Abstract

Community sport clubs (CSCs) provide a number of benefits to local communities, while confronting challenges with finances and staffing. In Queensland, Australia, these challenges have been compounded by recent natural disasters including widespread flooding that have significantly impacted operations of CSCs. The current research explores the provision of resources to CSCs in the aftermath of flooding events in 2010 and 2011, as well as the influence on power relations between CSCs and resource providers. To address this research purpose, qualitative data were collected across nine site visits (focus groups, interviews) to affected CSCs. The data revealed three resource providers: volunteers and members, partner organisations and government. In addition, the results indicate that relations between CSCs and members and volunteers, partner organisations and government were impacted in different ways. Examples of resource providers wielding power over CSCs due to the provision of resources emerged, along with some evidence of mutual power and dependence and CSCs exerting power over resource providers. The results provide implications for CSC managers to be more proactive in relation to resourcing through developing strategies for network building and improved communication within networks.
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1.0 Introduction

Non-profit organisations operate in a challenging environment with increasing competition for scarce resources (Enjolras, 2009). This situation also applies to non-profit sport clubs across countries (e.g., Sport and Recreation Alliance [SRA], 2013; Wicker & Breuer, 2011), and in particular to community sport clubs (CSCs) in Australia which have been confronted by extreme weather events. Specifically, in Queensland, Australia, CSCs have been affected by significant flooding events. For instance, in late 2010 and early 2011, flooding took place in which nearly 80% of the local government areas in the state were affected (Reilly, Wright, & Hannan, 2011). The natural disasters were felt across CSCs within these regions resulting in negative outcomes such as damaged grounds and facilities, closures, and reduction in membership (Wicker, Filo, & Cuskelly, 2013). Consequently, natural disasters can compound the typical resource-based challenges faced by CSCs (e.g., need of volunteers, financial issues) that have been observed in previous research (Sport and Recreation Alliance [SRA], 2013).

While natural disasters are often unexpected and difficult to predict with a high degree of accuracy, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC, 2013) has suggested that heavy precipitation in Australia will increase. Hence, managing the aftermath of natural disasters, particularly flooding, will be increasingly important within Australia generally, and within CSCs in Australia in particular. The current research explores the provision of resources to CSCs in the aftermath of flooding events in 2010 and 2011, as well as the influence on power relations between CSCs and resource providers. Accordingly, the following research questions are advanced: (1) what entities provided the resources CSCs relied upon in the aftermath of flooding events in 2010 and 2011? (2) How did the use of resources impact relations between the CSCs and resource providers? And (3) what power relations were evident in the aftermath of flooding events in 2010 and 2011?
Resource dependence theory is used to examine the affected CSCs and address the research questions. The contribution of the current research is the application of a theory which has been previously employed to examine CSCs (e.g., Horch, 1994; Wicker, Vos, Scheerder, & Breuer, 2013) to a specific context (i.e., recovery from natural disasters). Academic research in this specific context is both timely and relevant given recent events and forecasts, as well as limited in terms of enquiry (Wicker et al., 2013a). The application of this theory to this specific context allows for uncovering the resources relied upon as well as the exploration of how this influenced relations between CSCs and resource providers.

2.0 Literature Review and Theoretical Framework

To explore the provision of resources to CSCs in the aftermath of flooding events in 2010 and 2011, as well as the influence on power relations between CSCs and resource providers, Resource Dependence Theory (RDT) was used as the theoretical framework guiding this research. RDT posits that organisations are dependent upon factors within the external environment (Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978). These factors, or resources, can be reflected through relationships an organisation has within a particular community, and these resources can increase the connections an organisation has, as well as the influence an organisation has, within a community (Nienhueser, 2008). Specifically, RDT advances that an organisation does not operate autonomously, and is instead reliant upon a network of other organisations, and these dependencies and interdependencies must be managed to ensure survival and success for the organisation (Hillman, Withers, & Collins, 2009).

Pfeffer (1987) outlined five premises providing the basis for RDT. First, organisations reflect the fundamental units for understanding inter-corporate relations and society. Second, organisations are not autonomous, but rather rely upon other organisations. Third, this interdependence in conjunction with the uncertainty inherent to relying upon the actions of other organisations, contribute to uncertainty regarding survival and continued success for an
organisation. Fourth, organisations take action to manage their dependency on other organisations and the external environment, and this can produce new interdependencies. Fifth, this model of dependence can produce power within and among organisations. RDT has cultivated widespread application within research examining interorganisational relationships in the for-profit (e.g., Katila, Rosenberger, & Eisenhardt, 2008) and non-profit sector, including CSCs (e.g., Wicker et al., 2013b).

The production of power within and among organisations results from the provision of resources by one organisation to another. Specifically, when one organisation depends upon resources from another organisation, the entity providing resources holds power over the dependent organisation (Emerson, 1964). The basis for this power stems from the nature of interdependencies between the organisations, and this can result in varied power relations. Symmetric dependence between two organisations can translate to a balanced power relationship. However, when the dependence relationship between two organisations is asymmetric, the organisation that is less dependent will wield power over the other (Armstrong-Doherty, 1996).

Three categories of power, or pressures, stemming from resource dependence between organisations have been advanced: coercive, mimetic, and normative (Dimaggio & Powell, 1983). Coercive power reflects the exertion of power by one organisation over another forcing the latter to adhere to requests. Mimetic power involves one organisation aligning with the structure and decision making of another organisation to gain legitimacy. Normative power involves the development of new rules and standards to guide structure and decision making within an organisation. As the current research is positioned within the non-profit sector, coercive power is the focus of our examination of relations between CSCs and resource providers. This focus is based upon CSC reliance on the government for funding and support. Coercive power has previously been examined within sport clubs (Vos et al., 2011),
and evidence of coercion towards non-profit sport organisations has previously been found. (Slack & Hinings, 1994). Notably Edwards, Mason, and Washington (2009) found that non-profit sport organisations were confronted with coercive power from resource providers (i.e., government agencies) via threats to reduce or discontinue funding. Given the importance of financial resources (e.g., government grants) in CSC recovery from natural disasters (Wicker et al., 2013a), coercive power is explored in investigating relations between CSCs and resource providers.

In a review of the framework outlined by Pfeffer and Salancik (2003), Nienhueser (2008) advanced the external environment as the central source of uncertainty confronting organisations. From there, organisational actions and structures are affected by the distribution of power both within the organisation and outside of the organisation. In suggesting this, the author stated that the entity controlling resources has the power over those organisations in need of resources. In the context of the current research, the uncertainty confronted by CSCs extends beyond challenges with regard to staffing, volunteers and finances (e.g., Wicker & Breuer, 2011), to uncertainty with regard to severe weather related events and the consequent impact on CSC operations.

Based upon the importance of obtaining support from volunteers and external funding sources (e.g., donors, government), RDT is highly relevant to the non-profit context. In an investigation of the relationship between the autonomy of non-profit organisations and factors such as reliance on government, Verschuere and De Corte (2012) found that dependence on government had a significant negative effect on non-profit autonomy in terms of strategic decision making. However, the authors also noted a great deal of variance in terms of the level of cooperation between non-profit organisations and the government. Furthermore, the investigation revealed that the presence and number of volunteers available to an organisation positively influenced that organisation’s level of autonomy.
Meanwhile, Mitchell (2012) explored the strategies employed by non-profit organisations to address resource dependence stemming from reliance on external financial support. The strategies uncovered include: alignment, subcontracting, perseverance, diversification, commercialisation, funding liberation, geostrategic arbitrage, specialisation, selectivity, donor education, and compromise. With regard to the current research, perseverance would appear to align closely with the notion of resilience outlined in previous research in the CSC and natural disaster realm (e.g., Wicker et al., 2013a). Perseverance is revealed through attempting to secure grants and implementing cost-minimisation strategies (Mitchell, 2012), and the use of grants has been found to have a positive effect on CSC recovery (Wicker et al., 2013a).

RDT has been previously applied to examinations of community sport (Armstrong-Doherty, 1996). In applying RDT to non-profit sport organisations, Miller, Veltri and Combs (2002) determined that a majority of these organisations did not obtain resources from the external environment in an effective manner. Vos et al. (2011) uncovered a relatively low level of coercive power imparted by the government upon CSCs relying upon subsidies. Similarly, Horch (1994) revealed that the government does not limit the autonomy of CSCs due to their resource dependence as much as it potentially could. Volunteers have been identified as a resource employed by CSCs to bolster autonomy (Miller et al., 2002). Meanwhile, Vos, Wicker, Breuer, and Scheerder (2013) suggested that CSCs can have considerable decision-making autonomy when a variety of resources are obtained from multiple providers.

The fundamental basis of RDT is that organisations build relationships with other organisations to obtain resources from the external environment in an effort to reduce uncertainty. Nienhueser (2008) posited that within organisations, uncertainty introduces the development of strategies to reduce that uncertainty. Wicker et al. (2013a) found that natural
disasters provided CSCs with a great deal of uncertainty related to facility and equipment damage, closures, and the retention of club members. Furthermore, Wicker et al. (2013b) advanced that, when confronted by resource scarcity issues, CSCs draw upon relationships with other organisations to address these issues. In the context of the current research, uncertainty and resource scarcity issues can confront CSCs following natural disasters such as flooding events. Uncertainty and resource scarcity can lead to initiating or activating relationships with other organisations and requiring a variety of resources from other entities. Consequently, the current study extends this existing research on the resource dependence and scarcity of non-profit organisations and CSCs through investigation of these existing challenges within the context of recovery from natural disasters. In addition, the current study explores from whom CSCs were able to obtain resource support, and how this resource provision influenced relations for the CSC, with specific attention to power relations between CSCs and resource providers. These research questions, introduced earlier, are addressed using qualitative data from nine CSCs affected by flooding events.

3.0 Method

3.1 Participants

Background information concerning the CSCs that participated in the site visits, including the sport played and location, is provided in Table 1. The first rugby league club listed supported sports such as cricket and softball within its operations. All remaining CSCs were single sport organisations. In terms of size, the CSCs ranged from less than 20 members to over 900. Four of the CSCs were located in regional areas, while the remaining five were located in a major metropolitan area. An online questionnaire was used to recruit CSCs for the site visit. This questionnaire included an item that asked respondents to rate the extent of the CSC’s recovery in percentage terms. Of the nine CSCs that participated in the site visits, two indicated 100% recovery, while the lowest self-rating of CSC recovery was 20%. Details
concerning CSC size based upon membership, CSC location, and extent of recovery is also included in Table 1.

The nine site visits consisted of a focus group with the chair person or club manager along with a sample of volunteers who were involved in the club’s recovery from the natural disaster. The sample of volunteers for each focus group was recruited based upon availability among the individuals who assisted with the recovery. For one site visit, the volunteers recruited to participate did not attend, hence this focus group consisted of a semi-structured interview with a single individual. The focus groups consisted of 2-6 individuals each. All focus group participants, along with the individual interviewed, were adults over the age of 18.

3.2 Materials

An interview guide was developed in advance of the site visits with the objective of allowing the focus group participants to explain the CSC’s recovery from the natural disaster, both in the immediate days that followed the natural disaster as well as in the longer term. The interview guide was developed by one member of the research team, and was then reviewed and revised by the two other members. The first four questions were developed to allow interviewees to share the story of the impact of the natural disaster and the CSC’s recovery. The research team crafted these questions to elicit specific examples or moments that were critical to recovery. In addition, the broad nature of these questions, specifically the first two, allowed focus group participants the opportunity to introduce additional resources and resource providers that were not explicitly identified in later questions. The fifth and sixth question were developed to glean the specific resources that were required within the recovery process in line with RDT and the research question exploring the entities providing
resources in the aftermath of flooding events. The final question in the interview guide was intended to uncover different needs based upon outdoor versus indoor facilities, but this question was generally answered through the first six questions within each visit.

Revisions were made to the interview guide after the first two site visits. Specifically, four questions developed to uncover the resilience dimensions of robustness, redundancy, resourcefulness, and rapidity (Bruneau et al., 2003) were removed. These concepts emerged from earlier research focusing on the CSC’s recovery (see Wicker et al, 2013), but were not deemed useful for the focus groups. The interview guide is included in the Appendix.

3.3 Procedures

The current research was part of a larger research project on the focal topic. The CSCs selected for the focus groups were chosen from a list of clubs that had previously expressed interest in participating in a site visit to further explore community resilience and sport clubs within a previous study. Interest was expressed within the online questionnaire administered to CSCs that had been affected by natural disasters. Within this survey, a single item was included inviting respondents to indicate their interest in participating in a site visit.

Recruitment was initiated through an email invitation sent to the contact person at all 83 clubs that had expressed interest. The invitation email concluded with a request for the contact person to reply to the email to facilitate the scheduling of the site visit. A high percentage (> 50%) of CSCs contacted did not respond to this invitation, and a number of e-mails were unable to be delivered (e.g., email address no longer valid). Furthermore, a number of CSCs responded by stating that the club was no longer interested and/or unable to participate. Follow-up phone calls were made to CSCs that had not initially responded to the email invitation. Again, a high percentage of CSCs indicated that the club was no longer interested in participating in the research. The reasons provided in both email and phone conversations for not being willing or able to participate included: lack of time, ongoing
recovery for the CSC holding priority over discussing the recovery, lack of staff as a result of the natural disaster, and a general disinclination to revisit and further discuss the natural disaster and recovery. In total, 62 of the 83 CSCs invited to participate in the site visits either did not respond to the invitation or indicated an unwillingness to participate. This left the research team with a total of 21 CSCs with which to schedule a site visit.

The research team determined that the clubs examined within the site visits would not be able to be categorised based upon variables such as club size, location, or natural disaster as initially planned. The priority shifted to ensuring that nine site visits could be conducted in total. The decision to conduct nine site visits was made for pragmatic reasons. Specifically, the research team determined that the budget would account for nine visits, while the research team also believed that this number could reflect a suitable cross-section of the CSCs that had expressed willingness to participate.

Two researchers were present for seven out of the nine site visits, while a single researcher conducted the other two visits. The research protocol was approved by the university’s ethics office. On average, the focus groups lasted between 60 minutes and more than two hours. With the permission of each focus group member, each site visit was audio recorded by the research team. The digital audio recordings were transcribed verbatim by a third party transcription service.

3.4 Data Analysis

The transcriptions were analysed thematically in six phases: (1) getting familiar with the data; (2) generating initial codes; (3) searching for themes; (4) reviewing themes; (5) defining and naming themes; and (6) producing the report (Braun & Clarke, 2006). In getting familiar with the data (step 1), the research team repeatedly read the transcriptions provided by the service, while applying RDT as a guiding framework to generate initial codes to address each research question (step 2) (Miles & Huberman, 1994). That is, the research team
read through the transcriptions looking specifically for discussion from site visit participants highlighting the entities that provided these resources, the influence that obtaining and using these resources had on relations for the CSC, and the consequent power relations between CSCs and resource providers. This facilitated addressing each of the three research questions: 1) what entities provided the resources CSCs relied upon in the aftermath of flooding events in 2010 and 2011? (2) how did the use of resources impact relations between the CSCs and resource providers? And (3) what power relations were evident in the aftermath of flooding events in 2010 and 2011?

In addressing research questions 1 and 2, the following themes were uncovered, reviewed, defined, and supported through the data (steps 3-5): (1) volunteers and members; (2) partner organisations; and (3) government. Volunteers and members were defined as individuals within the community (both CSC members and non-members) who provided labour, equipment, money and expertise during recovery. Partner organisations were operationally defined as bodies such as local businesses, other sport clubs, and sponsors that assisted with recovery. Government refers to local, state and national authorities that were involved in CSC recovery. Each of the themes addressed research question 1 as each entity was involved in the CSC recovery to varying degrees. The themes also addressed research question 2 since relations between CSCs and resource providers were impacted.

From there, themes were uncovered, reviewed, defined, and supported through the data (steps 3-5) to address research question 3. Other organisations exerting power over CSCs encompassed discussion of resource providers dictating the terms in the relationships based upon the CSC’s reliance on resources. CSCs exerting power over other organisations was revealed through discussion by CSC representatives of instances wherein the CSC held power over resource providers. Mutual power and dependence includes CSC representatives highlighting the sharing of resources or exchange of resources wherein the distribution of
power was similar between CSCs and resource providers. Each theme addresses research question 3. After initial codes and themes had been identified, data were sorted with specific extracts (i.e., direct quotations), then organised according to each theme. Reviewing themes for overlap and homogeneity then followed. The results from the analysis are reported below (step 6) and the themes are described narratively with illustrative quotes.

To address data trustworthiness, three strategies were utilised (Lietz, Langer, & Furman, 2006). First, reflexivity was in place throughout the data collection process as the research team members involved in this step continually discussed and reflected upon each site visit. Specifically, the travel time required for each site visit (at times involving overnight trips) provided time and space for the researchers to review each focus group after each took place. This review time involved open discussion of concepts and ideas that had emerged within each focus group. Second an independent research assistant was used to analyse the data collected (Creswell, 2003). The research assistant was not directly involved in the site visits, and was sent each individual transcript along with a one-page overview of the research project. The themes and representative quotes uncovered through this process aligned with the themes and quotes identified within the initial analysis. Third, member checks (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) were completed in the form of a report provided to all CSCs involved in the site visits. This report encompassed an overview of main findings. The themes and quotes unearthed within the data analysis were included in this report.

4.0 Results

The results are organised below based upon each of the three research questions. Within each research question, themes are provided to organise the data extracts and address each question.

4.1 Entities which provided resources (RQ1)

4.1.1 Volunteers and Members
Throughout the focus groups and interviews, participants explained the importance of volunteers and community members in the recovery process. A critical contribution to the recovery was the labour that was provided by volunteers which was described in terms of the number of volunteers, as well as the morale evoked through volunteers working together. A volunteer from the first rugby league club stated: “There was a tremendous response from so many people just offering to volunteer and give up their time and help. I couldn’t keep count.” A hockey association representative communicated the importance of volunteers: “We just relied on the volunteers to turn up, which they did.” Two CSCs indicated that volunteer support from within the community, but not necessarily associated with the CSC, was an important resource. A focus group participant from the netball association revealed: People would just turn up, they didn’t even ask they just came in. People would just stop as they were driving past. They could be perfect strangers but they would come and say ‘can we help you out’?

A member of the softball association relayed a similar experience:

I think we had more people turn up just from people driving around looking for something to do than actual club members. They saw us working here and they just wandered in.

The labour afforded by the volunteers was augmented through the psychological benefit of having CSC representatives and community volunteers working together towards the goal of recovery. A hockey association focus group participant stated: “A lot of those people helped boost our morale a bit too. They would turn up for a few hours at a time or work every day.” A representative from the first rugby league club shared a similar sentiment: “It was a good bonding experience. You see people that you hadn’t seen for a while and they all just came through.” A focus group attendee from the hockey association
extended their description of the morale boost afforded by the volunteers in specifying a single volunteer whose attitude inspired the CSC and its recovery:

It was probably the volunteer, the building inspector that we said came down with his son, who was a builder, and they boosted our morale, and made us feel like, ‘No, we can do this, we can come back.’ People got a bit of hope.

In addition to the labour proffered by volunteer members and non-members, CSCs also referred to the importance of the equipment provided by these volunteers. The interviewee from the soccer association underscored the importance of volunteers for accessing equipment:

Beg, borrow and steal, probably not steal. Somebody knows somebody who knows somebody, get a grader down there for a morning to help out. Somebody knows somebody with a bobcat so they come down and do some work.

The second rugby league club indicated that a bobcat was an important resource for their club, and it was a volunteer who facilitated procuring this machinery. In addition, a member of this club stated that volunteers allowed them to use a variety of machinery:

We got a lot of people just stopping in like those fellows that come around with that ditch witch (i.e., vacuum excavator). They come in put their big vacuum hose on, in the paper ram, sucked all the mud up from where the walls had been pulled in, the fascia boards had been pulled off. They got all the mud up from inside around the framework for us.

Furthermore, a volunteer from the first rugby league club revealed that: “A lot of our members are chippies [carpenters] or sparkies [electricians] doing everything.” An additional participant from this rugby league club elaborated with the following: “Guys that have trades helped and they just got their friends…. And we had a couple of business people I believe
were involved and knew who to contact to get things, just networks, it makes a big difference.”

4.1.2 Partner organisations

In detailing the recovery process, CSCs noted assistance provided by partner organisations, which included sponsors, local businesses, and other sport and community clubs. One specific club noted that a sponsor of the club provided timely labour. In describing how the club relied upon its existing network to find solutions to the problems encountered as a result of the flooding, a representative of the bowls club mentioned a sponsor that was both generous and helpful with its labour, stating:

I was lucky to pick up a sponsor who had just built a heap of houses up the road in an estate and I brought them down and showed them what the club was and they had a bit of a quiet time so they brought their carpenters over and did a bit of work and it cost us nothing.

Sponsors and local businesses were also noted as entities from which equipment had been obtained. A member of the first rugby league club mentioned a number of laptops donated by a financial institution. A volunteer from the netball association acknowledged a donation program through a local hardware company: “<local hardware store> had a process where they were donating stuff...We got tables and chairs and stuff like that.”

Grants and donations were obtained by CSCs from partner organisations such as other clubs, state sporting organisations, and local businesses. With regard to other clubs, a number of donations were received unsolicited. A volunteer from the netball association referred to several other netball clubs who provided money: “Other netball associations they just contacted us....We had one particular club in Brisbane donate to us.” A representative from the first rugby league club expressed appreciation for money given by a club on the opposite side of the continent: “To start with we were very fortunate and humbled by the fact that
Western Australia had picked up on the mess that we suffered as a club so they gave us AUD$5,000.” Similarly, a bowls club representative shared a story of being contacted by another club regarding a relatively large donation:

The phone rang and it was the chairman of another bowls club… And he said I know you’re in trouble up there. He said promise me one thing, if we give you ten grand [ten thousand dollars] you’ll keep the door open… And they brought up a cheque for 10 grand so we had to keep the door open and keep that promise which we did.

CSCs mentioned fundraising events managed by other sport clubs wherein proceeds were donated to their club. A representative from the softball club was able to witness the collection of donations to aid in recovery while travelling interstate: “I was away with the state team and big collections were being taken all over Victoria for it and even at the softball ground they had a special event to raise money.” The hockey club volunteer highlighted a club from a different region of the state that hosted an event on the club’s behalf while donating a portion of that event’s proceeds, stating this club:

Gave us about AUD$6,000, because we were actually supposed to host a Vets men's championship earlier in that year too, and because we couldn't do it, <the club> offered to do it and give us half the proceeds.

4.1.3 Government

Local and state government representatives, including local council members, were cited as integral to recovery. This included direct involvement in the provision of the labour required to rebuild facilities. A netball association focus group participant noted that the local council re-sealed the netball courts, and commended their efforts: “We were very well supported by our council who were fantastic.” Meanwhile, a bowls club representative highlighted labour support from the chamber of commerce:
This bloke came in and said I can give you a bit of a hand to put this back together again. So we sat down and he said I can do this, this, and this and what do you really want done?

A volunteer from the first rugby league club indicated that the State Government rebuilt the lower level of their indoor facility: “The state government contacted us and said that they would be able to help us with rebuilding the club and they said that they will [provide the resources to] rebuild downstairs for us.”

Government funding in the form of external grants further complemented financial support obtained from partners and other entities. The soccer club interviewee depicted the array of grant funding available from government with the following: “when something happens there is a proactive approach by the government for sporting clubs to keep going.” The soccer club interviewee concluded the discussion of grant support available by stating that: “The grants are a real bonus. They kept us, otherwise we’d still be in the same boat now, <AUD>$20,000 is not something we can find just like that.” A bowls club representative acknowledged that existing relations with a local member within local government facilitated the securing of grants:

She’d been with us virtually right through the plight. She was the local member and she was excellent, absolutely top. She was a very, very critical part to it. Being able to tap into those positions is most important [for securing grants].

The softball association was successful in terms of being awarded grant money, and a participant from this focus group acknowledged the state government as the main benefactor: “We applied for just about every grant that was available and we were successful for <AUD>$72,000 and the majority of that came from the <state government>.” A volunteer from the hockey association also expressed gratitude towards the state government: “We
were lucky that we got some grants from the state government.” The final grant funding was in excess of AUD$400,000.

Some CSCs revealed that local council was also a valuable resource for obtaining equipment. A mud racing club representative described a long standing positive relationship with council which the club was able to leverage to gain materials to rebuild the racing course:

In years gone by and this year as well, the council have been really good. They donated the use of a loader and a grader plus an operator. We also got uncertified road bases, sort of largish stones with a bit of mix in it. We got 40 tons of that from the council.

A representative of the hockey association told of how the council used a bobcat to remove debris from the field then later returned to remove the synthetic turf field which had been destroyed, both tasks that the club would not have been able to complete on their own:

The council came in and they used bobcats, and they took off all the rubbish that was on the field….Because the way the field rolled up, because it had initially 80 tons of sand on it…You couldn't cut it. A man couldn't cut it, so we need council's help. They gave us that didn't they? They had enough machinery to pick up the thing up and take it out of here.

Overall, resources were provided to CSCs by member and non-member volunteers, sponsors, local businesses, state sporting organisations, as well as local and state government. These entities provided resources such as labour, equipment, expertise, grants and donations. Collectively, these findings address research question one.

4.2 Resource use and relations with resource providers (RQ2)

4.2.1 Volunteers and Members
In discussing how natural disasters and the consequent use of resources influenced relations between the CSC and the volunteers and members, CSC representatives were generally positive. A number of CSCs mentioned that they held barbecues or social gatherings to thank volunteers as well as to maintain positive relations. An individual from the first rugby league club highlighted a gathering held immediately following a labour intensive day of recovery work: “We've put on a barbecue because we were lucky enough to have people help us remove a lot of it.” A volunteer from the hockey association indicated that these gatherings were a regular occurrence after each day of work: “Yeah, we provided a few beers and a few soft drinks at the end of the day.”

4.2.2 Partner Organisations

Similar to the social gatherings held to express gratitude to volunteers and members, CSCs described effort put forth to reward and/or thank partner organisations that had provided resources. A netball association representative indicated the club went out of its way to support local businesses upon receipt of financial resources. This served to both stimulate the local economy and to return the favour to organisations which had provided assistance in the aftermath of the flooding:

When we got our funding monies, we supported the town too. We made sure that because we knew the local sports store for example had been hit, when we wanted to buy our balls that we got the funding for, we bought them from them so we made sure that we helped and that was a conscious decision to spend the money.

A volunteer from first rugby league club relayed how the flooding served to bond the club with other local clubs and this resulted in goodwill and improved communication:

One of the positive things that I think that has come out of the flood is really the goodwill. I talk to <representatives from two local community clubs> more than the junior football people probably would have before. I think there’s a lot more goodwill
because we’ve all been through the hard times and we’ve pulled through together. I do honestly think that and with the seniors and the junior cricketers and even the softball I’m sure we’ve all pulled together and if they need a hand with something, yes, no worries, we can give you a hand if you need to do something and I think that’s one of the positive things that come out of all this.

While the CSCs described positive relations maintained through investment and communication, focus group respondents indicated that partner organisations that had provided resources did exert some control concerning the allocation of funds. Specifically, partner organisations providing grants dictated the terms concerning eligibility, how the money could be spent and acquitted. A bowls club representative stated that partner organisations exerted less control in terms of how financial resources could be spent in comparison to government grants:

Now there’s not one company such as <local city council> and <local private businesses>, they all had grant money out there, not one of them asked that question or any of those questions. They just said what did you do wrong, how much damage have you got, how are you going to put it back together again, put your name here and if there’s money we’ll try and help you.

Nonetheless, a representative from the club noted that these entities required an acquittal process: “You had to do an acquittal once every six weeks what monies you’d spent and show them the invoices and things like that.”

4.2.3 Government

In describing the support provided by government organisations, a number of CSCs explicitly mentioned positive relations maintained throughout the recovery process. A volunteer from the netball association simply stated: “Actually they [local council] were very
supportive all the way through, we had terrific support.” A representative from this CSC elaborated further on the relationship with local council both before and after the flooding:

I think we always had a good relationship with the council ... they’ve always helped us when we’ve needed things done...you’re not expecting their help, but you weren’t surprised. I suppose it was surprising when you think of the amount of other work that was going on.

An individual from the first rugby league club also acknowledged that support provided by local council was appreciated due to all of the damage throughout the region: “As I said, council has helped as best they can.”

While select clubs portrayed positive relations with government throughout the recovery process, instances of government exerting control as the CSC underwent the rebuilding process were also evident. As many CSCs are located on local government land, council would offer input on how this land could be managed or rebuilt which this often led to delays. A member of the second rugby league club stated: “A lot of those things were council issues too. Where the fencing was. Wait for the council… Wait for somebody to come out.” Another representative from this club depicted it more bluntly: “They’d start, and then they'd piss off. Then they'd come back.” In some instances, repairs initiated through the council did not improve the club and there was resistance, by the council to address this. A volunteer from the first rugby league club shared a similar observation:

We had some input into the fields being rebuilt, not as much as we would have liked, and unfortunately to that end the fields still aren’t how we wanted them. There are a myriad of issues and so much so that I believe the company that did the fields didn’t get any more contracts through council. It was pretty bad. So we’ve got a full sized rugby league field with seven metres in goal [less than the standard required by the rules of the game], and in goal it actually starts to run uphill.
A focus group participant from the softball association portrayed local council as an obstruction to recovery while indicating that relations are still strained between the CSC and local government:

The council came and did absolutely nothing, not a thing. We did it all ourselves and all we got from the council was resistance. Part of our grant money is we have a wonderful new storage shed that we haven’t been able to put up yet because the council haven’t given us [planning] approval.

A number of CSCs indicated that government would exert control over the specific vendors that could be enlisted to rebuild the grounds, which often led to delays and frustration. A representative of the bowls club mentioned an incident concerning the rebuild of a disabled toilet wherein the council’s insistence on being involved complicated matters:

We’ve got a disabled toilet down here that was put in. We had a quote to do it, it was about six or seven grand [six or seven thousand dollars]…. it was a real simple job and the council got involved...Seventeen weeks later and <AUD>$23,000… these blokes with jack hammers and saws and [blasphemous word] knows what. Seventeen weeks later, dug up the entire floor in the toilets.

Similar to the terms set by partner organisations providing financial resources, government organisations also required justification to obtain funding and acquittal for grants. A volunteer from the hockey association noted a very challenging stipulation introduced by the government prior to providing grant support: “We had a lot of obstacles though, because the government was prepared to help us out. But not without some guarantee that it wasn't going to happen again, which is very hard to do.” Once grants had been obtained from government, additional control was exerted through requiring that all grants be properly acquitted, which many CSCs highlighted as time consuming and onerous. A representative for the first rugby league club reported that over a year after the flooding: “I’m
still acquitting the grant money.” While the softball association was very grateful and satisfied with their success in obtaining government grants, a representative did demonstrate frustration:

    Having to go there and do presentations was time consuming as well. So actually making ourselves available to the people that were giving us the money so that they could then do their promotional stuff…Yes, there was more work in actually promoting that they had given us the grants.

The dependence on resources to CSCs impacted relations with each entity providing those resources. Positive relations were maintained for the most part with volunteers and members as well as partner organisations through efforts to thank resource providers. Some CSCs sustained positive relations with government representatives, but others described a great deal of conflict between government and the club as the resources were deployed. These results address research question two.

4.3 Power relations (RQ3)

4.3.1 Other Organisations Exert Power Over CSCs

    A number of CSCs indicated that a power imbalance existed between the organisations providing resources and their club, wherein entities such as local council dictated terms to CSCs without concern for larger needs among the clubs. This imbalance encompassed a sentiment that other sports held greater priority for government along with communication issues between CSCs and government. A volunteer from the softball association shared the CSC’s frustration with the low priority given to its sport compared to others: “If you’re an association and it’s soccer, football or rugby league, no problem. Cricket gets a pretty good whack.” The golf club also indicated that they felt lost amidst other priorities for local council due to the size of their club: “when there is a bit of a disaster period that they forget about the little people sometimes.” A representative for the first rugby
league club portrayed this power imbalance in more stark terms as he detailed the plight of CSCs within the demands placed upon government:

I’m a nobody, I’m just the fellow putting his hand up to give kids the opportunity to play a game but really I’m a nobody. I don’t have any clout. I can’t go in there and go ‘we need this done now’.

Beyond priority given to other sports and activities, CSCs depicted an inability to communicate with government on their own terms as a factor contributing to this power disadvantage. A volunteer from the first rugby league club indicated that the CSC “Just needed a one on one with someone from the council instead of one person standing in front of a hundred clubs saying this is what is going to happen.” A volunteer from the hockey association shared a story of poor communication between the state government and local council leading to a power imbalance for the club, along with frustration:

We wanted to raise the levee bank to try and protect the field. The council was prepared to help us out with the levee bank. But they didn't want to do that until they knew that we had the funding. The government didn't want to give us the funding until we had the levee bank. It was like the cart before the horse or the horse before the cart, and you think, oh god. That was frustrating, extremely frustrating, because we were just going to and fro and to and fro and neither would give in.

A bowls club representative indicated that continuous changes in local council personnel led to an inability to communicate CSC needs and a consequent power imbalance: “Part of the problem was you’d be talking to XYZ and then you’d ring back a couple of weeks later and you’re talking to ABC because XYZ had gone. That was the big problem.” Meanwhile, a participant in the mud racing club focus group expressed that in order to communicate with council, it had to be done on their terms: “we have to reach out to them but that’s just like a council.”
Specific CSCs did describe a power imbalance with their state sporting organisation in the aftermath of the flooding. A lack of feedback from the state bodies was highlighted as an important aspect of this imbalance. A volunteer from the hockey association provided an example of a suggestion to help with future natural disaster recovery that did not garner a response from the state sporting organisation:

My suggestion to them was, that because of what's happened to us, it could very well happen to another hockey association within Australia. I suggested that they levy every player in Australia two dollars, or five dollars, and put that money aside, in a kitty, for this type of thing, but we didn't get a response.

Similarly, the soccer club interviewee described the state and national bodies with the following:

They’re very active in taking our money but we get nothing back from <national and state sporting organisations> at all….they had a big audit of all fields and the questionnaire was what areas could we improve on, we wrote all these things what we could do, what would make it better and got nothing back.

4.3.2 CSC Exerts Power Over Other Organisations

In describing ongoing power relations with government in the aftermath of the flooding, one club described possessing a degree of power over the council in their recovery. This degree of power was demonstrated through holding the local council accountable for promises made. Specifically, a focus group participant from the bowls club shared the following story:

They [local council] said we can’t do the road base. I said why? They said we haven’t got <AUD>$24,000 in the kitty to do that road base. I said righto you promised us that you were going to do it. They said look you’ll have to find the money yourself out of your grant money and do it….I said we can’t do it like that.
We haven’t got that money and then it tweaked to me. I said you’ve got the quote there. He said no we haven’t got the quotes here. I said yes you have, you’ve got a copy of the quote for the road base and the bitumen. He said no I haven’t got it. I said all right then I’ve got the quote here, I’ll fax it through to you but tell me something how come 40 ton of blue metal from the pothole people is going to cost <AUD>$3,895 to supply and lay and you want <AUD>$24,000 for the same thing. He said f**k it, the council will do it.

The representative from the bowls club later elaborated on how the state sporting organisation attempted to dictate the terms for clubs to obtain supporting funds to assist in the rebuilding process, but the club was able to resist:

Put it this way. They [state sporting organisation (SSO)] put out this application form. They wanted to know what our bank business was before the flood and after the flood. They wanted to know virtually your life history….That was that but <SSO>, no, they got this stupid application. We just tore it up, threw it in the bin and to put it in a nutshell the amount of money that they gained out of 430 odd bowls clubs in Queensland, we got out of two clubs and that’s how much they raised so that gives you the volume of respect that they’ve <SSO> got.

The representative ended this story with the following: “We can do without them and we’re doing without them fine now.” This anecdote introduces the notion that partnerships between CSCs and other clubs can lead to mutual power and dependence among these organisations.

4.3.3 Mutual Power and Dependence between CSC and Other Organisations

In describing relationships with partner organisations, some CSCs indicated that developing partnerships with other community clubs provided strength in numbers and support. This mutual support then transcended support from larger entities such as state sporting organisations. A volunteer from the second rugby league club revealed: “I find that
in a lot of clubs that do support each other. I'm just going and helping out that way.” A bowls club representative listed a number of clubs with which the CSC has developed relationships to generate revenues that the state sporting organisation could not provide:

For instance, we’ve got the basketball club up at Darra. They’ve got fields, they play the games up there but if they want to hold a function they haven’t got any function room so they come down here. <local soccer club> [is] on a similar arrangement. <local community club> have got their own hall up the road but when they have their Christmas party it’s down here.

To summarise, a number of CSCs indicated that the entities providing resources exerted power over the CSC. There was some evidence of mutual power between CSCs and partner organisations, and an example of a CSC exerting power over government and state sporting organisations. These examples address research question three.

5.0 Discussion

The focus groups and interviews conducted revealed a number of key findings. First, CSCs obtained resources from three different entities: volunteers and members, partner organisations, and government. Specifically, member and non-member volunteers completed physical work for CSCs and in some instances often arrived on the CSC grounds with equipment or expertise to assist with the rebuilding process. Partner organisations such as sponsors, local businesses and state sporting organisations also provided labour and equipment, along with select grant opportunities or donations to assist with recovery. Local and state government representatives provided machinery and equipment to complete tasks critical to CSC recovery, while an array of grants was made available through the government.

Second, the reliance upon and provision of these resources changed relations between CSCs and the entities providing resources. CSCs were able to maintain predominantly
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positive relations with volunteers and members through acts of gratitude towards individuals providing labour, equipment, money and expertise. Positive relations were preserved among some CSCs and partner organisations through CSCs rewarding those businesses and entities that had been supportive during the recovery process. In addition, goodwill and improved communication served to sustain positive relations. Relations between CSCs and government were portrayed both positively and negatively. Several CSCs reported positive experiences before, during and after the natural disaster, while many CSCs expressed frustration concerning government control over: land use within the recovery process, delays in approving building plans, rebuilding strategies and grant allocation and acquittal.

Third, power relations between CSCs and resource providers were influenced as a result of the flooding and subsequent resource provision. One CSC described exerting power over government representatives through holding local council accountable for promises made during the recovery process. In addition, this same club described power held over the state sporting organisation stemming from strong relations with other CSCs. Meanwhile, partnerships among CSCs and community clubs provided some evidence of mutual power and dependence. Overall, CSCs frequently described other organisations, such as local and state government, exerting power over the CSC. This power imbalance was portrayed in terms of a lack of priority granted to CSCs as well as poor (or predominantly one-way) communication between resource providers and CSCs.

Collectively, these findings address each research question. The resource providers uncovered in the current research accord with the findings from previous sport club studies (Misener & Doherty, 2009; Wicker & Breuer, 2011) showing that human resources (e.g., volunteers and members, local council members) and network resources (e.g., partner organisations and government) are critical to CSC functioning, particularly in the aftermath of natural disasters. Furthermore, the role of partner organisations and government in
recovery reinforces the importance of interorganisational relationships with entities in the for-profit, non-profit and public sectors to obtain both tangible (personnel, labour, equipment) and intangible (morale boosts) resources to support (Misener & Doherty, 2013).

These findings reinforce that organisations must manage interdependencies to work towards success and survival (Hilman et al., 2009). The interdependencies uncovered include resources obtained from both the internal and external environment (Pfeffer, 1987), along with other initially unrelated organisations (i.e., other sport clubs providing unsolicited donations). Examples of CSCs managing interdependencies include the barbeques and social events used to thank volunteers as well as the strategic use of financial support to give back to partner organisations such as local businesses. These initiatives assisted in maintaining positive relations which can facilitate survival for the organisation. The notion that select CSCs went out of their way to support local business and other sport organisations that had provided support aligns with Nienhauser’s (2008) assertion that the provision of resources can alter an organisation’s influence within the community. The findings of this research also underscore the importance of volunteers and inter-organisational relationships in addressing resource scarcity issues (Miller et al., 2002; Vos et al., 2011), with particular reference to the labour and morale boost provided by volunteers and community members.

The role of volunteers and members demonstrates the importance of community members in recovery from the floods. Sense of community has been advanced as a psychological factor that can mitigate a region’s vulnerability to natural disasters (Miller, Paton, & Johnston, 1999). More specifically, community development through participatory social organisations and civic organisations (i.e., CSCs) has been purported as a means to improve disaster management in communities (Buckland & Rahman, 1999), while community activity such as membership in clubs is believed to bolster resilience in communities (Paton & Johnston, 2001). These findings, in concert with the results uncovered
within the current research, indicate that CSCs would be well served to involve community members across a number of avenues beyond membership (e.g., administration, sponsorship, maintenance, etc.) to further develop and strengthen the community, while building a network from which resources can be obtained in times of need.

The importance of government grants and donations from other clubs and sporting organisations demonstrates that perseverance (e.g., Mitchell, 2012) is an important strategy for CSCs to address resource dependence. In addition, the support received from partner organisations reflects the revenue diversification and funding liberation strategies wherein funding was obtained in an unrestricted manner (Mitchell, 2012). Specifically, a high proportion of CSCs indicated that select resource providers contributed their labour or expertise unsolicited and with no expectation of receiving payment.

The portrayal of these resource providers as central to CSC capacity to return to normal operations demonstrates that CSCs recovering from flood events are resource dependent since the resources obtained were critical both to the survival of the organisation (Slack & Parent, 2006) and its capability to resume normal operations. Notably, the contribution of other organisations (i.e., partners and government) varied across the CSCs interviewed. While several CSCs highlighted support from sponsors and local business and other CSCs positively appraised local government for the role in recovery, other CSCs did not receive support from local business and still others were quite negative concerning support from local government. This bolsters Verschuere and De Corte’s (2012) contention that the cooperation between government and non-profit organisations in the realm of resource dependence can vary.

CSC reliance upon resources from volunteers and members, partner organisations and government underscores the uncertainty inherent to relying upon the actions of other organisations, and the consequent uncertainty regarding survival and continued success for
CSCs (Pfeffer, 1987). Specifically, engagement and support from entities such as state sporting organisations and local council varied considerably across the CSCs visited for this study. For instance, those CSCs that were unable to obtain resources from partner organisations were often more reliant on volunteers and members, or government, and this resulted in new networks and interdependencies being formed, often on short notice. A further example would be the softball club highlighting a great deal of frustration with support from local council, which contributed to their heavy reliance on government grants. In turn, these government grants came with challenges concerning eligibility, expenditures and acquittal. Such interdependencies influenced power relations within and among these CSCs and resource providers (Pfeffer, 1987).

The influence on power relations unearthed through the site visits demonstrates that entities providing resources to other organisations can then exert power over those resource dependent organisations (Emerson, 1964). While mutual power revealed through asymmetric dependence did emerge in some instances (Armstrong-Doherty, 1996), power imbalances were more commonly evident. For example, the bowls club gained power over a state sporting organisation based upon resources obtained from other CSCs. Meanwhile, a number of CSCs described the government exerting power over CSCs as a result of providing grant funding or labour. These examples demonstrate that among organisations, the entity that controls the resources exerts the most power (Nienhueser, 2008).

The most frequently cited instance of power imbalance existed between government and CSCs, and a number of CSCs attributed this to low priority for their specific sport or limited communication with government representatives. This supports Verschuere and De Corte’s (2012) view that dependence on government can negatively affect non-profit autonomy. These examples suggest that limited coercive power between government and CSCs (e.g., Horch, 1994; Vos et al., 2011) does not necessarily apply to the natural disaster
recovery context. In addition, resource providers such as local council and state government dictated the terms with regard to use of land, vendor selection, grant acquittal, and overall communication. Resource providers forcing CSCs to adhere to their requests and guidelines represents the exertion of coercive power within resource dependence (Dimaggio & Powell, 1983). Meanwhile, the communication issues between CSCs and government highlighted across select focus groups underscores the importance of open and regularly scheduled communication as well as consistency in personnel managing this communication within interorganisational relationships for CSCs (Misener & Doherty, 2013). Collectively, these imbalances provide additional evidence of coercive power being applied to non-profit sport organisations (Edwards et al., 2009; Slack & Hinings, 1994).

5.1 Managerial Implications

The findings derived from the current research suggest a number of recommendations for CSC managers with regard to accessing resources in the aftermath of a natural disaster. First, based upon the critical role played by existing networks in facilitating recovery, CSCs should strive towards fostering and nurturing strong networks within their local communities and beyond. Cunningham and Beneforti (2005) have suggested that strong relationships within local communities along with the broader sport community are imperative for the success of sport programmes. CSCs can build relationships with other entities in the local community including local businesses and other sport clubs to achieve the strength in numbers that underscored mutual power and dependence between CSCs and other community organisations. CSCs can also develop partnerships with non-traditional entities such as lawyers and university researchers as these alignments have been previously advanced as critical to CSC success (Misener & Doherty, 2009).

Furthermore, the results demonstrated that expressions of gratitude facilitated positive relations between CSCs and resource providers. Specifically, CSCs were able to express their
appreciation to volunteers, members and partner organisations through hosting social events for those involved in the recovery, as well as by spending money at local businesses and contributing financially to other sport organisations. These initiatives contributed to stronger relations among these groups. Research has advanced gratitude as a crucial mechanism in sustaining strong relationships (Algoe, 2012). In the aftermath of natural disasters, CSCs should adopt strategies and practices that allow for overt communication of gratitude towards organisations that provided resources.

CSCs are encouraged to be more proactive in the pursuit of external funding. CSCs might consider the establishment of a ‘grants officer’ position within the CSC management structure. This role could involve a volunteer assigned to the responsibility of identifying prospective funding opportunities as well as to manage the application process. Previous research indicated that the application process is challenging and many CSCs demonstrate a lack of awareness about available funding as well as uncertainty about the process involved leading to an overall reluctance to apply (Sotiriadou & Wicker, 2013). Hence, a designated grants officer would represent proactivity in ensuring that a CSC is prepared to apply for grant funds should they be needed and made available.

Research has also indicated that proactivity represents a crucial mechanism for managing stressful situations via the accumulation of resources (Crant, 2000). Allocating a management committee member to grant procurement could allow CSCs to amass knowledge of financial resources and strategies for preparing grant applications that can be deployed during the natural disaster recovery process. Specifically, grants officers could allow CSCs to better navigate the challenges regarding eligibility, expenditures and acquittal that were uncovered during site visits. Due to budget constraints faced by CSCs (e.g., Wicker & Breuer, 2011), challenges would exist with finding, training, and retaining a grants officer in a paid capacity. However, some of the most successful clubs in terms of grant procurement
(e.g., the softball club, the hockey club) explained how a committee member emerged to allocate the time and resources required for this initiative. Consequently, we suggest CSCs be proactive in soliciting knowledge and interest among the volunteer base to implement this strategy. Additionally, given that CSCs are focused on grant money and may thus become dependent on external organisations providing those grants, CSCs should also aim to generate financial resources from other stakeholders through fundraising activities and attracting sponsorship income.

Representatives from the local council as well as state and national sport organisations could be invited to CSC events to keep these stakeholders informed of activities as well as to foster strong relationships that could be leveraged in times of need for the CSC. These invitations could serve as a mechanism to improve communication between CSCs and government, which was highlighted as a factor contributing to power imbalances. Striving towards communicative partnerships between government and sport organisations has been previously advocated within sport policy as a means to facilitate more equitable power distribution (McDonald, 2005). Furthermore, mutual respect and open, two-way communication between community representatives and government agencies has been highlighted as a mechanism to bolster effectiveness in disaster management (Buckland & Rahman, 1999).

Additional strategies that could be employed by CSCs to address poor communication with resource providers and offset asymmetric power relations include: official documentation of all correspondence with government personnel and regularly scheduled meetings between CSC representatives and local council. Documenting all correspondence between CSCs and government can provide supporting evidence of any promises made by government agencies, for which the CSC could then hold the resource provider accountable. The use of this strategy allowed the bowls club to exert power over the local council. This
documentation could also address issues experienced with turnover within government agencies which was highlighted as an obstacle to communication that created a power imbalance towards government. Finally, efforts to schedule regular meetings with local council can potentially improve communication. While these overtures from CSCs may be met with some resistance due to a lack of priority or lack of time on the part of council officers, persistence on the part of CSCs could serve to shift priorities while also addressing poor communication between these entities.

### 5.2 Limitations

A number of limitations for the current research should be acknowledged. First, within the process of recruiting CSCs to visit, it became apparent that many CSCs were struggling to recover from the natural disasters and were reluctant to participate in the research. While this demonstrates the severity of the natural disaster and further supports the worthiness of this research context, this category of CSCs (i.e., those unlikely to recover) is likely to be under-represented in the sample. To facilitate the collection of data from CSCs that were unable to recover, a less resource intensive mode of data collection could be employed. The clubs that opted in to participate in the data collection, but ultimately did not agree to a site visit, could be sent a brief open-ended questionnaire to allow them to detail their experience on their own time. This data could then be compared to the data collected within the current study.

Second, the focus groups represented a single day visit within a long process towards recovery. Complicating matters, during data collection, several CSCs were enduring additional heavy rains and flooding at the time the field visit was taking place. These additional rains could have reinforced the challenges presented by flooding, but the clubs may have also had difficulty prioritising which flooding incidents to discuss, while their
attitude towards the ongoing heavy rains changed their responses to the questions. As this was not the case for all clubs, some inconsistencies within our data are recognised.

5.3 Future Directions

Using the current research as a starting point, a number of future studies can be conducted. First, data can be collected from for-profit organisations to provide a comparative view between for-profit sport organisations and CSCs to uncover differences and similarities in response and organisational needs, as well as the reasons for any differences. Meanwhile, the perspective taken within the current research can be expanded through the adoption of an organisational stress perspective (James, 1999). Specifically, the impact of the natural disasters on CSC operations can be compared to other stresses felt by CSCs such as ongoing financial challenges and volunteer retention (Breuer, Wicker, & von Hanau, 2012; Wicker & Breuer, 2011).

Second, follow-up interviews and focus groups could be conducted with the nine CSCs visited. This follow-up data collection would allow additional time for CSC staff and volunteers to reflect on the natural disaster experience. A follow-up could provide a longitudinal perspective on sustained recovery (or lack thereof) among CSCs, as well as a broader perspective on the influence of the reliance on resources from providers on inter-organisational relations. A longitudinal approach could examine whether the relative strength of the relations engaged throughout the recovery process were stronger or at least still in place for CSCs. This approach can further apply RDT to evaluate how the CSCs take action to manage dependency on other organisations (Pfeffer, 1987). Follow up interviews and site visits would also allow for investigation of whether the power relations within the organisational interdependencies uncovered were influenced long term (Nienhueser, 2008). This longitudinal investigation of CSC recovery and power relations with resource providers can also be extended to collect data from representatives of those entities providing resources.
The additional perspectives can provide insights on the motivations underlying resource providers’ decision to assist in recovery. Utilising multiple stakeholder perspectives and coming to an understanding of the motivations of resource providers could facilitate improved relations with CSCs.

6.0 Conclusion

This research provides an initial investigation of the entities providing resources to CSCs during recovery from natural disasters, and the resulting influence on relations between these entities. Specifically, this research explored the provision of resources to CSCs in the aftermath of flooding events in 2010 and 2011, as well as the impact on power relations between CSCs and resource providers. RDT guided this exploration as the authors conducted interviews and focus groups with personnel involved in the recovery process. The results provide implications for relationship building to facilitate recovery. In addition, CSCs can allocate personnel to continuously pursue grants to obtain this critical financial resource. It is hoped that this research leads to additional examination of how CSCs can leverage resources to confront ongoing challenges including severe weather events and other types of natural disasters.
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### Background information on the nine CSCs visited during the site visits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sport</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Number of Focus Group Participants</th>
<th>Natural Disaster</th>
<th>Membership</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Extent of Recovery (%)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rugby League</td>
<td>Southeast Queensland</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Flood</td>
<td>766</td>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rugby League</td>
<td>Southeast Queensland</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Flood</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hockey</td>
<td>Southeast Queensland</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Flood</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netball</td>
<td>Central Queensland</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Flood</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf</td>
<td>Southeast Queensland</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Flood</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowls</td>
<td>Southeast Queensland</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Flood</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer</td>
<td>North Queensland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Flood</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softball</td>
<td>Southeast Queensland</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Flood</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mud Racing</td>
<td>Southwest Queensland</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Flood</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* rounded to nearest 5%.
Appendix

*Focus Group Interview Guide*

**Focus Groups – Questions:**

- Describe the process in the immediate days and weeks following the natural disaster?
- Provide an example of the state of the CSO at its worst in the aftermath of the natural disaster.
- What event or strategy represented a turning point of your recovery? Why was this event/strategy a turning point?
- What would you do differently in response to the natural disaster? Why?
- Describe how your organization used human resources (i.e., staff, volunteers) in the days and weeks following the natural disaster?
- Describe how your organization used financial resources (i.e., existing revenues, grants, government support) following the natural disaster?

Describe any differences that existed in terms of the impact on outdoor versus indoor facilities following the natural disaster?