Event Management, Vol. 26, pp. 1259–1274
Printed in the USA.

1525-9951/22 $60.00 + .00
DOI: https://doi.org/10.3727/152599522X16419948390862
E-ISSN 1943-4308
www.cognizantcommunication.com

HOST COMMUNITIES, EVENT LEVERAGING, AND PARTICIPATORY SPORT EVENTS

MILLICENT KENNELLY

Department of Tourism, Sport and Hotel Management, Griffith University, Southbank, Australia

This article examines participatory sport event (PSE) organizers' perceptions of, and interactions with, the communities in which they host events. Internationally, PSEs are burgeoning in popularity and may be strategically leveraged to promote positive economic and social development in host locations. Yet little is known about who organizes such events, or how PSE organizers approach their interactions with event hosting communities. Further, it remains unclear if/how PSE organizers may contribute to broader strategic event leveraging activities. Twenty-two in-depth interviews were conducted with PSE organizers in the UK. The results indicate all interviewees value effective relationships with host community stakeholders, although those organizing events for-profit tended to regard stakeholder interaction in highly instrumental terms. Many organizers viewed the production of beneficial outcomes from their events as integral to ensuring community support. While organizers expressed a sense of responsibility to "do the right thing" when interacting with stakeholders, it was those who organized events in the location where they lived who exhibited greatest concern for production of benefits in the host community. This research has implications for smaller cities/locations seeking to build sustainable event portfolios as a strategy for economic or social development and may help guide decisions around which events are selected and why.

Key words: Participatory sport events (PSEs); Event host communities; Event leverage

Introduction

In recent decades there has been "tremendous growth" in demand for participatory sport events (PSEs) (Armbrecht & Andersson, 2020, p. 457). This trend reflects the broader "unprecedented" development of the event industry since the 1980s (Brown, 2014, p. 15). PSEs such as marathons, recreational cycling events, and triathlons are open to amateur athletes of varying levels of fitness, and tend to promote participation, fun, and personal challenge over winning (Coleman & Ramchandani, 2010; Crofts et al., 2012; Kennelly, 2017). While the number of PSEs held worldwide is unknown, authors have described their growing popularity (Hinch & Holt, 2017; Murphy et al.,

Address correspondence to Millicent Kennelly, Department of Tourism, Sport and Hotel Management, Griffith University, Gold Coast Campus, Southbank QLD 4222, Australia. E-mail: m.kennelly@griffith.edu.au

2015). Concomitantly, academic interest in PSEs has increased. Studies have predominately considered demand-side themes, such as what motivates participants to enter PSEs, participant experiences of PSEs, and event locations, and what factors contribute to participant satisfaction (i.e., Du et al., 2015; Kaplandiou & Gibson, 2010; Zhou & Kaplanidou, 2018).

While demand-side knowledge on PSEs continues to grow, supply-side perspectives remain relatively overlooked (Daigo & Filo, 2019; Kennelly, 2017). Little is known about who organizes PSEs and why, and what (if anything) PSE organizers do to manage the impacts of their events on hosting communities. Extant literature positions PSEs in a largely positive light, with researchers suggesting that PSEs can be leveraged to produce economic and social benefits that can improve the quality of life of people in host communities (i.e., Taks et al., 2015; Zhou & Kaplanidou, 2018). However, there has been limited critical exploration of the aims and actions of the individuals behind such events and the factors that influence their event design.

Hence, the aim of this article is to present a supply-side perspective of PSEs by bringing to light event organizers' perceptions of, and the nature of, their efforts to interact with the community (or communities) hosting their event(s). Specifically, this article explores the following question: How do PSE organizers view and approach interactions with the community/communities hosting their event(s) and why? The article is underpinned by literature on event leveraging and discusses the potential for small-scale event organizers to effectively support efforts to strategically maximize the benefits of their events.

Participatory Sport Events

The growth, professionalization, and commercialization of the event industry in recent decades denotes the significant role events play in entertaining, connecting, and contributing to the lives of individuals and communities (Brown, 2014; Lundberg et al., 2019). Internationally, events have also contributed to the delivery of opportunities for individuals to participate in sport and physical activity, leading to a surge in demand for PSEs (Armbrecht & Andersson, 2020). While PSE formats are diverse (i.e., triathlon, aquathons, duathlons, running events, recreational cycling events, open water swimming events, and various permutations of adventure races including obstacle challenges and "mud runs"), they exhibit common characteristics. They are largely promoted as open to all and noncompetitive (Coleman & Ramchandani, 2010; Crofts et al., 2012). They often involve mass or wave starts, repurpose open spaces (i.e., parks, footpaths, farmland, or public roads) and combine "terrain, time, and distance" to challenge participants (Berridge, 2014, p. 76). Participants enter of their own volition and accept responsibility for ensuring they are physically and mentally prepared.

The popularity of PSE's may be attributed to their "population reach" and "community context" (Murphy et al., 2015, p. 759) as PSEs are often promoted as fun, accessible, manageable, and may align with charitable causes or fundraising objectives (Filo et al., 2009). Sheehan (2006) suggested the popularity of PSEs has coincided with growing concern for personal health, while Berridge (2014) suggested their growth is "reflective of a challenge culture . . . where groups of individuals are undertaking more and more physically extreme activities" (p. 76).

The burgeoning popularity of PSEs has attracted interest from researchers. Understanding participants, particularly active sport tourists, and how PSEs can enhance tourism outcomes in host destinations have been dominant research themes (Gibson et al., 2018; Shipway & Stephenson, 2012). Host destinations can use sport events to build brand awareness, improve destination image, and stimulate tourism business development (Chalip & Costa, 2005; Gibson et al., 2012). Hosting PSEs may represent a good option for smaller communities seeking positive tourism and economic outcomes, because PSEs tend to utilize existing resources/infrastructure (Gibson et al., 2012; Herrick, 2015) and do not generate the level of financial risk associated with larger elite sport events (Derom & van Wynsberghe, 2015). Beyond their tourism-generating potential, researchers have also examined the ability of PSEs to positively influence community physical activity levels (i.e., Crofts et al. 2012; Murphy et al., 2015), and to contribute to public health objectives (i.e., the "fight against

obesity" and prevention of lifestyle diseases) and community well-being.

PSEs require substantial planning, during which tensions may emerge "between the short-termism of the event and the discourses of sustained impact" (Herrick, 2015, p. 299). PSE organizers may focus on managing (short-term) event delivery challenges, rather than considering how their events support the (long-term) agendas of tourism stakeholders or others in the host community (Chalip & Heere, 2014; Kennelly, 2017; Sant et al., 2019). This brings into question what role event organizers could reasonably be expected to play in ensuring beneficial outcomes for host communities. Hence, this article seeks to contribute insights into organizers' experiences of, and perspectives on, interaction with host communities, with the objective of providing a point of departure for greater understanding of how best to leverage PSEs.

Strategic Leveraging of Events

Strategic planning is required to produce desired outcomes (social, environmental, or economic) from hosting events (Beesley & Chalip, 2011; Chalip, 2004, 2006; Kelly & Fairley, 2018; O'Brien & Chalip, 2008; Ziakas, 2014). Event leveraging involves proactively designing and implementing strategies that exploit an event (or portfolio of events) to optimize benefits for the hosting community and key stakeholder groups (Chalip, 2004; Misener, 2015). In 2004, Chalip introduced a model for economic leveraging of events aimed at maximizing tourism, trade, and favorable destination media coverage, before adding suggestions on how events could also be leveraged for social and environmental outcomes (Beesley & Chalip, 2011; Chalip, 2006; O'Brien & Chalip, 2008).

Chalip's (2004) economic leveraging model suggested trade and revenue generated by an event could be optimized by: attracting visitors and encouraging them to stay longer and spend more, retaining event monies in the host location (i.e., by using local suppliers), and facilitating business relationships through the event (i.e., by offering event hospitability or associated networking opportunities). The model also highlighted the role of media (including advertising and other promotional activities) in enhancing the host destination's image, thereby paving the way for longer term tourism outcomes (Chalip, 2004; Chalip & Costa, 2005).

Chalip (2006) next proposed a social leveraging model focused on maximizing the social value of events. The underpinning logic of this model is that events produce social value by developing a "sense of social camaraderie" and a "sense of celebration" (p. 113). Chalip (2006) advocated that the former could be achieved by: encouraging participants or attendees to socialize at or around the event venue, running contemporaneous social events for participants or attendees, and encouraging other informal opportunities for social engagement (i.e., in the case of sport events through street festivals, fan zones, or other event activations). A sense of celebration could be achieved through ancillary events (i.e., complementary cultural festivals or arts events) or using "event symbols, colours, and decorations" to theme widely and provide a "visual statement that something special is happening" (Chalip, 2006, p. 118). While few empirical studies have directly used Chalip's social leveraging model, the notion that events can be strategically leveraged to produce social outcomes has received support (i.e., Misener, 2015; Schulenkorf et al., 2019; Ziakas, 2010).

Much of the published work on event leveraging has focused on large-scale events, although authors (i.e., Derom & van Wynsberghe, 2015; Kelly & Fairley, 2018; Kennelly, 2017; Misener, 2015; O'Brien, 2007; Schulenkorf et al., 2019; Taks et al., 2015) have also used Chalip's ideas to examine smaller, "non-mega"-sport events. In contrast to large-scale sport events, these smaller events potentially facilitate creation of tighter social networks, greater levels of reciprocity between the community and event managers, and enhanced opportunities to create "more positive (or less negative) social impacts" (Taks et al., 2015, p. 1). However, Misener and Mason (2006) cautioned that for "sporting events to have any positive impact within local communities, they need to embrace the core values of residents, community groups, and neighbourhood associations" (p. 45).

Further, the appropriateness of event leveraging strategies proposed for large-scale events may need to be revisited in the context of small-scale events. Kelly and Fairley (2018) examined whether

tourism leveraging strategies for large-scale events also apply to small-scale events, and concluded that leveraging strategies are not necessarily scalable. They found "efforts to leverage small-scale events can alter the direction and scope of the event itself" (Kelly & Fairley, 2018, p. 342). Specifically, they noted when event organizers received funding to support tourism leveraging activities, it distracted from their core task of event delivery and produced outcomes that favored tourism stakeholders (over other event imperatives).

Beyond leveraging individual events, host communities may adopt a strategic portfolio approach to planning their event calendars (Chalip, 2004; Getz, 2008; Ziakas, 2014). The portfolio approach involves host communities developing and cross-leveraging a calendar of events that suit the location's broader economic, tourism, sport, or sociocultural objectives (Ziakas, 2010, 2014). Ziakas (2010) positioned event portfolios as valuable community assets, which can comprise events of varying types and sizes, held across the year. Ideally events in the portfolio share community resources (i.e., volunteers) and values, and contribute to building a community's event hosting capacity. The effectiveness of such portfolios requires event planners to adopt an "integrative mindset" (Ziakas, 2010, p. 147) to create synergies between different events as well as the host community's overall product mix in order to attain "multiple ends" (p. 148) and maximize value.

One criticism of Chalip's earlier works on leveraging was their silence on who should undertake leveraging efforts. On this matter, Chalip and Heere (2014) acknowledged, "there is no single entity for which event leverage is necessarily a natural assignment" (p. 189). Event organizers may be focused on successfully staging their event, rather than concerning themselves with leveraging opportunities (Kennelly, 2017; Sant et al., 2019). Hence, responsibility for managing leveraging activities before, during, and after the event may reasonably fall to entities such as local business associations, destination marketers, government agencies, or other relevant service organizations in the hosting location (Chalip & Heere, 2014; Sant et al., 2019). Yet event organizers "clearly need to support leveraging efforts" (Chalip & Heere, 2014, p. 189). Scant attention has been given to event organizers' perspectives on what matters in the organization and delivery of their events, and their experiences of working with and within event host communities. Consequently, little is known about if and how PSE organizers may fruitfully play a supporting role in leveraging activities designed to produce benefits for host communities.

Methodology

The setting of this research is described first before details are provided on the qualitative approach utilized for data collection and analysis.

Research Context

This research was conducted in the UK. While data on participation in PSEs is not directly captured in any of the sport or physical activity participation surveys used in the UK (e.g., Sport England's Active Lives Adult Survey, Scottish Household Survey, National Survey for Wales), there is evidence to suggest the market is large with thousands of participatory events on offer annually across the UK. Outdoor events, including PSEs, are considered a key aspect of outdoor recreation in the UK (Rotherham et al., 2005). The Sport and Recreation Alliance (2014) argued that outdoor recreation is "the UK's favourite pastime" (p. 5), and that the "great outdoors" is one of the UK's "greatest assets" (p. 6): "Collectively our fields, forests, lakes, mountains, rivers, cliffs and beaches are the greatest leisure facility the nation has ever seen" (p. 6). Many of the PSEs featured in this research utilize this public "leisure facility" by repurposing national parks, public walking trails, footpaths, lakes and beaches.

Data Collection

Twenty-two in-depth interviews were conducted with event organizers: 19 were conducted in person, and 3 via Skype. Four of the interviews were attended by two event organizers, resulting in a total of 26 interviewees. Interviews enable researchers to access "peoples' perceptions, meanings, definitions of situations and constructions of reality" (Punch, 2014, p. 145). As the aim of this research was to bring to light PSE organizers' perspectives

on, and actions towards, the communities in which they host events, interviews were deemed an appropriate approach for data collection.

The recruitment of interviewees involved a purposeful maximum variation sampling strategy (Patton, 2015), considering the diversity of PSE formats and host locations. The intention of this approach was capturing central themes "that cut across a great deal of variation" (Patton, 2015, p. 283) in PSE formats and host locations throughout

Table 1
Summary of Intervieews

Interviewee Pseudonym	Living in Host Location (Y/N)[a]	No. of Events	Type of Events	Event Organization Type (for-Profit (FP) or Not-for-Profit (NFP) and Motivation Underpinning Event
Peter and Cheryl	Y (region)	6[b]	Triathlon, duathlon, running	FP event company
Geraldine	Y (region)	1	Off road triathlon	FP company running a PSE to diversify earnings
Nic	N/Y (region)	3[bc]	Trail running, obstacle endurance	FP event company
Ivan and Simon	Y	1	Running	NFP, raising funds for local charities and community projects
Jed	Y (region)	2[b]	Off road (fell) running	NFP, raising funds for local charities and community projects
Geoffrey	Y (region)	2	Off road (fell) running	NFP charity, raising funds for itself
Daryl	N	9	Running, cycling, obstacle endurance, adventure races	FP event company
Adrian	Y	1	Running	NFP, raising funds for local charities and community projects
Matthew	Y (region)	5	Open water swimming	FP event company
Toby	Y	1	Swimming	NFP charity, raising funds for itself and other community projects
Liam	Y	1[b]	Cycling (audax)	NFP sport club (cycling) raising funds for itself
Andre	N	1	Running (ultra)	FP event company
Chris	N	6	Triathlon, running, open water swimming	FP event company
Russell	Y	1	Cycling	NFP sport club (rugby union) raising funds for itself
Ryan	Y	2	Cycling	NFP, raising funds for community projects, plus awareness of host location
Mark	Y	1	Cycling (cyclo-sportif)	NFP, raising funds for community projects, plus awareness of host location
Heath	N	17	Triathlon, cycling, running, obstacle endurance, adventure racing	FP event company
Kelly	N	1	Open water swimming	NFP charity, raising funds for itself
Andrew and Callum	Y	1[b]	Cycling	NFP, raising funds for a community project
Seth	Y	1[b]	Cycling (Off road mountain biking)	NFP sport club (cycling), raising funds for local charities and community projects
Ross	Y	1[b]	Running	NFP sport club (athletics), providing racing opportunities for amateurs
Cooper	N/Y(region)	11[d]	Running, adventure racing, cycling	FP event company

Note. [a]Some interviewees hosted events that were situated in their hometown, while others hosted events that traversed large geographical areas (i.e., ultra runs or cycling challenges) in their home region. The latter group are indicated with "Y (region)." Nic and Cooper staged multiple events, but few close to home, indicated as "N/Y (region)." [b]In these instances the number refers to "event weekends." Organizers ran their events as "festival style" weekends with multiple races over 2 or 3 days. For example, Peter and Cheryl run six event weekends per annum featuring triathlons, duathlons, and runs of various lengths. These weekends are counted as "one event" because that is how they were viewed and organized by interviewees. [c]Nic's company ran three event weekends per annum but were also contracted to run multiple PSEs on behalf of other companies and charities. In order to protect the commercial interests of his clients, events he ran as a contractor were not included in our discussion or event tally. The same applies to Cooper and Heath. [d]Cooper runs several events that last 2–5 days due to the large distances traversed.

the UK. Prospective interviewees were identified through web searches. Sixty-one event organizers were contacted. Table 1 provides a summary of those who agreed to participate.

An open-ended interview schedule was used to probe event organizers on three broad topics: the evolution of their events, the purpose and outcomes of their events, and the existence of and reason for any informal or formal connections with key stakeholders, including sport governing bodies, governments, or tourism agencies. Sample questions included: What is the background of your event(s)? What motivated the development of your event(s)? Are you aiming to achieve specific outcomes? Do you evaluate your event(s)? Are there any informal or formal connections between your event/s and [insert stakeholder]?). Interviewees were also invited to reflect on challenges to staging PSEs. Interviews ranged from 17 to 97 min (average = 56 min). The variation in interview time arose from the number and complexity of events run by interviewees. All interviews were recorded and transcribed verbatim with interviewees' permission.

Data Analysis

Data were analyzed using an inductive coding process designed to reduce the mass of raw data into a "summary and organised form" (Gillham, 2000, p. 25). First, transcripts were read to generate a preliminary list of emergent codes, or labels designed to capture and condense the meaning of raw data (Miles et al., 2014). Next, after a second reading, overlapping or connected codes were grouped into a smaller number of distinct categories that were still reflective of the raw data (Neuman, 2011). Throughout these initial stages of analysis, analytical notes and observations were recorded (Miles et al., 2014), which aided in the final step of identifying overarching themes for reporting (Creswell, 2013). In accordance with the ethics approval for this research, pseudonyms are used in the reporting of results and event names are not disclosed to protect event organizers' commercial relationships.

Results

Three interrelated, overarching themes were derived from the data: "community connections," "economic contribution," and "approach to place." Background information gleaned from the interviews is provided first, before each of these themes is elaborated upon with supporting evidence.

Background

Over half the interviewees organized one event per annum (n = 12), while the remainder organized multiple events each year (2 to 17 events). Interviewees were collectively involved in running 75 PSEs annually, around the UK and abroad. Event locations ranged from metropolitan sites such as London or Canterbury, to village or countryside settings across the Peak and Lake District National Parks, Yorkshire Dales, and sites in Scotland and Wales. Some events were held in the same location annually, while other events periodically moved. The range of events was diverse, as illustrated in Table 1. Events ranged in size from a few hundred participants (particularly for inaugural, fledgling, or remote events), up to 10,000 contestants.

Some interviewees ran events commercially for-profit (n = 9), denoted where relevant in the below findings with "(FP)." Other interviewees ran not-for-profit events, primarily on a voluntary basis to raise money and/or awareness for charities or local causes (n = 13), signified in the below findings with "(NFP)." As summarized in Table 1, many interviewees organized events in or close to the community in which they lived, particularly those organizsing events for local charities or causes.

Community Connections

The theme "community connections" encapsulates the ways in which the event organizers interacted with communities hosting their events and comprises two subthemes. *Managing stakeholder relationships* related to event organizers' viewpoints on the importance of forming and managing relationships with key stakeholders in event hosting communities. *Embeddedness in the host community* focuses on the actions (if any) of event organizers to bolster the connection between their event and its host location.

Managing Stakeholder Relationships. Interviewees emphasized the importance of maintaining

positive relationships with stakeholders in the communities hosting their event(s). Positive relationships were described as a corollary of effective communication, minimizing adverse impacts (i.e., overcrowding/inconvenience), and the production of benefits, particularly economic benefits, for the host community.

Most event organizers felt it was important to inform relevant landowners, local government, and/or national park authorities that their event was taking place. Cooper (FP) described how "liberal" UK laws meant event organizers were not always legally required to notify these stakeholders if their event was using minor roads, or the "amazing network of [public] rights of way" that give people access to the English countryside. While there was not necessarily a legal obligation for event organizers to forewarn key stakeholders about their event, Andre (FP) described it as a "good practice" that should be observed. Yet, when Andrew and Callum (NFP) notified local council about their cycling event in its inaugural year (2015), the authorities responded positively with, "This is the first time a cycling event has contacted us in advance."

For commercial operators like Heath, Chris, Cooper, and Daryl, managing stakeholder relationships was primarily about ensuring their events could take place. Heath (FP) noted, "land access is quite a hot potato in this country, given that there ain't a lot of space, and everyone enjoys using it." He had invested years into developing relationships with landowners and local authorities and described these relationships as "our family silver." He emphasized the need for "good guardianship of relationships," as without admission to land, "you don't have an event." Similarly, Chris (FP), who held his events on private estates, commented, "we've protected our relationships with the [estate owners]. That's the key to our business."

Despite recognizing the importance of positive stakeholder relationships with landowners, several interviewees provided examples of the tensions that could emerge around PSEs. For example, Cooper (FP) commented: "There has been quite a few times . . . we will go to a land owner and say, 'Look, I'm sorry. I know you don't want us here, but we are going to come through. This is our right to be able to do this.' "

Heath (FP) thought some landowners believed PSE organizers achieved astronomical profits from events that traversed private land on public rights of way, and he described his efforts to reeducate landowners about the challenges and realities of event organizing (i.e., PSEs may be costly to stage and not always profitable).

Overall, while some event organizers described instances of fraught interactions with stakeholder groups, all interviewees spoke about carefully cultivating positive stakeholder relationships to ensure their event(s) had a future. Along these lines, several interviewees (particularly for-profit organizers) recognized that irresponsible behavior in host communities by individual event organizers could "prejudice the event landscape for other people" (Daryl, FP). As Daryl (FP) reflected, "it's very simple for someone to come in and do a bad job and then all of a sudden people think all events are going to cause problems." He argued event organizers "have a mutual responsibility" to "behave in a responsible manner" to preserve positive stakeholder relationships in hosting communities.

"Embeddedness" in Host Community. Events varied in how "embedded" they were in their host community. Organizers could connect their event(s) to the host community by using local volunteers, engaging local clubs, supporting local businesses, showcasing or promoting local industries, incorporating local venues, raising funds and awareness for local charitable causes, and/or drawing on local sponsors. Data suggested PSEs created and organized by interviewees who lived in the host community were more likely to utilize local structures and resources than events organized by for-profit, "fly-in, fly-out" companies. Organizers of the latter appeared more focused on location characteristics, particularly the attractiveness of the destination, its suitability for the event type, and/or the appropriateness of the site for managing logistical issues (i.e., ample parking, sufficient event space for mass gatherings).

Comparing the approaches of two interviewees who organize running events aptly demonstrates differences in the ways event organizers connected to and engaged with host communities. Daryl owns a for-profit event company that stages nine events per annum around the UK, while Adrian is a volunteer

who stages one event per annum for fundraising purposes in the community where he lives. Daryl does not run events where he lives because he feels, to be profitable, his events must be "accessible to the mass market." He strategically chooses event locations that enable him to "bring adventure close to populations, particularly London," so participants can "commute into the event in the morning, do the event, then go back home." Daryl prefers to stage events in locations where he can "deal with one landowner . . . [as] that makes life a lot easier." He typically uses private venues such as estates or military training land. His event sites tend to be "contained" and separate from nearby villages/towns. Daryl identifies national charities that his event participants can fundraise for if they wish, although this is not a requirement or core component of his event offerings. Finally, Daryl's company transports their own infrastructure into event sites and avoids using volunteers where possible. For-profit operators such as Nic, Chris, Heath, and Cooper outlined similar "fly-in, fly-out" approaches for their events.

In contrast, Adrian helps organize a running event hosted in his home community that draws heavily on local resources and is arguably deeply embedded in its host location. The event was established by a community member in the 1980s and is run annually by a small volunteer committee. The event attracts over 1,500 participants. All proceeds go to local organizations. The event is supported by 80 to 100 local volunteers. The event starts and finishes at a local school, which benefits financially through selling food, drinks, and parking. The event is sponsored by (and in turn promotes) local businesses and accommodation providers and engages the historic local industry (slate mining) to make prizes for participants. The event is "very much supported by the village" even though it causes a degree of inconvenience on race day (the event uses public roads). Adrian perceived the event as a good fit with the area and an important driver of economic benefit for his village. Fundraising events run by Ivan and Simon, Jed, Andrew and Callum, Mark, and Seth had similar profiles.

Economic Contribution

This theme conveys findings about the perceived economic impacts (measured and unmeasured) of PSEs. The primary forms of economic impact related to *supporting local businesses* in host communities, particularly through tourism and visitor spending, and *supporting charities and causes*. There were clear links between this theme and "community connections" as many organizers perceived the delivery of economic benefit as a key way to engage with, persuade, and/or maintain positive relationships with host stakeholders.

*Supporting Local Bus*iness. Most interviewees were mindful of working to create economic benefits for event hosting communities, although efforts to this effect varied. Event organizers described three ways in which they supported local businesses. First, organizers used local suppliers in the delivery of their event(s). For example, Liam (NFP) explained, "If we need the services of a company, we will normally try and find a company actually in [the host community] itself," while Ross (NFP) maintained "most of the money we spend in delivering the event . . . stays here." Second, several interviewees (i.e., particularly not-for-profit organizers Adrian, Toby, Jed, Andrew, and Callum), promoted local businesses and accommodation providers through their websites, event promotional materials, and prizes for participants. Many of these promotional activities occurred as part of sponsorship arrangements. However, their local focus is notable because most of the larger, commercial PSEs had sponsorships from national/international fitness apparel chains or food/supplement companies that had no ties to the event location.

Finally, many of the organizers believed that because their event(s) attracted tourists, they created an economic benefit through visitor spending. However, evidence of economic impact was largely anecdotal. For example, neither Matthew (FP) nor Cooper (FP) formally measured the impact of their events, yet Matthew (FP) described how his event filled the local hotel on "the quietest weekend of the year," while Cooper (FP) described the "massive impact" his event had on its small host village. Liam (NFP) was the only event organizer who had formally undertaken (and publicized the results of) an independent economic impact assessment of his event. His event contributed a quarter of a million pounds to the host community, an impact "far greater" than anticipated. He found this information useful in his relationships with local authorities

and the community. Indeed, several event organizers (both for- and not-for-profit) described how perceived economic benefits arising from their events helped maintain positive stakeholder relationships in the host community.

However, this theme did not apply to all events. Several for-profit events were staged on enclosed private land, with "festival like" set ups that involved limited interaction with local businesses (i.e., Daryl's events described above, as well as some of Nic's, Cooper's, and Heath's). For such events, participants were able to commute in and out of the event site in 1 day and/or were encouraged to stay onsite for the event's duration rather than exploring the local area or using local services. For example, Nic's (FP) weekend-long events were held on private land and featured an event "village" with shops, bars and food stalls, film screenings, and workshops. For such "festival like" event sites, visitor spending was theoretically concentrated at the event, rather than spread across a range of local tourism providers and businesses. This approach was only utilized by for-profit event organizers that staged events near large population centers.

Supporting Charities and Causes. Event organizers used their event(s) to support charities or charitable causes by: 1) donating profits to local charities and causes determined by the event organizer; 2) allowing participants to use the event to fundraise for a cause of their choice; 3) encouraging participants to give to, or raise funds for a charity nominated by the event organizer; and/or 4) giving charities event registrations they could then use for their own fundraising initiatives.

Raising funds for and awareness of charities and/or local causes were the dominant motives of 13 event organizers (all NFP organizers interviewed). These 13 predominantly favored the former two approaches (i.e., they directed all event profits to charities, and/or invited participants to fundraise for causes of their choice). Twelve of the 13 NFP organizers lived in the community hosting their event and tended to support smaller, local charities and causes. The exception was Kelly, who organized an ocean swim for a national charity from an inland base.

The range of charitable causes supported and the passion of volunteer event organizers was notable. For example, Seth (NFP) explained: "Each year we try to pick a different charity [to support], but keep it local, keep it small so that the lesser-known [charities] benefit." Russell's (NFP) rugby union club used a cycling event to raise funds to establish their wheelchair rugby team. Jed's (NFP) running events raised funds for a local father's group, as well as to buy equipment for the local preschool, and to improve disabled access to local sport facilities. Andrew and Callum's (NFP) cycling event raised funds for a community shop in their village. As Callum explained, "we had one shop and a post office. They both closed within a fortnight. Then the heart went out of the village." The community shop was established to prevent the village from turning into a "dormitory," but they "need[ed] a fundraising initiative" to keep it open. Hence, their cycling event was initiated.

In contrast to these examples of highly localized and relatively modest fundraising efforts, for-profit PSE organizers tended to support larger, national charities (i.e., by encouraging participants to give to a charity nominated by the event organizer). For example, across multiple events and years, Heath's company had raised over 1 million pounds for a national children's cancer charity.

Approach to Place

This theme concerns event organizers' approaches to the physical places hosting their events. For the most part, for-profit organizers perceived the place hosting their event as a source of competitive advantage for marketing purposes. Organizers felt the natural beauty or heritage of a location or its suitability for a physically challenging outdoor event were central to attracting athletes. Cooper (FP) said, "It's not the [event] format which I'm trying to sell. It's the location," while Matthew (FP) noted, "if you can capitalize on the location it helps a lot."

Occasionally the physical setting produced unexpected logistical challenges. Several organizers had canceled or modified event(s) due to outbreaks of disease affecting livestock or trees, or the presence of protected species (i.e., birds) on the event route. While event organizers were willing to comply with regulations and community expectations in these instances, only two organizers directly mentioned

adopting environmentally sustainable practices [i.e., Adrian (NFP) and Heath (FP)]. Instead, the most common concern expressed by event organizers about the physical setting of their event related to managing pressure on popular places due to the growing PSE market.

Several interviewees discussed the risk of PSEs overloading popular places, such as the Lake District or Peak District National Parks. Unregulated use of the network of public paths and rights of way in the UK was seen as part of the challenge. Cooper (FP) felt unfettered use of public paths by PSE organizers represented one of the "biggest vulnerabilities" for the sector. Adrian (NFP) described how the growing number of events in the Lake District was producing "tensions and problems" with local communities. He specifically complained about the number of "fly-in, fly-out" commercial event operators "using the landscape" with limited regard for their impacts on residents (i.e., traffic congestion, crowding, loss of access to public spaces) and the environment.

The risk of "overloading" popular locations had prompted some organizers to think strategically about the growth of their event(s). The data highlighted three approaches: restricted entry, organic growth, and active growth. Restricted entry was the least common approach and involved capping event registrations despite the popularity of the event. For example, Adrian (NFP) capped entries to his event to ensure his village could "cope." The capping point enabled Adrian's event to cover costs, raise money for local causes, manage logistical concerns (i.e., adequate parking, accommodation, and safety on the event route), and community expectations (i.e., minimizing inconvenience and disruption).

Other event organizers preferred "organic growth," whereby they wanted their event numbers to grow, but did not actively push for rapid growth. For example, Cooper (FP) described how organic growth had helped ensure village shop keepers on the route of his cycling event remained supportive. He noted, "We started with 250 [participants], then 500, then 750, 1,000. . . . I think if we'd gone in with 1,000, we would have had a problem with the local people. They wouldn't have liked it."

In contrast, Daryl's (FP) focus was actively growing his event participation numbers. To ensure his business remained viable, he aimed to make events "accessible to the mass market" by finding venues that could "cope" with rapid and extensive growth: "Actually finding the right sort of venues that can cope with mass participation and are potentially scalable, a venue where you can actually grow in years to come, that's the real challenge" (Daryl).

Overall, the approach organizers adopted to the growth of their event(s) was influenced by factors such as: whether or not the event was profit oriented, whether the event had the physical space to grow, and whether the size of the event produced adverse impacts on the host community. For-profit companies were geared towards growth (be it organic or active), and therefore focused on finding venues or routes that were scalable. Those involved in smaller, not-for-profit PSEs more often spoke about limiting participant numbers or growing slowly to ensure the host location could handle the event.

Discussion and Implications

This research examined PSE organizers' perceptions of, and approaches to, interacting with the community/communities hosting their event(s). The purpose of garnering a supply-side perspective was to reflect on if/how event organizers may support efforts to leverage events for host community benefit. Approaches to the host community varied, with concomitant implications for the ways in which PSEs may be strategically leveraged by hosting communities. Although nuances were evident in the data, the two dominant and interrelated sources of variation were: whether the event organizer was staging events for-profit or not-for-profit purposes and whether the event organizer lived in the hosting community. Those staging events for-profit typically chose event sites for strategic reasons, and in many, although not all cases, delivered events away from home. In contrast, not-for-profit organizers who were motivated to stage events for local charities and causes invariably held their events in their home community. These variations are expanded upon below, before implications for host community event planners are explored.

All organizers valued positive relationships with host community stakeholders, although relationships were valued for different reasons. For-profit PSE organizers described the value of positive

stakeholder relationships in strongly instrumental terms (i.e., the relationships were "assets"). In contrast, not-for-profit organizers staging events in the community where they lived described positive relationships as intrinsically valued and their events as touchpoints for encouraging or strengthening broader social connections. Many of the stakeholder relationships associated with their events transcended the events: that is, they existed and were valued before and after the event. Arguably, living in the host community had enabled some event organizers to foster strong local social networks and reciprocal relationships over time, as well as to become attuned to their community's values and expectations. These qualities have been identified as antecedents to delivering positive event outcomes (Misener & Mason, 2006; Taks et al., 2015).

However, data highlighted that managing stakeholder relationships could be time consuming for event organizers and sometimes relationships could be vexed, particularly around issues of land access and use. Hence, some for-profit event organizers sought to minimize the necessity for complex stakeholder interactions by hosting events in contained "festival sites" on private land. Negotiating with only one landowner substantially reduced the stakeholder interactions required to stage an event. However, this approach arguably muted the utility of economic leveraging strategies proposed by Chalip (2004) and reduced the likelihood of economic benefits permeating into the host community. This finding also underpins a disconnect between narratives highlighting the potential role of PSEs in destination marketing and tourism development (see Gibson et al., 2014; Herrick, 2015; Hinch & Holt, 2017) and the event design decisions made by some event organizers.

In contrast, for those not-for-profit organizers staging PSEs in public spaces in their home community, the complexity of stakeholder interactions could be extensive due to the range of individuals and organizations impacted (i.e., schools, businesses, local volunteers, charities, landowners, local authorities, etc.). The significance of this finding may be interpreted in light of Derrett's (2009) work on cultural festivals in Australia. Derrett (2009) found volunteer festival organizers felt "obliged" to deliver festivals that "authentically represent the best interests of other residents" (p. 107). These comments arguably apply to many of the not-for-profit PSE organizers featured in this research. The volunteer organizers of small, charity-based PSEs did not necessarily deliberately set out to engage in strategic economic or social leveraging. Yet events like theirs often occurred through extensive stakeholder engagement, and in turn inherently reflected community values, and fostered the production of economic and social benefits (Derrett, 2009; Misener & Mason, 2006).

Relatedly, there was variation in the degree to which for-profit and not-for-profit PSE organizers "embedded" their events into the fabric of hosting communities. Although care should be exercised in generalizing the findings of this small qualitative study, data highlighted that not-for-profit PSE organizers hosting events in their home community appeared more likely to embed their event through the use of community resources (i.e., volunteers, suppliers, contractors, public spaces, etc.) and were more concerned with the production of economic and social benefits (i.e., through donating to local charities and causes, promoting local businesses and industries). The approach of these organizers seems analogous with Ziakas' (2010) suggestion that event planners adopt an "integrative mindset" (p. 147) when thinking about how their events connect to the host community's "character" and product mix. Data suggested event organizers who lived in the host community utilized community resources for practical reasons (more so than for strategic leveraging purposes as defined by Chalip (2004, 2006). However, by embedding events into the host community they were arguably contributing more to community capacity and social capital building than those for-profit PSE organizers who avoided use of volunteers, did not need local suppliers, and who preferred to use contained, privately owned event sites.

Overall, there was limited evidence that PSE organizers were purposely designing events to strategically support broader host community economic or social leveraging efforts using the tactics articulated in Chalip's (2004, 2006) models. On the contrary, some for-profit organizers intentionally designed their events in ways that contradicted Chalip's suggested leveraging strategies. In this respect, the findings of this study broadly

concur with Kelly and Fairley's (2018) contention that leveraging strategies proposed for large-scale events may not be suitable for some smaller events. However, all event organizers recognized it was advantageous if their events benefited hosting communities and there was evidence of event organizers engaging in practices (albeit unintentionally or for instrumental reasons) that resonated with the underpinning intentions of strategic event leveraging. The implications of these findings are now explored.

Implications for Knowledge and Practice

Small-scale events, such as those featured in the current study, may be valuable, leverageable assets for host communities (Gibson et al., 2012; Kelly & Fairley, 2018; Taks et al., 2015). However, the current study suggests that to fully maximize the leveraging potential of PSEs, further consideration should be given to: the role of event organizers in supporting leveraging efforts; nullifying (workload) constraints to organizers' involvement in leveraging, and understanding organizers' viewpoints on the utility and/or normative importance of interacting with event host communities. PSE organizers may not be effective in supporting event leveraging efforts if they are: preoccupied with event delivery (Kennelly, 2017; Sant et al., 2019); not conversant in, or appreciative of, the notion of event leveraging; actively trying to avoid bureaucracy or complex stakeholder interactions; or not familiar with the location hosting their event and its broader social or economic goals. These findings give rise to implications for host community event planners in relation to 1) the willingness of event organizers to enable economic and social leveraging activities around their events, and 2) the selection of events for community event portfolios.

As events are transient, it is considered that leveraging activities are best undertaken by entities that are permanent fixtures in host communities, including business associations, destination marketing organizations (DMOs), local government agencies (i.e., event units), universities, and other relevant service providers (Chalip & Costa, 2005; Chalip & Heere, 2014; Kennelly et al., 2017; Sant et al., 2019). Event organizers ideally play a supporting role (Chalip & Heere, 2014). Yet, this research highlighted differences in the willingness and aptitude of event organizers to undertake or support leveraging activities. Specifically, findings suggested that when event organizers live in the community hosting their event(s) they may alleviate some of the event's transience. Unlike the one-off, large-scale events on which much of the leveraging literature concentrates, small, annual, locally run, and not-for-profit PSEs seemed to activate community relationships and resources regularly, even year round. Interviewees provided examples of how their events were "embedded" into the social fabric of the host community in ways that extended beyond the event timeframe (i.e., through utilizing and strengthening existing social and business networks, drawing on local resources, and subsidizing community causes). For example, funds raised through Andrew and Callum's cycling event kept their community shop open, which in turn provided villagers with a year-round point of contact (and opportunity for commerce) that would otherwise be lacking. Hence, although such events are technically temporally bound, by acting as points of convergence for a variety of local interests, they seemed to catalyze a range of longer term connections within host communities. In these examples, event organizers appeared to willingly and successfully be playing a pivotal (rather than supporting) role in long-term event leveraging and the intervention of the abovementioned more permanent local stakeholders may be unnecessary.

However, this research also found that other event organizers, particularly those operating larger, commercially oriented events in communities where they did not reside, may be ill-equipped or unwilling to support local event leveraging activities. Specifically, data from this project illustrate that such PSE organizers may be reluctant to engage in the level of stakeholder interaction required to support leveraging efforts and may even design events in ways that erode their leveraging potential. As noted by other authors (i.e., Herrick, 2015; Kelly & Fairley, 2018; Kennelly, 2017), these challenges typically arise from a clash between an event organizer's need to concentrate on short-term event delivery versus the (perceived) effort required to support the longer term leveraging agendas of other stakeholders. Dealing with multiple stakeholders and their divergent agendas

was considered to detract from the central task of event organization, especially where such stakeholders were concentrating on how event leveraging efforts could benefit them (rather than the event organizer). This attitude appears vindicated by Kelly and Fairley's (2018) finding that when small-scale event organizers accepted grant funding from a tourism organization, they were required to engage in tourism leveraging activities that distracted from the core task of organizing their event. Put simply, some PSE organizers may not be interested in supporting leveraging activities, especially when such activities increase their workload with limited direct return.

In response to this finding, it could be valuable for host community organizations seeking to leverage events to work collectively on outreach specifically to for-profit and out of town PSE organizers. The underlying aim of such outreach could be to educate event organizers on the potential value of their event(s) to the host community and to encourage event organizers to give host community stakeholders adequate event access to facilitate leveraging activities. However, interacting with these stakeholders needs to be simple and worthwhile for event organizers. Host community organizations seeking to leverage an event may need to work collectively to liaise with an event organizer (e.g., sending one representative with a streamlined and combined leveraging plan, rather than sending multiple representatives with divergent agendas). In addition, host community organizations should consider what they can contribute to an event (i.e., resources, promotional support, staff) to make it worthwhile for the event organizer to accommodate event leveraging activities. These suggestions are about supporting event organizers so they can in turn support the production of benefits through event leveraging.

Relatedly, the findings of this research provide insights that could influence the design of event portfolios for smaller destinations. The ability of a community to build an effective and sustainable event portfolio relies on some form of central agency, or local authority committing to oversee the attraction, retention, leveraging, and seasonal arrangement of events that complement the host location (Ziakas, 2010, 2014). Local authorities looking to develop event portfolios should be encouraged to think about their community's sensitivities, needs, resources, and social or economic development goals (Ziakas, 2010). The perspectives of event organizers offered in this research suggest decisions on the composition of an event portfolio could also benefit from considering *who* is organizing selected events, and the event organizers' capabilities, resources, motivations, and willingness to support leveraging activities that contribute to broader community goals.

For example, PSE organizers from "out of town" may not understand the local community's needs, goals, or sensitivities. Consequently, without the abovementioned outreach, "fly-in, fly-out" organizers may not be best placed to facilitate local business networks, to deliver events that authentically represent the host community and its values, or help the host community establish networks that contribute to longer term resilience and social benefit (see Derrett, 2009; Taks et al., 2015). Data in this project highlighted that profit-oriented organizers were typically most concerned with an event location's logistical features and marketing value. Hence, as suggested above, out of town PSE organizers may need encouragement to understand how they can contribute to broader community goals before their event is included in a local event portfolio.

Alternatively, local authorities may consider prioritizing locally run PSEs that are already focused on benefiting local causes and community projects. Data from this research indicated that local organizers [i.e., those living in the community where they ran their event(s)] were already more inclined to invest in engaging and serving the needs of the community within which they live. However, Getz (2008) argued there may be good reasons for not exploiting these kinds of community events for economic development/tourism imperatives, in order to preserve cultural authenticity and local control, which may be undermined when tourism goals take precedence, as illustrated by Kelly and Fairly (2018). The authenticity (and even tourism appeal) of such events may be retained if organizers are left to focus on successful event delivery, and are not pushed to pursue growth, or engage in economic leveraging activities that serve the interests of local authorities. Hence, authorities may need to adopt a "hands-off" approach when integrating locally run,

non-profit PSEs into event portfolios. Specifically, organizers of these events may be better left to continue their work with little interference in recognition that they already produce social value and contribute to community capacity building.

Conclusions and Future Research

As acknowledged, care should be exercised in generalizing the findings of this qualitative project on the perceptions of event organizers on interacting with the communities hosting their events. Despite this, the research provides a valuable supply-side perspective that gives rise to a range of potential implications that may help guide communities in strategic decisions around which events to host and how to work with PSE organizers to leverage event opportunities.

The research highlighted that all event organizers were focused on delivering successful events, valued positive stakeholder relationships, and recognized the advantages of producing beneficial outcomes in host communities. Yet event organizers varied in their level of interest in engaging with host community stakeholders, which concomitantly influenced the likelihood they would be willing or able to engage in event leveraging as outlined by Chalip (2004, 2006). Hence, local authorities making strategic decisions around which events should be included in a community's event portfolio may benefit from also considering who is organizing an event and why. In this research, event organizers living in the communities hosting their events generally exhibited greater concern for the production of longer term social and economic benefits, as well as willingness to interact with multiple local stakeholders.

A key limitation of this research is its exclusive focus on the UK context. Although the popularity of PSEs has similarly burgeoned in other geopolitical contexts, some features of the UK market are unique. For example, the public rights of way traversing private land throughout the UK, and used by PSE organizers, are not common in other countries. This likely compounds issues raised in this research around stakeholder engagement, overcrowding of popular event locations, and land access—but without further research this cannot be confirmed. Hence, research providing supply-side perspectives of PSEs and the role of PSEs (and their organizers) in enriching host communities beyond the UK could provide useful points of comparison and suggestions for new approaches to event leveraging. An additional limitation of this research was that a small and diverse sample size was used to capture what transpired to be quite divergent approaches and attitudes toward host communities. Future research could build on these findings by segmenting the PSE market and comparing the approaches of different groups of PSE organizers (i.e., commercial, not-for-profit, based on different event motivations, styles, and participant markets) to host community interaction.

ORCID

Millicent Kennelly: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8890-9849

References

Armbrecht, J., & Andersson, T. (2020). The event experience, hedonic and eudaimonic satisfaction and subjective well-being among sport event participants. *Journal of Policy Research in Tourism, Leisure and Events*, *12*(3), 457–477. https://doi.org/10.1080/19407963.2019.1695346

Beesley, L., & Chalip, L. (2011). Seeking (and not seeking) to leverage mega-sport events in non-host destinations: The case of Shanghai and the Beijing Olympics. *Journal of Sport and Tourism, 16*(4), 323–344. https://doi.org/10.1080/14775085.2011.635016

Berridge, G. (2014). The gran fondo and sportive experience: An exploratory look at cyclists' experiences and professional event staging. *Event Management*, *18*(1), 75–88. https://doi.org/10.3727/152599514X13883555341977

Brown, S. (2014). Emerging professionalism in the event industry: A practitioner's perspective. *Event Management*, *18*(1), 15–24. http://doi.org/10.3727/152599514X13883555341760

Chalip, L. (2004). Beyond impact: A general model for host community event leverage. In B. W. Ritchie & D. Adair (Eds.), *Sport tourism: Interrelationships, impacts and issues* (pp. 236–262). Channel View.

Chalip, L. (2006). Towards social leveraging of sport events. *Journal of Sport and Tourism, 11*(2), 109–127. https://doi.org/10.1080/14775080601155126

Chalip, L., & Costa, C. A. (2005). Sport event tourism and the destination brand: Towards a general theory. *Sport in Society*, *8*(2), 218–237. https://doi.org/10.1080/17430430500108579

Chalip, L., & Heere, B. (2014). Leveraging sport events: Fundamentals and applications to bids. In I. Henry & L. Ko (Eds.), *Routledge handbook of sport policy* (1st ed., pp. 183–193). Routledge.

Coleman, R., & Ramchandani, G. (2010). The hidden benefits of non-elite mass participation sports events: An economic perspective. *International Journal of Sports Marketing and Sponsorship*, *12*(1), 19–31. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJSMS-12-01-2010-B004

Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches*. SAGE.

Crofts, C., Schofield, G., & Dickson, G. (2012). Women-only mass participation sporting events: Does participation facilitate changes in physical activity? *Annals of Leisure Research, 15*(2), 148–159. https://doi.org/10.1080/11745398.2012.685297

Daigo, E., & Filo, K. (2019). Using a sport event to create a sense of community: Charity sport event manager perspectives. *Event Management*, *24*(1), 57–74 https://doi.org/10.3727/152599519x15506259856039

Derrett, R. (2009). How festivals nurture resilience in regional communities. In J. Ali-Knight, A. Fyall, M. Robertson, & A. Ladkin (Eds.), *International perspectives of festivals and events: Paradigms of analysis* (pp. 107–124). Elsevier. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780080914374

Derom, I., & van Wynsberghe, R. (2015). Extending the benefits of leveraging cycling events: Evidence from the Tour of Flanders. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, *15*(1), 111–131. https://doi.org/10.1080/16184742.2014.997772

Du, J., Jordan, J., & Funk, D. (2015). Managing mass sport participation: Adding a personal performance perspective to remodel antecedents and consequences of participant sport event satisfaction. *Journal of Sport Management*, *29*(6), 688–704. https://doi.org/10.1123/JSM.2014-0225

Filo, K., Funk, D. C., & O'Brien, D. (2009). The meaning behind attachment: Exploring camaraderie, cause, and competency at a charity sport event. *Journal of Sport Management*, *23*(3), 361–387. https://doi.org/10.1123/jsm.23.3.361

Getz, D. (2008). Event tourism: Definition, evolution, and research. *Tourism Management*, *29*(3), 403–428. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2007.07.017

Gibson, H. J., Kaplanidou, K., & Kang, S. J. (2012). Small-scale event sport tourism: A case study in sustainable tourism. *Sport Management Review*, *15*(2), 160–170. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.smr.2011.08.013

Gibson, H. J., Lamont, M., Kennelly, M., & Buning, R. J. (2018). Introduction to the special issue active sport tourism. *Journal of Sport and Tourism, 22*(2), 83–91. https://doi.org/10.1080/14775085.2018.1466350

Gillham, B. (2000). *Case study research methods.* Continuum.

Herrick, C. (2015). Comparative urban research and mass participation running events: Methodological reflections. *Qualitative Research*, *15*(3), 269–313. https://doi.org/10.1177/1468794113509260

Hinch, T., & Holt, N. L. (2017). Sustaining places and participatory sport tourism events. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, *25*(8), 1084–1099. https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2016.1253703

Kaplandiou, K., & Gibson, H. (2010). Predicting behavioral intentions of active event sport tourists: The case of a small-scale recurring sports event. *Journal of Sport and Tourism, 15*(2), 163–179. https://doi.org/10.1080/14775085.2010.498261

Kelly, D. M., & Fairley, S. (2018). What about the event? How do tourism leveraging strategies affect small-scale events? *Tourism Management*, *64*, 335–345. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2017.09.009

Kennelly, M. (2017). "We've never measured it, but it brings in a lot of business": Participatory sport events and tourism. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, *29*(3), 883–897. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-10-2015-0541

Kennelly, M., Corbett, H., & Toohey, K. (2017). Leveraging ambitions and barriers: Glasgow universities and the 2014 Commonwealth Games. *Marketing Intelligence and Planning, 35*(6), 822–838. https://doi.org/10.1108/MIP-05-2017-0078

Lundberg, E., Andersson, T., & Armbrecht, J. (2019). Introduction. In J. Armbrecht, E. Lunderberg, & T. Andersson (Eds.). *A research agenda for event management* (pp. 1–6). Edward Elgar Publishing.

Miles, M., Huberman, A., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (3rd ed.). SAGE.

Misener, L. (2015). Leveraging parasport events for community participation: Development of a theoretical framework. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, *15*(1), 132–152. https://doi.org/10.1080/16184742.2014.997773

Misener, L., & Mason, D. S. (2006). Creating community networks: Can sporting events offer meaningful sources of social capital? *Managing Leisure*, *11*(1), 39–56. https://doi.org/10.1080/13606710500445676

Murphy, N., Lane, A., & Bauman, A. (2015). Leveraging mass participation events for sustainable health legacy. *Leisure Studies, 34*(6), 758–766. https://doi.org/10.1080/02614367.2015.1037787

Neuman, W. L. (2011). *Social research methods: Qualitative and quantitative approaches* (7th Ed.). Pearson.

O'Brien, D. (2007). Points of leverage: Maximising host community benefit from a regional surfing festival. *European Sport Management Quarterly, 7*(2), 141–165. https://doi.org/10.1080/16184740701353315

O'Brien, D., & Chalip, L. (2008). Sport events and strategic leveraging: Pushing towards the triple bottom line. In A. Woodside, & D. Martin (Eds.), *Tourism management: Analysis, behavior, and strategy* (pp. 318–338). CABI. https://www.cabi.org/VetMedResource/ebook/20083075466

Patton, M. C. (2015). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (4th ed.). SAGE.

Punch, K. (2014). *Introduction to social research: Quantitative and qualitative approaches* (3rd ed.). SAGE.

Rotherham, I. D., Egan, D., & Egan, H. (2005). *A review of the economic value of countryside recreation and sports*. Sheffield Hallam University. https://tinyurl.com/45hwnmf8

Sant, S.-L., Misener, L., & Mason, D. S. (2019). Leveraging sport events for tourism gain in host cities: A regime perspective. *Journal of Sport and Tourism, 23*(4), 203–223. https://doi.org/10.1080/14775085.2019.1711444

Schulenkorf, N., Giannoulakis, C., & Blom, L. (2019). Sustaining commercial viability and community benefits: Management and leverage of a sport-for-development event. *European Sport Management Quarterly, 19*(4), 502–519. https://doi.org/10.1080/16184742.2018.1546755

Sheehan, R. (2006). Running in place. *Tourist Studies, 6*(3), 245–265. https://doi.org/10.1177/1468797607076673

Shipway, R., & Stevenson, N. (2012). Experiencing sport tourism. *Journal of Sport and Tourism, 17*(2), 81–84. https://doi.org/10.1080/14775085.2012.729897

Sport and Recreation Alliance. (2014, June). *Reconomics: The economic impact of outdoor recreation*. https://www.sportandrecreation.org.uk/policy/research/reconomics

Taks, M., Chalip, L., & Green, B. C. (2015). Impacts and strategic outcomes from non-mega sport events for local communities. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, *15*(1), 1–6. https://doi.org/10.1080/16184742.2014.995116

Zhou, R., & Kaplanidou, K. (2018). Building social capital from sport event participation: An exploration of the social impacts of participatory sport events on the community. *Sport Management Review, 21*(5), 491–503. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.smr.2017.11.001

Ziakas, V. (2010). Understanding an event portfolio: The uncovering of interrelationships, synergies, and leveraging opportunities. *Journal of Policy Research in Tourism, Leisure and Events*, *2*(2), 144–164. https://doi.org/10.1080/19407963.2010.482274

Ziakas, V. (2014). Planning and leveraging event portfolios: Towards a holistic theory. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management*, *23*(3), 327–356. https://doi.org/10.1080/19368623.2013.796868