennett, C., & Puig, N. (2003, 2002). *Conclusions and Recommendations*. Paper presented at the Legacy of the Olympic Games 1984-2000, International Symposium, Lausanne.
- Moragas, M., Moreno, A. B., & Kennett, C. (2003). *The Legacy of the Symbols: Communication and the Olympic Games*. Paper presented at the Legacy of the Olympic Games 1984-2000, International Symposium.
- Neuman, W. (2003). *Social research methods: qualitative and quantitative approaches* (5 ed.). Boston; London: Allyn and Bacon.
- O'Brien, D., & Chalip, L. (2008). Sport events and strategic leveraging: pushing towards the triple bottom line. In A. Woodside & D. Martin (Eds.), *Advancing Tourism Management* (pp. 318-338). Cambridge, MA: CABI Publishing.
- Organising Committee. (2005). *XI FINA World Championships Final Report*. Montreal, Canada: Montreal 2005.
- PAGS. (1999). *XIII Pan American Games: PASO report*. Winnipeg, Canada: PAGS.
- Pellegrino, G., & Hancock, H. (2010). *A lasting legacy: How major sporting events can drive positive change for host communities and economies*: Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu.
- Preuss, H. (2007). The Conceptualisation and Measurement of Mega Sport Tourism. *Journal of Sport & Tourism*, 12(3-4), 207-227.
- Pyrgiotis, Y. (2003). *Athens 2004: Planning and Organising Olympic Legacy*. Paper presented at the Legacy of the Olympic Games 1984-2000, International Symposium.
- Ritchie, B. W. (2008). Contribution of Urban Precincts to the Urban Economy. In B. Hayllar, T. Griffin & D. Edwards (Eds.), *City Spaces Tourist Places: Urban Tourism Precincts* (pp. 151-182). UK: Elsevier.
- Ritchie, J. R. (2000). Turning 16 days into 16 years through Olympic legacies. *Event Management*, 6(3), 155-165.
- Roche, M. (2003). *The Olympics and the Development of "Global Society"*. Paper presented at the Legacy of the Olympic Games 1984-2000, International Symposium.
- Schulenkorf, N. (2010). The roles and responsibilities of a change agent in sport event development projects. *Sport Management Review*, 13(3), 118-128.
- Shoval, N. (2002). A new phase in the competition for the Olympic Gold: The London and New York bids for the 2012 Games. *Journal of Urban Affairs* 24(5), 583-599.
- Smith, A., & Fox, T. (2007). From 'Event-led' to 'Event-themed' Regeneration: The 2002 Commonwealth Games Legacy Programme. *Urban Studies*, 44(5/6), 1125-1143.

- Sport and Recreation Victoria. (2007). *12th FINA World Championships Summary Report*. Melbourne, Victoria: Sport and Recreation Victoria.
- Stake, R. (1995). *The Art of Case Study Research*. California: Sage Publications.
- Sydney Organising Committee for the Olympic Games. (2001). *Official Report of the XXVII Olympiad: Volume I*: Olympic Co-Ordination Authority.
- Sydney Paralympic Organising Committee. (2001). *Sydney 2000 Paralympic Games Post Games Report*. Sydney: Sydney Paralympic Organising Committee Limited.
- Taylor, M., & Edmondson, I. (2007). Major Sporting Events - planning for legacy. *Municipal Engineer*, 160(ME4), 171-176.
- Thomson, A., Schlenker, K., & Schulenkorf, N. (2009, 6-8 July). *The Legacy-Factor: Towards conceptual clarification in the sport event context*. Paper presented at the International Event Management Research Symposium, Gold Coast, Australia, pp.360-374.
- Vaz, L. F., & Jacques, P. B. (2006). Contemporary Urban Spectacularisation Chapter 13. In F. J. Monclús & M. Guardia (Eds.), *Culture, Urbanism and Planning* (pp. 241-253). England: Ashgate.
- Veal, A. (2002). *Leisure and Tourism Policy and Planning* (2nd ed.). Oxon: CABI Publishing.
- Whitehorse 2007 Canada Games Host Society. (2007). *Final Corporate Report Whitehorse 2007 Jeux du Canada Games*. Whitehorse, Canada: Whitehorse 2007 Canada Games Host Society.
- Whitson, D., & Macintosh, D. (1996). The Global Circus: International Sport, Tourism and Marketing of Cities. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, 23, 278-295.
- World Masters Games Local Games Organization. (2005). *Edmonton 2005 World Masters Games Final Report*.