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Abstract

This thesis investigates why, how, and what legacies universities have sought to achieve through leveraging a major sport event, the Commonwealth Games. Stakeholder theory and interorganisational relationship literature provide the theoretical framework to uncover the complexity of Commonwealth Games stakeholder interactions and the barriers to achieving legacy. Although previous research has investigated primary sport event stakeholder groups, such as sponsors and organising committees, there has been a lack of research specifically examining secondary, but nevertheless salient, sport event stakeholders, such as universities. This thesis contributes to sport event management knowledge and scholarship on this topic.

A qualitative multiple-case study of three Commonwealth Games (Melbourne 2006, Glasgow 2014, and Gold Coast 2018) was conducted. Data were collected through a document analysis of primary and secondary sources and semi-structured interviews with key informants from universities, the Commonwealth Games Federation, Games Organising Committees, governments, and other Games’ stakeholders within the three case regions. Data analysis was managed using NVivo10 software and included inductive within-case and cross-case analysis.

The results evidenced similarities and differences between universities in each Games city as well as between each case study. Melbourne universities did not attempt to leverage the 2006 Commonwealth Games to achieve legacy. Although there was some university-Games involvement, it was informal, and respondents perceived a missed opportunity. Universities in Glasgow attempted to leverage the 2014 Commonwealth Games, for example, by forming research partnerships. Some Glasgow universities continued to collaborate with Games stakeholders post the event. Evidence from the Gold Coast case suggested that universities are taking a more strategic
approach to legacy by engaging with the 2018 Games earlier and in a more formal capacity, including through sponsorship. Examples of intended positive university legacies include student and staff opportunities, new or improved physical infrastructure, interorganisational relationship development, and brand awareness.

Three key themes emerged from cross-case analysis of the data: (1) stakeholder leverage; (2) barriers to achieving positive legacy; and (3) intended and unintended legacies. Overall, results highlight that universities are complex social organisations that are dependent on the external environment. Over the past few decades, the university context has changed. An increasing importance is being placed on university enterprise activities, links with industry, brand awareness, and community collaboration. Concurrently, expectations from Games legacy have grown, and therefore the salience of universities as Games stakeholders has increased, so has the willingness of universities to become Games stakeholders.

Results of this thesis can inform universities located in future Commonwealth Games host regions on how to strategically leverage their Games involvement. The results may also advise Organising Committees, the Commonwealth Games Federation, and relevant government authorities about the challenges and benefits of stakeholder and interorganisational relationship management.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

In a crowded sport calendar, the Commonwealth Games’ relevance has been questioned (Brown, 2010; O’Connor, 2013), as the event competes with other major sport events (MSEs) such as the Olympic Games to attract highly skilled athletes as well as television and live spectator audiences. The Games also competes to attract potential host cities, with the bid process of the upcoming 2022 Games still undecided. Future host cities are more likely to want to host an event if they can see that there will be a positive legacy. Legacy has many components that together form a “legacy quantum”. For these reasons, the Commonwealth Games have an unknown future (Ewart, 2014; Kidd, 2011), and the need to understand the event’s stakeholders and its potential legacies is germane to discussions about the Games’ future value. Research into Games legacies can contribute to the strategic planning of the Commonwealth Games Federation (CGF), future Organising Committees (OC), and other Games stakeholders, as well as to potentially influence the events’ sustainability (Holmes, Hughes, Mair, & Carlsen, 2015).

This study examines why and how universities within purposively selected Commonwealth Games host cities have leveraged the Games in order to create their own legacies. In particular, the study investigates the interorganisational relationships (IORs) and strategic planning required to achieve Games’ legacies in a university setting. Such legacies include research outputs, new and/or strengthened IORs, new and/or improved infrastructure, opportunities for students and staff, and increased brand awareness. This study explores what these legacies entailed as well as the perceived barriers that universities experience when attempting to leverage the Games. A brief list of definitions, the rationale for this research, and further details of the research context and design is provided in this introductory chapter. In particular, this chapter previews
the research questions, theoretical underpinning, research methods, and researcher identity.

1.1 Definitions Used in this Research

In the literature, some terminology has been used interchangeably or is not agreed upon (Chappelet, 2012; Coakley & Souza, 2013). For instance, scholars have tried to classify “all that remains” after an event using terms such as legacy, impact, outcomes, and benefits (Chappelet, 2012, p. 76). Therefore, this section defines how these terms were used in this research.

- **Legacy**: Legacy can be seen from various event stakeholders’ perspectives (Chappelet, 2012) and is defined as follows: “Irrespective of the time of production and space, legacy is all planned and unplanned, positive and negative, tangible and intangible structures created for and by a sport event that remain longer than the event itself” (Preuss, 2007, p. 211).

- **Impact**: Impact is related to a “short-term impulse, for example, an exogenous shock (e.g. consumption of event visitors) to the economy directly through the event. Although economic mega event impacts are strong, they are short-term and therefore not a legacy” (Press, 2007, p. 213).

- **Outcome**: Often used interchangeably with legacy, outcome relates to a post-event result that can be planned or unplanned, intended or unintended (Hiller, 2006).

- **Leverage**: Leverage are “those activities which need to be undertaken around the event itself…which seek to maximise the long-term benefits from events” (Chalip, 2004, p. 228).

- **Stakeholder**: A stakeholder is any individual or group who can affect or is affected by the achievement of organisational objectives (Freeman, 1984).
IOR: It is defined as “a voluntary, close, long-term, planned strategic action between two or more organisations with the objective of serving mutually beneficial purposes in a problem domain” (Babiak & Thibault, 2008, p. 282).

1.2 Rationale for this Study

MSEs have a plethora of stakeholders (Agha, Fairley, & Gibson, 2012), who may seek to achieve their own, sport or non-sport related goals through association with MSEs. There are certain organisations and entities that remain well after an event (Chalip, 2014). An OC exists pre-, during, and for a short time post-Games then it dispands. The responsibility for leveraging and legacy to occur is with organisations that have a responsibility, they have a role to play in ensuring that benefits are derived (Chalip, 2014). Permanent stakeholders, such as universities may seek to collaborate with a MSE in order to ensure long-term legacy. For example, a university located in a city or region hosting an MSE may seek to leverage the event for its own benefit (Cashman & Toohey, 2002). While the interests of some sport event stakeholders, such as OCs and sport organisations, have been considered in extant academic literature (Friedman, Parent, & Mason, 2004; Parent & Deephouse, 2007; Smith & Westerbeek, 2007), the involvement of universities appears to have been largely overlooked (Cashman & Toohey, 2002; Kennelly, Corbett, & Toohey, 2017). However, they are worth investigating in the context of MSEs because they are an entity that exists in a host location more permenently than an OC and if they get involved with a MSE the benefits could extend beyond the event. Further, universities can potentially ensure that MSE legacy is achieved and sustained. The relevance of universities as a MSE stakeholder can be illustrated in the context of the upcoming 2018 Commonwealth Games on the Gold Coast in Queensland, Australia. In the Gold Coast, the education and training services sector employs over 17,000 people and instructs almost 100,000
students (Regional Development Australia, 2013). Universities fit the definition of a stakeholder as they are an organisation that can be affected or affect the event. Universities are an important stakeholder because they are still there post event and can make sure that long term benefits are delivered.

Understanding how universities can achieve Games’ legacies has relevance for universities and other Games stakeholders of future Commonwealth Games host destinations, such as the Gold Coast. This research can provide valuable insights into how universities can leverage the Commonwealth Games to achieve legacies aligned with their strategic plans. Further, the research makes a contribution to the relatively scant literature on the Commonwealth Games, which have been under researched compared to other MSEs such as the Olympic Games and Fédération Internationale de Football Association (FIFA) World Cup. The research also has an impact on the understandings of IORs between universities and industry. Thus, the results offer management implications for universities, the CGF, future host OCs, and other Commonwealth Games stakeholders.

To gain a better understanding of this research context, the following section provides a detailed account of the Commonwealth Games and includes the following: its philosophy, its governance structure, the process to bid and host the Games, key stakeholders, universities associated with the Commonwealth Games, and current situation of the Commonwealth Games.

1.2.1 Commonwealth Games overview

The Commonwealth Games are often positioned as “second” only to the Olympic Games as a multi-sport event, in regard to the number of competing countries, athletes, and range of sports involved (Lockstone & Baum, 2009; Preuss, Seguin, &
O’Reilly, 2007). The Commonwealth Games has its origins in the Commonwealth, one of the world’s oldest political associations of states (The Commonwealth, 2014a), which today is often referred to as a “family” of nations and people. Although the Commonwealth has its origins in the British Empire, it is now a voluntary association. Currently, the Commonwealth comprises over 2.4 billion people from 52 independent countries (CGF, 2017); however, 71 nations and territories competed at the 2014 Glasgow Commonwealth Games (Game On Scotland, 2014). The difference is a result of nations such as the Cook Islands and Niue being self-governing in free association with New Zealand; Norfolk Island is an external territory of Australia; however, they compete as individual nations at the Games (CGF, 2014b).

The Commonwealth spans five regions (Africa, Asia, Caribbean and Americas, Europe, and the Pacific) and consists of some of the world’s largest (Canada with 10 million square kilometres, and India with 1.1 billion people), smallest (St Helena with 4,000 people and Nauru with 13,000 people), richest (based on GDP per capita: Canada and Australia), and poorest (based on GDP per capita: Sierra Leone and Malawi) countries (CGF, 2014b; The Official Website of The British Monarchy, n.d.). Once every four years, one city within the five regions hosts athletes from the 71 competing Commonwealth countries and territories to participate in the Commonwealth Games. The Games are overseen by the CGF, which describes them as a world-class multi-sport event and the “Friendly Games” (CGF, 2014e, 2015).

The precursor to the Commonwealth Games was the Inter Empire Sports meeting, staged in London in 1911. The first official Games did not occur until 1930 in Hamilton, Canada (XII Commonwealth Games Australia 1982 Foundation, 1982; CGF, 2014e). Since the Games’ inception, they have had various titles: the British Empire Games from 1930 to 1950; the British Empire and Commonwealth Games from 1954 to
1966; and the British Commonwealth Games from 1970 to 1974. The current event
name, the Commonwealth Games, originated from the 1978 Games in Edmonton,
Canada (CGF, 2014e).

The first official British Empire Games held in Hamilton, Canada, in 1930, were
advanced by Canadian M. M. (Bobby) Robinson, who pledged free lodging and travel
grants for competitors. During this time, officials decided that the future of the British
Empire Games would be
designed on the Olympic model, both in general construction and its stern
definition of the Amateur. But the games (sic) will be very different, free from
both the excessive stimulus and the babel of the international stadium. They
should be merrier and less stern, and will substitute the stimulus of novel
adventure for the pressure of international rivalry (XII Commonwealth Games

At the completion of the first Games, representatives of Great Britain and the
Dominions and Colonies agreed that the British Empire Games would be held
quadrennially, approximately half way between each summer Olympic Games (XII
Commonwealth Games Australia 1982 Foundation, 1982). The representatives formed a
British Empire Games Federation, now the CGF, with headquarters in London to
oversee future competition (CGF, 2014). Due to World War II, the 1942 and 1946
Games were suspended, and the Games did not resume until 1950 in Auckland, New
Zealand (XII Commonwealth Games Australia 1982 Foundation, 1982). Since 1950, the
Games have occurred quadrennially, as originally planned.

Over the years, the Games have developed and expanded in size regarding
athletes, officials, nations and territories represented, and sports offered. For instance,
the 1930 Games hosted 400 athletes from 11 countries who competed in six sports. The
most recent Glasgow 2014 Commonwealth Games hosted 4500 athletes from 71 nations
and territories, who competed in 17 sports (CGF, 2015).
Gratton and Preuss (2008) suggested that the Commonwealth Games are an unusual event, in that they are televised across most continents, but are not a global event in the same way as the Olympics and FIFA World Cup. Some key markets, such as the USA, Europe (outside the British Isles), Japan, and China, have no broadcast coverage of the event. Therefore, the event is limited in the potential effect on the image and profile of its host city. However, the lack of broadcast coverage does not necessarily negate the Games’ importance and potential for stakeholders, particularly those in the host city, as they may leverage the event to seek and achieve their own legacies. One major difference between the Commonwealth Games and other MSEs is the overtly political basis of its formation and its continuity (Kidd, 2008).

1.2.2 Political basis of the Commonwealth Games

The Commonwealth of Nations, also referred to as the Commonwealth, forms the broader socio-political context in which the Games operate. It comprises independent countries, many of which were former British colonies (Bandara, 2013). Most of these countries have become self-governing while retaining Britain’s monarch as Head of State. Kidd (2011) suggested that the Commonwealth Games were never imagined just as another international sporting event, but as an explicitly political and cultural exchange to affirm and strengthen the communities and values whose economies, parliamentary traditions and major institutions were forged through the British Empire and its many related struggles for human rights and self-governance (p. 2).

The current association, the Commonwealth, was established in 1949. It was decided by the leaders in the Commonwealth that its membership did not have to be based solely on allegiance to the British Crown (The Commonwealth, 2014b). For instance, the last two countries to join the Commonwealth – Rwanda and Mozambique – have no historical ties to the British Empire. Since 1949, other independent countries from Africa, the Americas, Asia, Europe, and the Pacific have voluntarily become
members of the Commonwealth (The Commonwealth, 2014b), as it can provide opportunities for countries to raise matters of concern with fellow members (Massiah, 2012), despite their size or economic stature.

Over the Games’ history, some countries have combined (in 1963 Malaya, Sarawak, Sabah, and Singapore combined to form Malaysia), disbanded (Aden and South Arabia), and withdrawn (The Gambia) from the Commonwealth (CGF, 2014b). The political influence of the Games was evident when South Africa withdrew from the Commonwealth in 1961 due to pressure from other member states against its apartheid policies. South Africa has since re-joined the Commonwealth and continues to compete in the Commonwealth Games (CGF, 2014d).

1.2.3 Commonwealth Games governance structure

The CGF is the international governing body for the Commonwealth Games (Australian Commonwealth Games Association, 2012), comprising approximately 27 staff members (CGF, 2014c). It is the CGF’s responsibility to establish Games-wide requirements and standards. The CGF authorises final approval for all Games arrangements and provides advice and support to each host city’s OC and related agencies through the CGF Coordination Committee and the Commonwealth Games Knowledge Management Programme (CGF, 2014c).

The CGF’s governance consists of two components, the General Assembly and the Executive Board (CGF, 2014c). The General Assembly approves which Affiliated Commonwealth Countries (CGA) can enter teams into the Commonwealth Games (CGF, 2014b). The CGAs comprising sport bodies from Commonwealth Countries include Commonwealth Games Associations, National Olympic Committees, or other multi-sports bodies formed by a Commonwealth Country, which then become affiliated
to the Federation (CGF, 2014b). Each CGA is then responsible for preparing, selecting, and sending its team of athletes and support staff to each Commonwealth Games (CGF, 2014b).

The CGF’s Executive Board is the “guardian and representative of Affiliated CGAs and shall be responsible to carry into effect the CGF Documents and the Vision, Mission and Objects of the Federation” (CGF, 2014b, p. 9). Among its various responsibilities, the Executive Board inspects the facilities offered by a Candidate City for the Games; reviews the general plans for the organisation of the Games; and organises Games Manuals for the preparation, management, and control of the Games (CGF, 2014b). The Commonwealth Games’ governance structure contributes towards determining its stakeholders and their involvement and interaction with the Games (CGF, 2014b).

1.2.4 Commonwealth Games bidding and hosting procedures

The CGF’s Constitution (2014) outlines the requirements to bid for and host the Games within the Candidate City Manual, which is available to Candidate Cities at least 18 months prior to the award ceremony of a Commonwealth Games. The successful bid for a Commonwealth Games is chosen eight years prior to the Commonwealth Games in question at the General Assembly (CGF, 2014b). The OC, Commonwealth Countries, host government(s), and the host city are jointly responsible for organising and staging the Commonwealth Games, including all financial commitments in accordance with the Host City Contract and the CGF documents (i.e. Constitution, the Regulations, the Code of Conduct, and the Games Manuals) (CGF, 2014b). Whilst bidding to host the Commonwealth Games is open to all nations, over the past 87 years of Games existence the most prolific hosts have been the UK (six Games), Australia (five Games), and Canada (four Games) (Commonwealth Games Federation, 2014f).
1.2.5 Commonwealth Games stakeholders

The CGF is responsible for working with a variety of stakeholders ranging from media to the general public. As the Commonwealth Games have grown, they have become important to a larger number of stakeholders, who have diverse connections to the event, and who experience a range of impacts as a result of the event. For instance, the Glasgow OC recognised its stakeholders as “individuals or organisations that are subject to, provide, or have an interest or involvement in decisions that impact on the success of the Games” (Glasgow 2014 Commonwealth Games, 2014, p. 14). Beyond the CGF, affiliated Commonwealth countries, and OCs, other key Games stakeholders include national and local governments, infrastructure authorities, communities, schools, and universities (Queensland Government, n.d.). MSE stakeholders, specifically universities, and stakeholder theory are further discussed in Chapter Three.

1.2.6 Commonwealth Games legacies

Commonwealth Games legacies have become more important in recent decades, and a host city is now “expected to produce legacies” (Rogerson, 2016, p. 500). For instance, legacy planning was at the forefront of the Manchester 2002 Commonwealth Games bid, with the aim “to leave a lasting legacy of new sporting facilities and social, physical and economic regeneration” (Commonwealth Games Legacy Manchester 2002, 2003, p. 1). According to Gratton, Shibli, and Coleman (2006), in the 2002 Games, “the first time in Britain an ambitious legacy programme was designed around a major sport event” (p. 993). Manchester and the North West of England experienced valuable outcomes due to strategic legacy planning associated with the Commonwealth Games (ECOTEC Research and Consulting, n.d.; Smith & Fox, 2007). Legacy was also a primary focus for the Glasgow 2014 Commonwealth Games, as the OC aimed “to stage an outstanding, athlete centred and sport focused Games of world-class
competition which will be celebrated across the Commonwealth, generate enormous pride in Glasgow and Scotland, and leave a lasting legacy” (Glasgow 2014 XX Commonwealth Games, 2013, p. 2).

The legacies of Commonwealth Games are not all positive. Delhi 2010 was the first Games staged in India and only the second time that the Games have been held in Asia (Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia 1998 was the first) (CGF, 2014a). Operational and legacy problems in Delhi resulted in concern of the viability of the Commonwealth Games in the future (Reuters, 2010). For example, new infrastructure was built for the Games; however, presently many sites are derelict – a “stark reminder that hopes of a lasting legacy from international events can lie in tatters” (Daily Mail Reporter, 2012, p. 1). Kannan (2011) noted that corruption was associated with the 2010 Games, with the Chairman of the OC jailed on Games-related corruption charges (BBC News, 2011). Preliminary research in the development of this study suggested a lack of evidence of university association with the Commonwealth Games around Delhi, and hence the 2010 Games were not included as a case for this thesis.

In summary, legacy has increasingly become an essential component not only to the bid process but also to the successful staging of the Commonwealth Games. Reasons for the importance placed on legacy and how stakeholders may or may not have benefited warrants further investigation. This research project is delimited to three recent Commonwealth Games: Melbourne 2006, Glasgow 2014, and Gold Coast 2018.

Although legacy planning for the Commonwealth Games first became a focus for Manchester 2002 (Commonwealth Games Legacy Manchester 2002, 2003), it is excluded from this research due to the timeframe (15 years since the Games were staged, 23 years since the Games’ bid), difficulty in locating documents, contacting potential participants, and obtaining accurate recollection of events. Delhi 2010 is also
excluded from this research due to the lack of evidence of university involvement as well as complications associated with staging the Games. The three Commonwealth Games purposively selected as case studies for this dissertation were selected because Melbourne 2006 were the most recent Games staged in Australia, and Gold Coast 2018 are the next Games that will be hosted in Australia. Glasgow 2014 were selected as they are the most recent Games and are culturally, politically, and economically similar to Australia. The selection of these cases allowed for comparison of similarities and differences, discussed in detail in Chapter Four.

1.3 Research Questions and Theoretical Underpinning

The aim of this research is to identify how and why universities have leveraged Commonwealth Games to achieve their own legacies. Two research questions guided this study:

- Why, how, and what legacies have universities sought to achieve through leveraging a Commonwealth Games?
- What were the barriers to achieving a legacy?

The research seeks to understand universities’ perspectives because universities, as MSE stakeholders, have previously received limited academic attention (Cashman & Toohey, 2002) despite their importance to the economies and social fabric of their host communities. This study can add another factor to the legacy quantum by investigating the university sector, which is becoming a more involved stakeholder with increased legacy potential.

A combination of stakeholder theory and IOR literature was employed to explore university–Games IORs and ways in which the Games were leveraged in order to achieve positive university legacies. This research can inform future universities in
MSE host regions about the type of legacies that can be achieved through strategic planning. Results may also advise OCs, the CGF, and relevant government authorities about the complexities of event stakeholders and IOR management.

1.4 Brief Overview of Research Methods

This research adopted a qualitative methodology to understand how and why universities, as stakeholders, have leveraged the Commonwealth Games to achieve legacy. Case study research “allows investigators to retain the holistic and meaningful characteristics of real-life events” (Yin, 2009, p. 4), such as organisational and managerial processes (Yin, 2009) within universities and the Commonwealth Games. Chapter Four further details why a multiple-case study approach was suitable to address the research problem. Data collected and thematically analysed for this thesis include documents and semi-structured interviews with key informants from universities, the CGF, relevant OCs, and local government. Interviews were transcribed verbatim, and data were managed with qualitative computer software, NVivo10. Data were iteratively analysed by first, second, third, and fourth cycle coding (Saldaña, 2015) to develop themes (Neuman, 2011).

1.5 Researcher Identity

I am originally from the USA, and prior to moving to Australia in 2011, I was not familiar with the Commonwealth Games. However, my background is in sport science and sport management, and I have always been interested in sport events. My first exposure to the Commonwealth Games was in 2012. I was involved with the Griffith University Sport Strategy Sub-committee (GUSS), which was a research team that worked on several projects related to Griffith University’s 2013–2020 Sports Strategy.
The first project I contributed to was the “2018 Commonwealth Games Benefits Project”. The aim of the project was a forecast of the potential benefits of the Commonwealth Games to the Gold Coast with a focus on the Gold Coast City’s strategy, legacy, and proactive planning for legacy. After working on this project, I became interested in learning more about the Commonwealth Games and MSE legacy initiatives and therefore, I continued to request work on all projects related to the Commonwealth Games. I was hired as a Research Assistant for research projects including “Legacy of the 2018 Commonwealth Games on the Gold Coast”, “A History of the Commonwealth Games”, and “GC2018 Legacy”; “Best Practice Report”.

In 2013, Professor Kristine Toohey was in the process of developing a new undergraduate course offered at Griffith University, titled “2018HSL Organising and Staging the Commonwealth Games”. Professor Toohey presented me with an opportunity to be involved with course development. In this role, I gathered information about the Commonwealth Games, including academic articles, newspaper articles, official reports, bid books, and videos. I realised that there was limited information about the Commonwealth Games compared to other MSEs, such as the Olympic Games and FIFA World Cup. Once the research for the course was completed, I became the tutor and subsequently also lectured in this course.

My role with GUSS, researching and teaching for 2018HSL, and discussions with academics and fellow PhD students contributed towards developing my current research topic. During the period of my involvement, pre-commencing my PhD, Griffith University was trying to strategically position itself so that it benefited in the short- and long-term from the 2018 Gold Coast Commonwealth Games. The University’s proactivity inspired me to explore what other universities in host cities of Commonwealth Games have done, what they are planning to do, and what benefits or
legacies they can achieve. It is acknowledged that my involvement at Griffith University has affected this thesis; however, in order to diminish the bias against case study research, I employed Yin’s (2009) suggestion to use data triangulation.

1.6 Chapter Conclusion

Chapter One provided an overview of the research. It outlined the rationale for the study along with providing background information on the Commonwealth Games. It introduced the research questions, theoretical underpinning, and methodological approach. Chapter Two provides a review of literature including MSEs, legacy, leverage, and the university environment. Chapter Three then reviews stakeholder theory and IOR literature, and further explains the theoretical framework for this study. Chapter Four details and justifies the research methods. Chapter Five provides the results of the within-case analysis, while Chapter Six offers a cross-case analysis and discussion of the results. Finally, Chapter Seven concludes this research.
Chapter 2: Literature Review

This chapter presents a review of literature on MSEs, sport event legacy, and the university context. This chapter aids in framing the focus of this thesis by presenting relevant studies and highlighting existing gaps in knowledge. Overall, the review indicates a lack of research directly pertaining to the topic of this investigation: universities leveraging the Commonwealth Games for their own legacies.

2.1 The Commonwealth Games: A Major Sport Event

Over the last three decades, MSEs have been studied extensively in the sport management context (Hautbois, Parent, & Seguin, 2012). Common topics of investigation have included economic, social, and environmental legacy and impacts (Coleman, 2004; Collins, Flynn, Munday, & Roberts, 2007; Gratton, Dobson, & Shibli, 2000; Toohey, 2008), sport participation outcomes (Frawley & Cush, 2011; Veal, Toohey, & Frawley, 2012), bidding to host an MSE (Emery, 2002; Hautbois et al., 2012), managing personnel (Hanlon & Cuskelley, 2002; Hanlon & Stewart, 2006), event-generated tourism (Solberg & Preuss, 2007), and destination image (Carlson & Taylor, 2003; Chalip, Green, & Hill, 2003; Cornelissen, 2004).

MSEs can present host cities and event stakeholders with a variety of opportunities, impacts, and risks (Emery, 2002; Green, 2001; Lockstone & Baum, 2008, 2009; Matheson, 2010; Searle, 2002). For instance, MSEs are often perceived to be an important part of a host city’s tourism strategy (Gratton et al., 2000) and can be seen as a way to raise the profile of the host city for the long-term (Lockstone & Baum, 2008). However, hosting an MSE can also present financial burdens (Emery, 2002) (e.g. 1976 Montreal Olympic Games) and challenges, such as balancing and maintaining
community support and political partnerships (Matheson, 2010). One such MSE that has experienced both positive and negative legacy is the Commonwealth Games.

The Commonwealth Games have been referred to as both a mega sport event (Carlson & Taylor, 2003; Martin & Barth, 2013) and an MSE (Coleman, 2004; Preuss et al., 2007; Solberg & Preuss, 2007). While the Commonwealth Games are not on the scale of the Olympic Games (i.e. in terms of the number of countries competing, sports contested, and facilities required), they are an international, major multi-sport event that require substantial planning and infrastructure investment (Gratton & Preuss, 2008; Lockstone & Baum, 2008). Therefore, for the purpose of this research, the Games are referred to as an MSE based on the definitions provided by Torkildsen (1994) and Emery (2002).

Torkildsen (1994) suggested that a major event encompasses the following characteristics: (a) a clear-cut starting and finishing point; (b) fixed, absolute deadlines; (c) one-off organisation, normally superimposed on other work; (d) large risks; and (e) many opportunities. Emery (2002) reviewed the sports event literature and put forth the following definition of an MSE:

Either – a sporting championship recognised by the appropriate governing body of the sport and attracting a minimum of 1,000 spectators. Or – a sporting championship that receives national or international media coverage as a result of the calibre of competition, and attracting a minimum of 1,000 spectators (emphasis in original, p. 318).

Emery’s (2002) definition was further supported by Coleman’s (2004) definition as he defined MSEs as an international spectator event capable of “generating significant economic activity and media interest, such as the Commonwealth Games” (p. 11). Preuss et al. (2007) proposed that MSEs are large-scale events that require a large number of sport facilities and training sites.
Several studies have used the context of the Commonwealth Games to explore topics such as economic impact (Lynch & Jensen, 1984), volunteer management (Downward, Lumsdon, & Ralston, 2005; Lockstone & Baum, 2008; Nichols & Ralston, 2012), regeneration (Carlsen & Millan, 2002; Jones & Stokes, 2003; Matheson, 2010; Paton, Mooney, & McKee, 2012; Smith & Fox, 2007), health impacts of the Games (McCartney, Hanlon, & Bond, 2013; McCartney et al., 2010) community perspectives (Martin & Barth, 2013), tourism impacts (Lockstone & Baum, 2008), and legacy (Gratton & Preuss, 2008; Matheson, 2010; Nichols & Ralston, 2012; Porter, Jaconelli, Cheyne, Eby, & Wagenaar, 2009; Smith & Fox, 2007).

2.2 Sport Event Legacy

The study of sport event legacy has gained momentum in the last 15 years (Agha et al., 2012; Bloyce & Lovett, 2012; Cashman, 2003; Cornelissen, Bob, & Swart, 2011; Davidson & McNeill, 2011; Doherty, 2009; Frawley & Cush, 2011; Leopkey & Parent, 2012; MacAloon, 2008; Matheson, 2010; Porter et al., 2009; Preuss, 2015; Sallent, Palau, & Guia, 2011; Searle, 2002; Thomson, Schlenker, & Schlenkorf, 2013; Veal et al., 2012). Veal et al. (2012) noted that international sporting event legacies “can take many forms” (p. 157), and the review of sport event legacy literature indicated several definitions of legacy; see Table 1, which illustrates a sample of existing definitions of legacy identified through this review of literature. For instance, legacy has two meanings in English: the first relates to an individual bequest, and the second refers to anything that is left over from an era or an event (Cashman, 2003). As interest in event outcomes has increased, use of the term “legacy” has been inconsistent in extant academic literature and industry reports, and a clear definition of legacy has not been determined (Cornelissen et al., 2011; Gratton & Preuss, 2008; Preuss, 2007; Rogerson, 2016).
Preuss (2007) argued that lack of agreement on the meaning of legacy and what it entails creates confusion and makes legacy difficult to measure accurately or consistently. The lack of a clear understanding of legacy may also be problematic, as legacy has been used to justify extensive public expenditure and bidding for MSEs (Gratton & Preuss, 2008; Matheson, 2010; Veal et al., 2012). The promise of legacy as justification for hosting an event has led to increased academic and industry interest in legacy over the last two decades (Preuss, 2007; Sallent et al., 2011) and therefore, both academic and industry analyses of sport events and event legacy have increased significantly (Preuss, 2007).

Table 1: Sample examples of definitions of legacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s) (Year)</th>
<th>Definitions of Legacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Getz (1991)</td>
<td>“The physical, financial, psychological, or social benefits that are permanently bestowed on a community or region by virtue of hosting an event. The term can also be used to describe negative impact, such as debt, displacement of people, pollution, and so on.” (p. 340)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiller (2000)</td>
<td>“Permanent improvements to the built environment. Social improvements, of course, may benefit some people more than others.” (p. 88)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cashman (2005)</td>
<td>The “word legacy, however, is elusive, problematic and even a dangerous word for a number of reasons. When the term is used by organising committees, it is assumed to be entirely positive, there being no such thing as negative legacy when used in this context. Secondly, it is usually believed that legacy benefits flow to a community at the end of the Games as a matter of course…Thirdly, legacy is often assumed to be self-evident, so that there is no need to define precisely what it is.” (p. 15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preuss (2007)</td>
<td>“Irrespective of the time of production and space, legacy is all planned and unplanned, positive and negative, tangible and intangible structures created for and by a sport event that remain longer than the event itself.” (p. 211)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold and Gold (2009)</td>
<td>“…belongs to a family of loosely defined concepts that also includes ‘effects’, ‘consequences’, ‘outcomes’, and ‘impacts’, but differs from those terms by virtue of the types of the consequences and the times frames that are considered.” (p. 181)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Matheson (2010) argued that legacy can encourage community and stakeholder support for an event, especially when there are potential tangible outcomes. However, she also cautioned that event legacies have often been little more than a fancy way to mask political agendas using dubious research methodologies to quantify outcomes. Cashman, Toohey, Darcy, Symons, and Stewart (2004) noted that the record of positive legacy outcomes resulting from hosting an Olympic Games does not match the promises for legacy that are made pre-event.

To conceptualise sport event legacy, Thomson et al. (2013) reviewed the legacy literature across fields of event management, sport management, and urban planning contexts. The authors identified five key considerations surrounding sport event legacies (Thomson et al., 2013), which were as follows:

1. Terminology: use of “legacy” as opposed to another term;
2. Legacy as automatically bestowed or needing to be planned;
3. Temporal nature of legacy: permanent or long term;
4. Legacy as a positive and/or negative concept; and
5. Legacy as a local global concept (p. 112).

More recently, Preuss (2015, p. 647) reviewed the legacy literature and explored the following: how to identify legacies; who is affected by the legacies; how long legacies last; and how to judge whether a legacy creates or destroys value. He noted that legacies can affect stakeholders differently and can be positive for some and negative for others. This is important to note, as Cashman (2005) stated that legacy is often perceived to be solely positive. Preuss (2015) suggested that legacies can gain and lose their power or “utility” over time, and that often a legacy will only be activated if environmental circumstances offer opportunities (p. 657). He noted the fundamental elements of a definition of legacy as follows.
1. Legacy lasts longer than the event and its directly initiated impacts. Legacies can derive from structures already completed before the event, but most legacies stem from changed location factors after the event takes place (time).

2. Legacy produces new opportunities out of an initial impact and may even develop its own dynamics over time as the environment changes (new initiatives).

3. Legacy consists of changes that bring positive outcomes for some stakeholders and negative outcomes for others (value).

4. Legacy may be tangible or intangible, or material or non-material (tangibility).

5. Legacy is essentially limited to a defined space, that is, a city, but some of its effects may extend beyond the city. It can be individual (affecting only one person) and local, or international and global (space).

6. Legacy is often developed indirectly by the event. A negative legacy reminds us that outcomes may be unintentional (intention) (p. 647).

For the purpose of this research, Preuss’ (2007) definition of legacy is employed, which states that “irrespective of the time of production and space, legacy is all planned and unplanned, positive and negative, tangible and intangible structures created for and by a sport event that remain longer than the event itself” (p. 211). Preuss’ (2007) definition is used because it facilitates a holistic investigation of the topic of legacy and includes both positive and negative legacies. In this research, the legacy attributes Preuss (2007; 2015) identified are explored within the university sector in order to gain a better understanding of universities’ strategic planning to achieve Games’ legacies.
2.2.1 Categories of major sport event legacies

Successful MSE legacies are important, as they can encourage cities and/or nations to bid for future events (Veal et al., 2012), which is pertinent to event owners and their stakeholders, such as the CGF (Matheson, 2010), International Olympic Committee (IOC) (Gratton & Preuss, 2008), or FIFA. According to Lynch and Jensen (1984), the positive experience of hosting the 1982 Brisbane Commonwealth Games encouraged authorities to consider hosting other major national events, such as Expo 88 and the 1992 Olympic Games. Creating successful Commonwealth Games legacies is therefore relevant to the CGF and other Games stakeholders, as the future of the Commonwealth Games is unclear (Kidd, 2011; Lockstone & Baum, 2008). The review of event legacy literature indicated several categories of potential legacy, as depicted in Table 2, which provides sample examples of such categories. These categories of legacy can assist Games stakeholders, such as universities, in understanding what types of legacies can be achieved through hosting an MSE.

Table 2: Sample examples of categories of legacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author (Year)</th>
<th>Categories of Legacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cashman (2005)</td>
<td>(1) sport; (2) economics; (3) infrastructure; (4) information and education; (5) public life, politics, and culture; (6) symbols, memory, and history</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chappelet (2006)</td>
<td>(1) sporting legacy; (2) economic legacy; (3) infrastructure legacy; (4) urban legacy; (5) social legacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gratton and Preuss (2008)</td>
<td>(1) infrastructure; (2) knowledge, skill development, and education; (3) image; (4) emotions; (5) networks; (6) culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veal, Toohey, and Frawley (2012)</td>
<td>(1) economic impact; (2) built environment – non-sporting; (3) public life, politics, and culture; (4) sport – information and education; (5) sport – elite performance; (6) sport – mass participation; (7) sport – financial/administrative support; (8) sport – physical infrastructure; (9) sport – symbols, memory, history; (10) health</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For the purpose of this research, Gratton and Preuss’ (2008) and Veal et al.’s (2012) categories of legacies were used to understand how, why, and what legacies universities have sought to achieve when leveraging the Commonwealth Games. Gratton and Preuss (2008) reviewed the legacy of the 2002 Manchester Commonwealth Games and proposed six “event structures” that typically remain after an event has concluded and that can alter the quality of the host city in a positive or negative way. The event structures included the following:

1. Infrastructure – for example, the development of Sportcity and the Manchester Swimming Pool Complex for the 2002 Manchester Commonwealth Games (Sautter & Leisen, 1999);

2. Knowledge, skill development, and education – for example, the volunteer legacy of the 2006 Melbourne Commonwealth Games (Nichols & Ralston, 2011);

3. Image – such as when sport events are used as motivation to reconstruct a host city into a tourist destination (Gratton & Preuss, 2008);

4. Emotions – for instance, local citizens may become emotionally involved due to the pride of hosting such an event that can create “local identification, vision and motivation” (Gratton & Preuss, 2008, p. 1928);

5. Networks – for example, Manchester used the 2002 Commonwealth Games as a promotional asset for trade and investment to provide a platform for business opportunities (Manchester 2002 Commonwealth Games Bid Ltd, 1995); and

6. Culture – such as Manchester’s “the Spirit of Friendship Festival”, which was designed to celebrate the Commonwealth, thus leaving a cultural legacy (Gratton & Preuss, 2008).

Gratton and Preuss’ (2008) event structures may not be an exhaustive list of Games legacy, yet they demonstrate a range of potential sport event outcomes.
Extending Cashman’s (2005) sixfold categories of sporting event legacy, Veal et al. (2012) proposed a typology of potential MSE legacies in the following 10 categories:

1. Economic impact – such as direct and indirect economic impact of Melbourne hosting the 2006 Commonwealth Games for Victoria (KPMG, 2006)
2. Built environment – non-sporting – for instance the transport infrastructure on the Gold Coast and the urban renewal of Glasgow
3. Public life, politics, and culture – for instance, increased political relationships because of the Games
4. Sport – information and education
5. Sport – elite performance – as an example, the Sydney Aquatic Centre was designed as a dual purpose venue. It provided facilities for elite sport as well as a “sport for all venue”, which incorporated a play area for children (Cashman, 2003)
6. Sport – mass participation – including community sport, grassroots participation, or sport for all (Veal et al., 2013)
7. Sport – financial/administrative support – such as financial support to local sport development
8. Sport – physical infrastructure – such as Games’ Villages and venues.
9. Sport – symbols, memory, history – such as the creation of an Olympic Museum, ensuring the “memory of the Games and provide a focal point for the sporting, intellectual and organisational legacy of the event” (Cashman, 2003, p. 13)
10. Health – such as the benefit arising from mass sport participation as well as improvements to host city air and water quality (Veal et al., 2012)
These legacy categories can assist in the legacy planning and evaluation that is required to achieve what Preuss (2007) identified as a positive planned legacy.

2.2.2 Legacy planning and evaluation

Legacy has increasingly become an integral and expected part of bidding for and hosting MSEs (Matheson, 2010), including the Commonwealth Games. However, Thomson et al. (2013) noted that the use of “strategic planning for legacy is a rather new phenomenon” (p. 117). Legacy does not just happen; it needs to be planned (Thomson et al., 2013). Gratton and Preuss (2008) suggested that legacy planning and evaluation should occur in three key stages: pre-event, event, and post-event (see Figure 1 below). The efficacy of past Games legacy planning efforts can only be determined through effective evaluation and research (Matheson, 2010).

Figure 1: Process of building planned event legacy

Source: Gratton and Preuss (2008, p. 1926)

Toohey (2008) raised the questions when the best time to measure legacy is and who should be responsible for the measurement. A well planned post-Games “wrap-up” phase is essential to determine the long-term outcomes of an event for its stakeholders (Cashman et al., 2004, p. 5). It is essential to manage the impacts of events effectively
so that event stakeholders, such as the host community and other Games stakeholders, can experience potential benefits (Ntloko & Swart, 2008).

Evaluating legacy is important to determine the extent to which the promises made pre-event are delivered post-event, because event stakeholders can be affected either positively or negatively (Parent, 2008; Preuss et al., 2007). Cornelissen et al., (2011) emphasised legacies should continue to be evaluated for at least 20 years after an event. However, Gratton and Preuss (2008) noted the lack of long-term measurement of event legacy relates to the challenges of resources, such as financing projects over 15-20 years. To date, such long-term event legacy research has not been conducted.

2.2.3 Challenges with legacy planning and evaluation

Some scholars have argued that there are theoretical and methodological weaknesses underpinning legacy planning and implementation of legacy initiatives within MSEs (Matheson, 2010; Preuss, 2015; Rogerson, 2016). For instance, Matheson (2010) noted three main concerns with the legacy planning and implementation process, the first concern was …: a lack of a shared understanding of conceptualisation of legacy, which is an evolving area of study. The second concern was a lack of evidence-based performance indicators and holistic longitudinal studies surrounding legacy. The third concern was related to problems with insufficient time for legacy planning and lack of evaluations undertaken at key stages (i.e. event conception to post-event) (p. 13).

Legacy is an evolving area of research; there can be challenges in identifying who is responsible for legacy planning, funding, and gaining community support, and ensuring legacy plans are timely and considered post-event (Matheson, 2010). Further, the people who created the legacy strategy may not be the same ones responsible for its implementation (Puranam, 2014). Another challenge with planning for legacy is that the
OC typically disbands within two years after the event (Toohey, 2008), making long-term planning challenging for permanent stakeholders, such as governments and universities.

Mangan (2008) suggested that in order to identify potential legacy implementation challenges, pre-event evaluations should be employed. These evaluations may include determining the potential of “white elephants” and can help to mitigate unanticipated post-event revision and maintenance of infrastructure (Mangan, 2008). Therefore, in order to achieve the intended, positive outcomes, it is vital to strategically plan long-term for legacy (Davies, 2012; Matheson, 2010).

Despite these difficulties with legacy planning and implementation, there have been some attempts to evaluate MSE legacies. For instance, in 2000, the IOC initiated a project known as the “Olympic Games Global Impact” (OGGI) study to better manage information about the impacts of the Games (Toohey, 2012). In 2007, the OGGI was modified and is currently known as the Olympic Games Impact (OGI) study (Toohey, 2012), which attempts to measure legacies of the Olympic Games. However, the study concludes three years after a Commonwealth Games, supporting Gratton and Preuss’ (2008) argument that no one has been prepared to commit the research resources required to carry out a scientific study of long-term net legacy benefits.

In summary, legacy planning strategies must be formulated to identify and sustain the benefits of an event (Kellett, Hede, & Chalip, 2008). According to O’Brien and Chalip (2007), the “phenomenon of strategically planning for the maximisation of both short- and long-term event outcomes is referred to as event leveraging” (p. 297). In order to generate positive planned legacies, appropriate planning prior to hosting an event is paramount (Matheson, 2010). The following sections provide an overview of literature examining MSE leverage.
2.3 Leveraging Major Sport Events

The study of event leverage is a relatively recent phenomenon (Chalip, 2004, 2014; O’Brien, 2007; O’Brien & Chalip, 2007; O’Brien & Chalip, 2008). According to Chalip (2004), the term leverage refers to “those activities which need to be undertaken around the event itself…which seek to maximise the long-term benefits from events” (p. 228). In contrast to legacy as a result of an event, leveraging is “more strategic and planned, extending both the potential benefits and beneficiaries, and highlighting the ways in which host cities and other stakeholders are starting to shape mega-event ‘projects’ to lever strategic objectives” (Rogerson, 2016, p. 498).

The concept of event leverage received interest as a result of the various ways that Australian businesses, governments, and not-for-profit organisations collaborated to formulate strategies in order to capitalise on the Sydney 2000 Olympic Games (Chalip, 2014). The notion of leveraging resulted in a model for economic leverage (Chalip, 2004). Then, prior to the 2006 Melbourne Commonwealth Games, Chalip (2006) developed a model for social leverage. Consequently, the two models were merged into an integrated model for economic and social leverage (O’Brien & Chalip, 2008).

O’Brien (2006) suggested that the formation of IORs among event stakeholders is essential to cultivate longer-term economic outcomes from leveraging. A small but emergent body of literature has begun to explore the strategic leveraging potential that events create for business development (Chalip, 2004; Chalip & Leyns, 2002; O’Brien & Gardner, 2006). As an example, host communities can leverage an event for short and long-term outcomes through networking opportunities among key event stakeholders (Chalip, 2004). However, O’Brien (2006) noted that empirical work on the factors that impede or facilitate event networking is notably lacking in the literature.
Leveraging is a “function of stakeholders using the event as a tool, vehicle or mechanism to accrue benefits of their own” (Parent, 2015, p. 20). However, one of the challenges of event leverage is identifying leverageable event assets, and then formulating the necessary strategy to capitalise on those assets. Essentially, leveraging an event means implementing processes to optimise desired event outcomes with the objective to create a positive legacy (Preuss, 2015).

O’Brien (2006) suggested that events and the opportunities they provide are the “seed capital”, and what hosts do with that capital influences the success of sustainable long-term legacies (p. 258). Therefore, those responsible for leveraging initiatives must also implement processes and procedures that take advantage of the desired outcomes (O’Brien & Chalip, 2008). For instance, if universities intend to leverage the Commonwealth Games to create their own legacies, there must be adequate and appropriate processes and procedures in place.

Chalip (2004, 2006) argued that event organisers need to modify their traditional ex-post focus on legacy to an ex-ante one. An ex-ante approach involves identifying, in advance of the MSE, assets of the event that can be leveraged (Chalip & Leyns, 2002). By changing organisers’ current routine of reflecting back at event outcomes (i.e. legacy), to a more strategic approach that looks forward to planning (i.e. event leveraging), a host community can capitalise on potential benefits from MSEs (O’Brien & Chalip, 2007). However, this approach requires event stakeholders to have access to relevant information and to have the opportunity and resources to engage (Chalip & Leyns, 2002).

As leveraging an event for legacy has increasingly become an expectation over the past few decades, simultaneously, but in a separate context, universities have experienced changes in their structures, how they operate as educational institutions in
the community, and how they collaborate with their stakeholders. The next section outlines the changing nature of universities.

2.4 The Changing Context of Universities

Over the past few decades, the university context has markedly changed (Alves, Mainardes, & Raposo, 2010; Jongbloed, Enders, & Salerno, 2008; King, 2016; Mainardes, Alves, & Raposo, 2010; Tetřevová & Sabolová, 2010) with universities operating more like businesses (Greatrix, 2011; Hiltzik, 2016; Stoller, 2014). Alves et al. (2010) and Jongbloed et al. (2008) suggested that universities worldwide have been compelled to carefully reconsider their roles in the society and, in doing so, their relations with their various stakeholders. Such stakeholders encompass a number of stakeholder groups. For instance, internally, they include students, staff, administration, and management. Externally, they include alumni, research communities, businesses, consumer organisations, governments, and professional associations (Jongbloed et al., 2008).

In the UK context, Howlett (Howlett, 2010) noted that for a significant time, universities were only concerned with teaching and research. However, recently, a third mission has been recognised, which includes “university enterprise activities, links with business and more recently still, collaboration with the community” (p. 1). Furthermore, as universities are recipients of public funding and government scrutiny, the expectations of universities’ roles have expanded beyond solely teaching and research and now include service to the community, which requires establishing partnerships with their surrounding communities and university stakeholders (Jongbloed et al., 2008). One such stakeholder includes the Commonwealth Games OCs and associated delivery partners.
Alves et al. (2010) suggested the importance for universities to engage in profitable relationships with stakeholders. As universities have transformed, they have had the need to adapt their professional management structures and thus have become more entrepreneurial (Alves et al., 2010). For example, universities have been pressured to develop not only their ability to manage their resources and students but also develop their brands, prepare students for the job market, and evaluate their own performance (Michael, 2004).

A limited number of studies exist that investigate university stakeholder management (Alves et al., 2010). However, from the literature reviewed, the most studied stakeholder is the student, followed by the academic staff, and then other university members of staff (c.f. Brown, 1999; Harvey, 1999; Macfarlane & Lomas, 1999; Baldwin, 2002; Pearce, 2003; Simmons, 2003; Roberts, 2004; Trustrum & Wee, 2007; Watson, 2007). There is also an absence of research exploring universities as stakeholders of an MSE, such as the Commonwealth Games, despite universities’ role in the wider community. The next section reviews more general university-industry involvement.

### 2.4.1 University-industry involvement

The literature refers to relationships between universities and business as university–industry collaboration. There are several studies, both conceptual and empirical, that explore university–industry collaboration and involvement (Ankrah & Al-Tabbaa, 2015; Arvanitis, Kubli, & Woerter, 2008; Bruneel, D’Este, & Saltera, n.d.; De Wit, Dolfsm, De Windt, & Gerkema, 2016; Maietta, 2015; Perkmanna, King, & Pavelin, 2011; Welsia, Glenna, Lacy, & Biscotti, 2008). However, most of this research has explored academic entrepreneurship (Etzkowitz, 2003) or research commercialisation, specifically activities related to technology, knowledge transfer,

According to Liew, Tengku Shahdan, and Lima (2012), university–industry collaboration has been essential for development in science and technology and can exist through many types of collaborations. These collaborations have differing levels of engagement, ranging from traditional forms such as internships and publications of results to more all-inclusive forms of engagement such as joint industry partnerships and research consultancies (Liew et al., 2012). One form of university-industry involvement with a long history is university-sport involvement.

2.4.2 University-sport involvement

Universities have been heavily involved in sport in many guises since before the 1900s (Clotfelter, 2011). Examples include intercollegiate athletics, World University Games, University Games, and British Universities and Colleges Sport (Australian University Sport, n.d.; British Universities and Colleges Sport, 2016; Clotfelter, 2011; International University Sports Federation, n.d.). There is a plethora of research that has explored universities and their involvement with sport (i.e. National Collegiate Athletic Association), but not in the specific context of this research: universities as a stakeholder of an MSE, specifically the Commonwealth Games. For instance, such studies have investigated doping, substance abuse, and eating disorders in university student-athletes (Green, Uryasz, Petr, & Bray, 2001; Holm-Denoma, Scaringi, Gordon, Van Orden, & Joiner, 2009), managing diversity in intercollegiate athletics (Fink, Pastore, & Riemer, 2003) injuries and prevention (Arendt & Dick, 1995; Kamath et al., 2014; Zuckerman et al., 2015), and sexual harassment in university sport (Fasting, 2015; Lenskyj, 1992).
According to Roy, Graeff, and Harmon (2008), intercollegiate athletics are “instrumental in shaping institutional image, the image of its students and graduates, and building bonds of community among supporters” (p. 15). Therefore, Hutchinson and Bennett (2012) noted that through sport, “universities are making a concerted effort to develop a unique brand identity for their respective institutions” (p. 434). Further, with advancing use of technology and media, universities have been forced to recognise the importance of positioning the university brand in the mind of its stakeholders and consumers (Hutchinson & Bennett, 2012). Another form of university-sport involvement has been with MSEs.

2.4.3 University-major and mega sport event involvement

Universities have been a long standing stakeholder through their involvement with major and mega sport events. Particularly, there appears to be a strong connection between universities and the Olympic Games (Anyangwe, 2012; Cashman & Toohey, 2002; de Moragas, 2006; Nickisch, 2015; Smothers, 1996). De Moragas (2006) noted that “relations between the academic world and universities and the Olympic Movement date back to the congress of the founding of the International Olympic Committee in the Sorbonne University, Paris in 1984” (p. 4).

According to de Moragas (2006), Pierre de Coubertin intended the Olympic Movement, as a sporting-cultural phenomenon, to find its identity and adapt to the modern world through knowledge advanced at universities. Consequently, in 1938, Carl Diem created the International Olympic Institute, and in 1982, the IOC Olympic Studies Centre and Museum were opened (de Moragas, 2006). One of the Olympic Studies Centre’s key roles is to “facilitate communication and cooperation between the IOC and the international academic community in order to promote research and stimulate
intellectual exchange” (IOC, 2016). Since that time, 41 Olympic Study Centres have been opened in 23 countries (The Olympic Studies Centre, 2016).

Cashman and Toohey (2002) published *The Contribution of the Higher Education Sector to the Sydney 2000 Olympic Games*. The study was the first of its kind to investigate university involvement in an Olympic Games and provided a better understanding of the potential for the higher education sector to leverage a legacy from the Olympic Games. Their study investigated universities’ contribution to the 2000 Sydney Olympics as well as the lessons learned, both positive and negative. The authors provided 15 recommendations to pass on to future Olympic Games OCs regarding this stakeholder group and noted that the Olympic Games “provides many potential benefits for higher education, their staff and students” (p. 3).

Another example of university-MSE involvement was the development of the Russian International Olympic University (RIOU) in Sochi. In preparation for the 2014 Sochi Olympic Games, the RIOU was established in 2009 under the Memorandum of Understanding between the IOC, the Sochi 2014 OC, and the Russian Olympic Committee (Morgan, 2016). The university can accommodate 500 students and focusses on training experts in sport management for the Russian and international sports industry as well as the Olympic and Paralympic Movements (Russian International Olympic University, 2015). Thus, there is great evidence supporting a thriving relationship between universities and the Olympic Games. There is far less information documented about the relationship between universities and the Commonwealth Games, even though there are links between them.

Since the inception of the Commonwealth Games, educational institutions and universities have supported and been involved with the Games in various ways. For instance, during the 1950 Auckland Games, national teams stayed free of charge at the
Ardmore Teachers’ Training College (XII Commonwealth Games Australia 1982 Foundation, 1982, p. 53). For the 1982 Brisbane Games, the Commonwealth Games Village was built at Griffith University Nathan campus (XII Commonwealth Games Foundation, 1982), and the Village is still used today as student accommodation (Kennelly & Corbett, 2012).

Beyond the provision of accommodation, universities have been associated with past Games in numerous ways; however, to date, there is scant academic research exploring the relationship between universities and the Commonwealth Games, specifically how universities have and can leverage the Games to achieve their own legacy. As discussed further in Chapter Six, online documents and press releases indicated that there have been relationships between universities and the Commonwealth Games both formally and informally. For instance, in the Melbourne case, university facilities were utilised for national team training. In the Glasgow case, a research consortium was developed between Glasgow City Council, Glasgow Life (responsible for culture and sport in the city), and three universities in Glasgow (Rogerson, 2016). Finally, in the Gold Coast case, there was an official partnership developed between Griffith University and Gold Coast 2018 Commonwealth Games Corporation (GOLDOC). However, the lack of academic research exploring this topic supports the need for this study.

2.5 Gaps in Knowledge

The proposed research addresses several gaps in knowledge. To date, there is no research exploring universities as stakeholders of the Commonwealth Games or how they have leveraged an MSE to achieve their own legacies. MSE legacy expectations and the university sector context have changed over the past few decades, independent
of each other. This research brings the two areas together, as universities seek relationships with, and legacies from involvement with, the Commonwealth Games.

The Commonwealth Games arguably have a contested future (Kidd, 2011), and this research provides the CGF and future host cities with ideas on how to capitalise on the Games. It also gives future host city universities new knowledge to strategically plan for their own legacies. This study also adds to knowledge of MSE stakeholder management by addressing the perspectives of a previously un-researched stakeholder relationship, universities, and the Commonwealth Games.

For universities, leveraging the Commonwealth Games provides many opportunities, such as expediting a university’s strategic agenda. As an example, Griffith University did not create the idea of hosting the Commonwealth Games on the Gold Coast; however, the Games have presented an opportunity for Griffith University to leverage the event and experience positive outcomes. Therefore, in order to contribute to university-MSE knowledge, this research will address the gaps in understandings that were noted in this section; adopt qualitative research methods to ask “how” and “why” questions regarding university relationships with the Commonwealth Games; and is underpinned by a theoretical framework comprising literature on IORs and stakeholder theory, discussed in Chapter Three.

2.6 Chapter Conclusion

This chapter presented a review of literature on MSEs, event legacy and leverage, and the changing nature of universities. The review process highlighted that there was an absence of research directly pertaining specifically to the topic of this investigation: engagement between universities and the Commonwealth Games. Chapter Three outlines the theoretical framework that underpinned this research.
Chapter 3: Theoretical Framework

This chapter reviews theory relating to IORs and stakeholder theory, which contributed to the theoretical underpinning of this research. The chapter begins by providing an overview of IOR literature, followed by a background of stakeholder theory. The chapter then examines universities as stakeholders of MSEs, and the use of stakeholder theory in the contexts of university and sport events. The chapter concludes with an explanation of how the theories are applied in this study.

3.1 Interorganisational Relationships in the Sport Management Context

IORs in the sport management context have attracted much academic interest (Alexander, Thibault, & Frisby, 2008; Babiak, 2007; Meiklejohn, Dickson, & Ferkins, 2016; Misener & Doherty, 2012; Thibault, Frisby, & Kikulis, 1999; Thibault & Harvey, 1997; Werner, Dickson, & Hyde, 2015; Wicker, Vos, Scheerder, & Breuer, 2013), due to the strategic collaboration, interactions, and partnerships that are necessary for the success of sport organisations (Turner & Shilbury, 2010). IORs can refer to many types of partnerships, for instance, joint ventures, sponsorships, or alliances; however, they are all commonly founded in the notion that the success of each organisation in the partnership is dependent upon the other organisation (Babiak & Thibault, 2008).

For the purpose of this research, Babiak and Thibault’s (2008) definition of IORs was employed, which identified IORs as “a voluntary, close, long-term, planned strategic action between two or more organisations with the objective of serving mutually beneficial purposes” (p. 282). IORs develop when organisations react to their environmental circumstances, such as new or improved technologies, globalisation, economic reform, and social change (Turner & Shilbury, 2010). IORs mature because
the organisations that are involved in the partnership endeavour to develop a strategic approach towards advancing the IOR’s agenda (Turner & Shilbury, 2010).

However, the incentive for IOR formation varies between organisations, reflecting a “process of reacting to the environmental circumstances thrust upon the organization, or alternatively, attempting to become proactive in developing a strategic approach toward advancing the direction of the organization” (Turner & Shilbury, 2010, p. 11). There are multiple ways of conceptualising what motivates partners to work together. For instance, Oliver (1990) provided six determinants of IOR formations, which explained organisations’ motivations for creating IORs. The six determinants are necessity, asymmetry, reciprocity, efficiency, stability, and legitimacy. Organisations may be forced into an IOR out of necessity or because of a mandate from a sport governing body (Meiklejohn et al., 2016).

Turner and Shilbury (2010) explored whether the preconditions for IOR formation have changed as a result of advancing broadcasting technologies in the context of professional football clubs in Australia. The authors found six preconditions for IOR formation. The first was uncertainty, for instance, IORs can assist organisations in reducing uncertainty. The second was knowledge/expertise, meaning that IORs can provide organisations with knowledge or expertise. The third relates to resource acquisition or resource-based reasons for the formation of IORs often referred to as resource dependence. The fourth precondition to IOR formation is adaptive efficiencies, IORs can provide efficiencies such as economies of scale. The fifth precondition is regulation for instance, IORs can assist organisations with overcoming regulation and barriers to entry. The final precondition relates to strategic enhancement, there must be a degree of willingness by organisations to enter into an IOR, or it is simply a takeover rather than IOR (p. 16).
Babiak (2007) reviewed the determinants and conditions of partnership formation in a non-profit sport organisation in Canada and its partners from multiple sectors. Babiak (2007) found that the determinants legitimacy, stability, reciprocity, and efficiency are important motives for relationship formation for the collaborating organisations (Babiak 2007). Katner (1989) emphasised that IORs are vulnerable when they are under-managed, and many partnerships are at a risk of failure due to difficulties in implementation and execution.

Babiak and Thibault (2008) investigated the process of managing IORs in the context of sport and noted that such partnerships bring together two or more independent organisations, each with its own objectives, agenda, and culture. The authors examined how individuals and sport organisations involved in IORs manage their interactions with partner organisations across three sectors: public, commercial, and non-profit. Their findings suggested that successful management of multiple partnerships requires a delicate balance of experience, planning, and confidence. Although their research found that some formal processes were in place to guide the management of sport IORs, Babiak and Thibault (2008) argued that informal processes, specifically mutual trust, played a key role in overcoming the challenges and the tensions that inevitably arise when dealing with partners. Turner and Shilbury (2010) noted that collaboration, cooperation, and coordination have become key competitive strategies in sport, thus inspiring IOR formation.

Frisby, Thibault, and Kikulis (2004) highlighted several management challenges with IORs, including (a) implementing a partnership strategy; (b) managing relationships among partners; (c) understanding challenges within partners’ organisations; (d) changing roles and responsibilities; and (e) negotiating interpersonal issues. This thesis sought to understand how and why IORs are formed between
universities and the Commonwealth Games; therefore, IORs in the context of universities are discussed next.

3.2 IORs in the University Context

University–industry relationships have been studied extensively over the past two decades (Alves et al., 2010; Ankrah & AL-Tabbaa, 2015; Bonaccorsi & Piccaluga, 1994; Bruneel et al., n.d.; Cyert & Goodman, 1997; Perkmann, 2007). However, these partnerships have often been related to research and design activity (Bruneel et al., n.d.; Geisler, 1995; Siegal, Waldman, & Link, 2003; Smith, 2015). Smith (2015) noted that universities frequently form partnerships with community organisations, such as non-profit organisations, schools, government, and local residents to address important social issues. These social issues have included improving service delivery, including nursing and teaching, enhancing education and educational access, reducing poverty, improving sustainability, sharing of resources, research, and program evaluation.

Bonaccorsi and Piccaluga (1994) noted two considerations in university–industry relationships, (a) the intensity of the relationships, such as the size of the partner organisations, the sectors in which the relationships were created, and the countries of origin of the partners; and (b) the characteristics of the relationship, including the distinct types of collaborations, the financial arrangement of the partnership, and the scientific fields studied. To address these two issues and to understand and assess the variety of factors that influence the performance of university–industry IORs, Bonaccorsi and Piccaluga (1994) developed a theoretical framework based on IOR concepts (see Figure 2). The authors identified a variety of organisations’ motivations for entering into a university–industry IOR. These motivations included gaining access to scientific frontiers, increasing the predictive
power of science, delegating selected development activities, and overcoming a lack of resources.

Figure 2: A theoretical framework to study university–industry IORs

Source: Bonaccorsi and Piccaluga (1994)

One theory that examines IORs is stakeholder theory. This theory was selected as the appropriate conceptual framework to examine the engagement between universities and the Commonwealth Games in combination with IOR literature. Stakeholder theory is an appropriate theoretical lens, as this research seeks to understand universities as a stakeholder group of the Commonwealth Games. An overview of stakeholder theory, stakeholder classifications, and the theory’s use in the context of sport and universities is discussed in the next section.
3.3 Stakeholder Theory


In management literature, stakeholders are often defined as groups or individuals who have a stake in the organisations’ decision making. The term was initially meant to generalise the idea that stockholders (individuals who own stock in an organisation) were not the only group that management needed to consider (Freeman, Harrison, Wicks, Parmar, & Colle, 2010). The original definition of stakeholders was “those groups without whose support the organisation would cease to exist” (Freeman et al., 2010, p. 31) and included shareowners, employees, customers, suppliers, lenders, and society (Freeman, 1984).

Freeman broadened his definition of stakeholders to groups and individuals who can affect, or are affected by, the achievement of an organisation’s mission (Freeman, 1984, 2010), and not only those with a financial stake. An underlying premise of stakeholder theory is that in a competitive business environment, an organisation’s success is dependent on effective stakeholder management, not just the attainment of profits (Hede, 2008).
Since Freeman’s (1984) seminal work, scholars have proposed other definitions for stakeholders. For example, Clarkson (1995) defined stakeholders as “persons or groups that have, or claim, ownership, rights, or interests in a corporation and its activities, past, present, or future” (p. 106). Merrilees, Getz, and O’Brien (2005) described stakeholders as “groups or individuals with whom the organisation interacts or has interdependencies” and “any individual or group who can affect or is affected by the actions, decisions, policies, practices or goals of the organisation” (p. 1063). Based on these definitions, a university in an event’s host destination may be considered a stakeholder of the Commonwealth Games, especially if it seeks to connect with, or leverage the Games for the benefit of students, staff, and the institution’s reputation.

Over the past few decades, the idea that corporations have stakeholders has been widely accepted in both academic and professional management literature (Batty, 2016; Donaldson & Preston, 1995; Parent, 2015). However, Donaldson and Preston (1995) argued “the concepts stakeholder, stakeholder model, stakeholder management, and stakeholder theory are explained and used by various authors in very different ways and supported (or critiqued) with diverse and often contradictory evidence and arguments” (p. 66, emphasis in original). Therefore, Donaldson and Preston (1995) identified important distinctions, problems, and implications associated with the stakeholder concept. Furthermore, they sought to clarify and justify the essential content and significance of stakeholder theory.

Donaldson and Preston (1995) highlighted that stakeholder theory as an organisational theory provides three perspectives of the theory: descriptive, instrumental, and normative (Alves et al., 2010; Donaldson & Preston, 1995). These three aspects of the theory were described by Laplume, Sonpar, and Litz (2008) as “the
descriptive (how firms behave), the normative (how firms should behave), and the instrumental (how behaviour affects performance)” (p. 1159).

Descriptive stakeholder research primarily focuses on corporate characteristics driving firm behaviour, specifically management’s perceptions of its obligations to stakeholders (Alves et al., 2010; Verbeke & Tung, 2013). Descriptive stakeholder theory has been used to describe and occasionally explain specific corporate characteristics, which “reflects and explains past, present, and future states of affairs of corporations and their stakeholders” (Donaldson & Preston, 1995, p. 71). However, Donaldson and Preston (1995) argued that stakeholder theory “goes well beyond the descriptive observation that ‘organizations have stakeholders’” (p. 70).

Instrumental stakeholder theory is used to “identify the connections, or lack of connections, between stakeholder management and the achievement of traditional corporate objectives” (Donaldson & Preston, 1995, p. 71). Instrumental stakeholder theory is applied to examine the organisational outcomes of stakeholder management, such as the social and financial performance, organisational learning, and innovation (Verbeke & Tung, 2013). Alves et al. (2010) noted that instrumental stakeholder theory seeks to understand how the consequences of strategies and policies aimed at stakeholders have had an impact on the organisation’s performance. For example, university strategies developed to leverage the Commonwealth Games have involved a variety of stakeholders, such as staff, students, and the community. According to instrumental stakeholder theory, these stakeholders can potentially have an impact on the outcome of the university’s strategic objectives of engaging with the Games.

An instrumental stakeholder approach is “essentially hypothetical; it says, in effect, ‘If you want to achieve (avoid) results X, Y, or Z, then adopt (don’t adopt) principles and practices A, B, or C’” (Donaldson & Preston, 1995, p. 72). Instrumental
uses of stakeholder theory aid in making a link between stakeholder approaches and the achievement of sought after objectives. In this thesis, instrumental stakeholder theory is applicable, as the university–Commonwealth Games relationship is explored to understand how and why universities engaged with the Commonwealth Games achieve legacy.

The third type of stakeholder theory, normative stakeholder theory, is used to "interpret the function of the corporation, including the identification of moral or philosophical guidelines for the operation and management of corporations" (Donaldson & Preston, 1995, p. 72). The use of a normative stakeholder theory endeavours to interpret the purpose of, and offer guidance about, the organisation on the basis of some underlying moral or philosophical principle (Alves et al., 2010). Normative stakeholder theory is “prescriptive”, as it sets out expectations about how the focal organisation should behave towards its stakeholders (Donaldson & Preston, 1995).

While stakeholder theory has been widely adopted in management literature, it has also been acknowledged as having some limitations (Donaldson & Preston, 1995; Fassin, 2009; Waxenberger & Spence, 2003). For instance, according to Donaldson and Preston (1995), stakeholder theory in the literature is often “implicit rather than explicit”, which can lead to a variety of unclear uses of the theory (p. 70). Furthermore, there is a lack of consistency in use of the term stakeholder and what constitutes a stake (Fassin, 2009). In addition, Donaldson and Preston (1995) noted that instrumental stakeholder theory has often failed to fully explore “specific links between cause (i.e. stakeholder management) and effect (i.e. corporate performance) in detail” (p. 71). Fassin (2009) and Waxenberger and Spence (2003) suggested that stakeholder theory has oftentimes been ambiguous and vague in managerial, organisational, and strategic
issues, leading to inconsistencies in definitions and graphical representation of the
model (Fassin, 2009, p. 116).

Despite these limitations, the instrumental approach to stakeholder theory was
adopted for this thesis as a part of the theoretical framework to examine how and why
universities engaged with the Commonwealth Games to achieve legacy. The theory
provides a lens through which to examine the three cases of university–Commonwealth
Games interaction to determine whether the universities inputs in the relationships
satisfied the relevant Games’ authorities, whilst at the same time producing outcomes
that benefit the universities. Furthermore, the value of using a stakeholder framework is
that it offers the capability to identify aspects of stakeholder relationships in a structured
way in order to assist organisations to manage their relationships more effectively
(Smith, 2015).

3.4 Major Sport Event Stakeholders

MSEs have many stakeholders (Emery, 2002) who can either advance or
constrain the OC with their own agendas (Toohey, 2008). Research conducted regarding
MSE stakeholders has included the perspective of the OC (Emery, 2010; 2002), the OC
and its stakeholders (Leopkey & Parent, 2009; Parent, 2008; Parent, 2015; Parent,
Kristiansen, Skille, & Hanstad, 2015), and the analysis of stakeholder relationships in
order to determine key success factors to bid for an MSE (Hautbois et al., 2012).
However, little is known about the reasons why and the processes of how
Commonwealth Games stakeholders, such as universities, have engaged with the
Games.

Emery (2002) identified that a basic MSE is likely to involve a minimum of
three organisational levels: international, national, and local levels (Figure 3 below).
Leopkey and Parent (2009) sought to understand an event’s risk management issues from the perspective of OC members and its stakeholders. The authors used Freeman’s (1984) definition of stakeholders, identifying a stakeholder as anyone who can impact or be impacted by the event or the event OCs’ actions. The stakeholder groups included in their research consisted of the OC, Canadian governments, media, community, delegation, and sporting bodies. The International Skating Union 2006 World Figure Skating Championships and the U-20 Fédération Internationale de Football Association World Cup Canada 2007 were used as case studies. Leopkey and Parent (2009) highlighted 15 risk issue categories: environment, financial, human resources, infrastructure, interdependence, legacy, media, operations, organising, participation, political, relationships, sport, threats, and visibility. Leopkey and Parent’s (2009) findings indicated generalised risk management issues that event stakeholders must be aware of and prepared to deal with during an event’s lifecycle. Furthermore, the risk issue categories identified suggested that risk is not a singular issue; rather it is one
that has a wide-ranging impact with regard to planning and hosting a large-scale international sporting event.

Although the above-mentioned research explored MSEs including the Commonwealth Games and stakeholders, it did not investigate universities as stakeholders of an MSE, nor how stakeholders, such as universities, can leverage the Games to create their own legacies. As explained in Chapter Two, industry engagement and commercial relationships have become important for universities; hence, this research seeks to understand how universities, as stakeholders, engage with the Commonwealth Games to create university legacies.

### 3.4.1 Event stakeholder classifications

Various event stakeholders have been identified in the event management literature (i.e. Getz, Svensson, Peterssen, & Gunnervall, 2012; Hede, 2008; Merrilees et al., 2005; Reid, 2004) (see Table 3). For example, Reid (2006) developed a typology that categorised a range of event stakeholders and differentiated them as either primary or secondary stakeholders. Reid (2006) defined primary stakeholders as those “without whose support the event would cease to exist” (p. 1482).

Clarkson (1995) noted there is a high level of interdependence between an organisation and its primary stakeholders. Alternatively, secondary stakeholders were classified as those who are “not directly involved in the event [but] can seriously impede the event’s existence” (Reid, 2003, p. 1482). Thus, secondary stakeholders are not as essential to an organisation’s survival; however, they can still affect or be affected by the achievements of the organisation’s objectives (Clarkson, 1995).
Table 3: Examples of event stakeholders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Stakeholders</th>
<th>Secondary Stakeholders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteers</td>
<td>Host community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsors</td>
<td>Emergency services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suppliers</td>
<td>General business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spectators</td>
<td>Media and tourism organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendees</td>
<td>Beneficiaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Environmentalists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Event associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Competitors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from: Clarkson, 2005; Hede, 2008; Reid & Arcodia, 2002; Reid, 2004, 2006.

Post, Preston, and Sachs (2002) believed that it is important to manage primary stakeholders in a manner that is mutually beneficial for the stakeholder and the organisation, while managing secondary stakeholders should focus on developing benefits and/or avoiding or decreasing harm to the stakeholder and the organisation.

Getz, Anderson, and Larson (2007) used the terminology internal and external stakeholders (see Table 4). The authors suggested that internal event stakeholders are directly involved with a focal organisation, while external stakeholders comprise various sub-groups that are not directly involved with a focal organisation. Hede (2008) proposed an event stakeholder map incorporating many of the stakeholders identified by Getz et al., (2007), Merrilees et al., (2005), and Reid (2006) and the logistical concerns of the event that event managers need to identify in order to have a successful event.
Table 4: Examples of internal and external event stakeholders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internal Stakeholders</th>
<th>External Stakeholders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owners or investors</td>
<td>“Allies and Collaborators” e.g. Tourism agencies and professional associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directors</td>
<td>“Regulators” e.g. Local authorities and government agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>“Co-producers” e.g. Other organisations that participate in the festival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteers</td>
<td>“Facilitators” e.g. Non-participating resource providers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members and advisors</td>
<td>“Suppliers and venues”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Audience and the impacted” including the community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Getz et al. (2007)

Development of event stakeholder models (i.e. Getz et al., 2007; Reid, 2006; Reid & Arcodia, 2002) and maps (Hede, 2008) may provide event organisers with strategic management tools to identify and determine the relative importance of their stakeholders and the effects that their event will have upon their stakeholders (Hede, 2008). Although a single definition of a stakeholder is not universally accepted (Donaldson & Preston, 1995; Merrilees et al., 2005), extant literature consistently highlights the importance for organisations to recognise their stakeholders. However, organisations are unable to respond to all stakeholders’ needs equally and hence, must be strategic in managing their stakeholder relationships (Parent, 2015). A further means by which to classify stakeholders is based on the concept of salience.

3.4.2 Stakeholder salience

Mitchell et al. (1997) proposed that the attributes of power, legitimacy, and urgency can provide an approach to prioritise stakeholders through the concept of salience. According to Google Scholar, as of January 2017, Mitchell et al.’s (1997) seminal work has been cited over 9,000 times from a range of fields, including sport management (Friedman et al., 2004; Hautbois et al., 2012; Parent, 2015; Parent &
Séguin, 2007) and event management (Parent & Deephouse, 2007). Instrumental interpretations of stakeholder theory have recognised that organisations may not be able to accommodate all of their stakeholders. As a result, scholars have sought to better understand how organisations can prioritise their stakeholders (Boesso & Kumar, 2016; Kennelly, 2011; Mitchell et al., 1997; Neville, Bell, & Whitwell, 2011). Mitchell et al.’s (1997) stakeholder salience model has become one of the major methods of prioritising stakeholders in management research (Boesso & Kumar, 2016).

Mitchell et al. (1997) suggested that managers can arrange stakeholders based on their salience or the degree to which they possess power, legitimacy, and/or urgency. The authors proposed that stakeholders can be differentiated by their possession or attributed possession of one, two, or all three of the following: (a) the power to influence the firm; (b) legitimacy in the stakeholder’s relationship with the firm; and/or (c) urgency in the stakeholder’s claim on the firm.

According to Mitchell et al. (1997), power is utilitarian, coercive, and normative. For instance, a party to a relationship has power to the extent it has or can gain access to coercive, utilitarian, or normative means, in order to impose its will in the relationship. It can be acquired as well as lost (Mitchell et al., 1997).

Legitimacy is “a generalized perception or assumption that the actions of an entity are desirable, proper, or appropriate within some socially constructed system of norms, values, beliefs, and definitions” (Suchman, 1995, p. 574). Suchman’s (1995) definition implied that legitimacy is a desirable social good, and this is something beyond a mere self-perception, and that it may be defined and negotiated differently at various levels of social organisation (Mitchell et al., 1997). Neville et al. (2011) suggested that it is primarily the moral legitimacy of the stakeholder’s claim that applies to stakeholder salience.
Mitchell et al. (1997) described urgency as being able to move from static to dynamic. Urgency exists when “two conditions are met: (a) when a relationship or claim is of a time-sensitive nature and (b) when that relationship or claim is important or critical to the stakeholder” (Mitchell et al., 1997, p. 867). Urgency is defined as the degree to which stakeholder claims call for immediate attention. Neville et al. (2011) argued that urgency is not relevant for identifying stakeholders, only for the “prioritisations of stakeholder claims, but irrelevant in the identification of stakeholders” (p. 362).

The stakeholder framework is a systematic tool that can aid in prioritising stakeholders; however, stakeholder’s salience can change over time and stakeholders can become more or less salient through their actions (Mitchell et al., 1997; Verbeke & Tung, 2013). Stakeholder attributes are “variable” and “socially constructed, not objective reality” (Mitchell et al., 1995, p. 868). For instance, a dormant stakeholder who possesses one attribute, such as power, can become an expectant or definitive stakeholder by increasing their legitimacy or urgency, thereby becoming more salient to managers. Neville et al. (2011) noted that stakeholders’ salience will vary as the degrees of the attributes vary (p. 357). According to Mitchell et al. (1997), organisations that do not possess the attributes of power, legitimacy, or urgency in relation to the firm are not stakeholders and will be perceived as having no salience by the firm’s managers. See Table 5 below for the types of attributes.
Table 5: Stakeholder analysis based on the various combinations of the three attributes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Stakeholder</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Degree of Attributes One</th>
<th>Degree of Attributes Type Two</th>
<th>Degree of Attributes Type Three</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Latent</td>
<td>Possess one attribute</td>
<td>Low salience</td>
<td>Dormant stakeholders</td>
<td>Discretionary stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low salience</td>
<td></td>
<td>Attribute: power</td>
<td>Attribute: legitimacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectant</td>
<td>Possess two attributes</td>
<td>Moderate salience</td>
<td>Dominant stakeholders</td>
<td>Dependent stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate salience</td>
<td></td>
<td>Attributes: power and legitimacy</td>
<td>Attributes: urgency and legitimacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitive</td>
<td>High salience for stakeholders who possess all three attributes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Mitchell et al. (1997)

Kennelly (2011) suggested a fourth component to identify stakeholder salience: utility, or the usefulness of the stakeholder to the focal organisation. She found that some stakeholders may not possess much power, legitimacy, or urgency, yet they can provide benefit to an organisation. Therefore, in line with an instrumental approach to stakeholder management, organisations may choose to engage with such stakeholders for instrumental reasons. Driscoll and Starik (2004) alternatively argued that stakeholder salience could be determined by proximity. This attribute incorporates “the near and the far, the short- and the long-term, and the actual and the potential” (p. 61). They suggested that more proximate stakeholders – near, short-term, and actual – will be more salient to managers.
Friedman and Mason (2004) used stakeholder theory to examine the issue of public subsidies for the construction of major league sports facilities. Their research explored economic development decision making by local governments and the various groups affected by these policy decisions. The authors found that policymakers identified stakeholders based on their power, legitimacy, and urgency to develop strategies that aligned with definitive stakeholder interests (Friedman & Mason, 2004).

Hautbois et al. (2012) explored the importance of the stakeholder network during an MSE bid by using Mitchell et al.’s (1997) stakeholder framework. The authors examined the 2018 Olympic Winter Games’ French national bid competition, which had four candidacies. They analysed the stakeholder relationships, identified their salience, and then determined stakeholder-based key success factors to bid for an MSE. The authors noted that in the bid phase for an MSE, stakeholders typically included political officials, athletes, media, local population, economic actors or sponsors, and facilities managers. The position of the different stakeholder groups can influence the probability of success or failure of a bid.

The more salient the stakeholder, the more likely an organisation will give attention and acknowledgement to that stakeholder. In addition, Mitchell et al. (1997) noted that the manager’s perception of a stakeholder’s attributes can have an impact on the manager’s perception of that stakeholder’s salience. For example, a primary stakeholder would be considered more salient, whereas a secondary stakeholder by Reid’s (2004) classification would be perceived as less salient. However, stakeholders can become more salient depending on their ability to increase their attributes of power, legitimacy, and urgency.

The underpinning premise of Mitchell et al.’s (1997) approach to stakeholder salience is that “the degree to which managers give priority to competing stakeholder
claims” will vary (Mitchell et al., 1997, p. 854). Therefore, identifying the most salient stakeholders will help managers to better understand how to prioritise and respond to their stakeholders.

For instance, UK Sport (2003) conducted a stakeholder analysis and identified nine categories of National Governing Body stakeholders, one of which included universities. The nine categories included

- internal (including board members, staff, and voluntary administrators);
- participants (including members, clubs, and elite athletes);
- local (schools, tertiary institutions [universities], and local authorities);
- regional (including regional sports boards);
- commercial partners (including sponsors, media, and commercial operations);
- other NGBs (and international federations);
- multi-sport organisations (such as Olympic Committees, Commonwealth Games organisers, and sport institutes and training facilities);
- sport councils; and
- governments (p. 19).

Alves et al. (2010) suggested that universities need to engage in lucrative relationships with various stakeholders who are profitable and incorporate each organisation’s strategic objectives. While stakeholder identification and classification is a familiar concept in business, its application to the university context is less explored (Chapleo & Simms, 2010). The use of stakeholder theory in the context of research on universities is discussed in the next section.
3.5 Use of Stakeholder Theory in the University Context

Globally, universities are being forced to reassess their role in society and to evaluate their relationships with their stakeholders (Jongbloed et al., 2008; Maric, 2013). Much of the literature regarding universities and stakeholders refers to stakeholders of universities, such as students, staff, and the wider community (Benneworth & Jongbloed, 2009; Covell, 2005; Jongbloed et al., 2008; Mainardes et al., 2010; Mainardes et al., 2011). Other studies have explored benefits of knowledge transfer from universities to businesses (Howlett, 2010; Stevens & Bagby, 2001); university stakeholder analysis and management (Alves et al., 2010; Chapleo & Simms, 2010; Maric, 2013; Tetřeová & Sabolová, 2010); and stakeholder attitudes towards department behaviour in universities (Hutchinson & Bennett, 2012).

In addition to examining stakeholders of universities, several studies have used stakeholder theory in the general university context (Alves et al., 2010; Ankrah & AL-Tabbaa, 2015; Benneworth & Jongbloed, 2009; Chapleo & Simms, 2010; Covell, 2005; De Lange, 2013; Jongbloed et al., 2008; Mainardes et al., 2010; Maric, 2013; Slaba, 2015; Smith, 2015; Tetřeová & Sabolová, 2010). However, the majority of studies have focused on stakeholders of the university and not universities as stakeholders specifically of an MSE.

In a sport management context, Covell (2005) merged tenets of stakeholder theory and the theoretical constructs of attachment and allegiance to investigate how football season ticket holders of an Ivy League school demonstrated their attachment and allegiance to the intercollegiate athletic product. Jongbloed et al. (2008) utilised stakeholder analysis to classify university stakeholders and determine stakeholder salience. The authors highlighted how universities are interacting with an increased number and variety of stakeholders. Each of these stakeholders has their own particular
demand on universities resulting in new and revised relationships between universities and their stakeholders (Jongbloed et al., 2008). Stakeholder demands include economic expectations and research and knowledge creation (Enders & Fulton, 2002).

Benneworth and Jongbloed (2009) used stakeholder theory to explore the valorisation of Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences (HASS) compared to the hard sciences. They argued that from a stakeholder perspective, stakeholders who might wish to capitalise on university HASS knowledge face implicit barriers to being regarded as salient by universities, such as a lack of financial resources. Chapleo and Simms (2010) tried to gain a better understanding of stakeholders and the nature of stakeholder management for universities in the UK. The authors argued that stakeholder management is important for universities, as often university success is dependent on a wider range of stakeholders than those encountered by private sector organisations.

Chapleo and Simms (2010) found three key factors that affected the influence of stakeholders on their university case study: student recruitment and satisfaction, financial implications, and potential to have an impact on the strategic direction of the organisation.

In the Czech Republic context, Tetřevová and Sabolová (2010) defined and classified university stakeholders and provided recommendations for universities to select and strategically negotiate with stakeholders. They argued that “universities have to understand the role of their stakeholders, identify their primary stakeholders and apply corresponding strategies to deal with them” (p. 231). Similarly, Slaba (2015) adopted stakeholder theory to analyse the tertiary education needs in the Czech Republic market, noting that there are only slight differences between public and private universities. Slaba (2015) found 11 most important stakeholder groups for universities, which include prospective students; donors and grant organisations; current students;
accreditation commission Czech Republic; media; management; Ministry of Education, youth and sports; alumni; competitors; faculties and employees; and government authorities.

De Lange (2013) noted that universities have different sets of stakeholders compared to those of traditional firms. Further, the authors highlighted that “universities seek legitimacy through status and/or by maintaining academic standards, thus garnering resources” (p. 112). Recently, Smith’s (2015) doctoral dissertation examined university–community partnerships in the USA. She employed stakeholder theory to assess university stakeholder partnership attributes and found that perceptions of partnership quality are different between partners and that “university partners found their community counterparts more important than their community partners found them to be” (p. i). This section has highlighted the increasing importance of understanding and effectively managing stakeholders in university management and policymaking context (Chapleo & Simms, 2010; Sabla, 2015). It further supports the justification of using stakeholder theory to examine the relationship between universities and the Commonwealth Games. Therefore, the use of stakeholder theory in the context of sport events is discussed next.

3.6 Use of Stakeholder Theory in the Sport Event Context

Many scholars have utilised stakeholder theory in the context of sport and sport events (Batty, 2013; Covell, 2005; Ferkins & Shilbury, 2015; Friedman & Mason, 2004; Friedman et al., 2004; Getz et al., 2007; Hautbois et al., 2012; Kennelly, 2011; Kihl, Leberman, & Schull, 2010; Lamont, Kennelly, & Weiler, 2015; Leopkey & Parent, 2009; Merrilees et al., 2005; Parent, 2008; Parent & Harvey, 2009; Parent et al., 2015; Parent & Séguin, 2007).
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To demonstrate that stakeholder theory has descriptive and prescriptive value for sport management practitioners and academics, Friedman et al. (2004) reviewed the basic tenets of stakeholder theory and suggested its applications to sports-related issues. The authors concluded that stakeholder theory has “significant value” as a way to understand how organisations respond to certain situations in a sport context (p. 186). For instance, Friedman et al. (2004) highlighted that in evaluating a situation, stakeholder theory “requires several questions to be answered and establishes a framework through which to utilise this information” (p. 186). Further, stakeholder theorists have recommended that individuals and groups that may be possibly involved in the situation be identified, regardless of whether they are in a position to influence or be impacted by the outcome of the situation. In addition, the degree to which various stakeholders can affect the outcome should be considered as well as the potential benefits or costs to each stakeholder (Mitchell et al. 1997). For similar reasons, stakeholder theory offers an appropriate framework to research how and why universities have leveraged the Commonwealth Games.

Merrilees et al. (2005) explored the stakeholder relationships utilised by the marketing department of the organisation staging the Brisbane 2001 Goodwill Games in order to understand how a global brand can be developed on a local scale. The authors argued that stakeholder theory is “a powerful way of building inter-organizational linkages” (p. 1060) and offered a way to understand less traditional marketing networks, such as for sporting events. The results of their study produced three principles for effective stakeholder management, which included developing a supportive culture, allowing “seamless integration of stakeholder interests” (p. 1076); technical skills, including negotiating and a flexible management style; and branding as a way to unify stakeholders. Stakeholder analysis and management can be used to build more effective
brands (Merrilees et al., 2005) such as universities using the Commonwealth Games to
increase university brand awareness.

Parent and Séguin (2007) illustrated the potential issues or barriers that
stakeholders can experience. Using a case study approach based on stakeholder theory,
Parent and Séguin (2007) explored the organisational and stakeholder-related issues,
which led to Fédération Internationale de Natation (FINA) withdrawing its contract
with the 2005 Montreal Aquatics World Championships OC. The authors identified a
combination of issues, including “a lack of formal financial commitments, power
congruence between partners and the pervasive politics, communication, proper human
resource management procedures, and proper due diligence” (Parent & Séguin, 2007, p.
187). The findings of Parent and Séguin (2007) can contribute to better understanding
of potential barriers that universities have experienced when seeking to leverage the
Games.

Parent and Deephouse (2007) examined how OC managers in two large-scale
sporting events identified and prioritised stakeholders. Using Mitchell et al.’s (1997)
stakeholder salience framework, the authors conducted a comparative case study that
supported the importance of hierarchical level and role in an organisation as having
“direct and moderating effects on stakeholder identification and salience” (Parent &
Deephouse, 2007, p. 18). Parent and Deephouse (2007) concluded that power has the
most important effect on salience, followed by urgency and legitimacy. The work of
Parent and Deephouse (2007) can help discern the Commonwealth Games OCs’
perceptions of universities’ salience.

Another example of the use of stakeholder theory in the context of sport
management was by Ferkins and Shilbury (2015), who integrated sport governance and
stakeholder theory literature and conducted action research to explore how non-profit
sport organisations can develop their governing capability. Lamont et al. (2015) utilised stakeholder-agency theory to understand how volunteer tour guides shaped experiences of sport tour customers. Lamont et al. (2015) found that there is a need to embed the notion of stakeholder salience in the management process in order to explain and clarify the challenge of multiple stakeholders and the lack of stakeholder engagement.

Parent (2008) utilised a combination of stakeholder theory and issues management to develop a framework to understand how event OCs matured operationally and the types of issues that the OC and their stakeholders must consider throughout the event’s planning stages. Parent (2008) found that three trends emerged for OCs, which included issues changed according to the evolution of the OC; issues changing according to the stakeholders dealt with; and issues changing according to OC members’ hierarchical level. Leopkey and Parent (2009) conducted extensive research on event OCs and stakeholders and suggested that stakeholder theory can focus on three main components of a stakeholder–OC relationship: the OC itself; the stakeholders; and the relationship between the OC and its stakeholders (Donaldson & Preston, 1995; Jones & Wicks, 1999; Parent, 2008). This thesis focuses on the second component, universities as a stakeholder group.

As a final example, stakeholder theory informed the work of Gargalianosa, Toohey, and Stotlar (2015) in developing the Olympic Games Complexity Model, which presented the complexity of the Games by way of a three-dimensional model. The model displays stakeholders of the Olympics and the interrelationships among them from the perspective of the OC. The work of Gargalianosa et al. (2015) demonstrated how many stakeholders an OC must interact with, which as previously noted, is very difficult. Hence, determining stakeholder salience is important to organisations, and can aid universities’ understanding of the complexity of an MSE.
Although there is substantial research that has utilised stakeholder theory in the context of sport, there is limited research that has specifically applied stakeholder theory in the context of the Commonwealth Games, with the exception of Harris (2010, 2012). Harris’s (2010) doctoral dissertation examined the relationship between large-scale sporting events, including the Melbourne 2006 Commonwealth Games, and education for sustainable development. Using components of stakeholder theory, he developed the conceptual framework for his thesis and found that the process of host–community education for sustainable development was influenced by state governments; involved a diverse range of programs and initiatives; was largely of an informal educational nature; and had an impact on organisations, groups, and individuals from all sectors of the communities concerned. This thesis sought to understand the relationships between universities and the Commonwealth Games; therefore, Harris’ (2010, 2012) research is relevant to understanding this dyadic relationship.

While such examples of stakeholder theory’s application in research on the Commonwealth Games is minimal, the theory’s broader application in sport management and sport event studies underpins the selection of stakeholder theory as an appropriate framework for this research.

3.7 Alternate Management Theories and Criticisms of Stakeholder Theory

Some scholars have criticised stakeholder theory (Egels-Zandén & Sandberg, 2010; Mitchell et al., 1997). According to the criticisms, stakeholder theory is not actually a theory and the definition is so broad that it includes “virtually anyone” (Mitchell et al., 1997, p. 854). In response, Mitchell et al. (1997) noted that it is “clear that no individual organisational theory offers systematic answers to questions about stakeholder identification and salience, although most such theories have much to tell us about the role of power or legitimacy (but not both) in stakeholder-manager relations”
Mitchell et al. (1997) proposed a model for stakeholder identification and prioritisation, which has subsequently been applied by other scholars (Hautbois et al., 2012; Parent & Deephouse, 2007). Mitchell et al.’s (1997) argument supports the reason for using both IOR literature and stakeholder theory as a framework for this research.

Because of some of the criticisms of stakeholder theory, alternative management theories were considered for this research, which included resource dependence theory (RDT) (Hillman, Withers, & Collins, 2009; Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978) and agency theory (Jensen & Meckling, 1976). RDT focuses on power through resources, but overlooks why stakeholders without resource-related power should be considered (Frooman, 1999; Mitchell et al., 1997). Until data was collected on the university–Commonwealth Games relationships, it was difficult to assess if, and to what extent, universities were resource dependent on the Commonwealth Games or vice versa. Thus, it was not clear whether resource-based power relationships could explain why or how universities initiated engagement with the Games. It also appeared unlikely that RDT would adequately explain why universities sought to maintain relationships with the Games.

Similarly, agency theory focuses on power dynamics in relationships in which party A, the principal, attempts to influence party B, the agent, to act in a manner that is advantageous to the principal (Mason & Slack, 2005). Agency theory focusses on ways to manage situations where the principal’s and agent’s interests are incongruent (Mason & Slack, 2005), for instance, where the agent acts opportunistically or at the principal’s expense. This type of relationship did not align with the preliminary data collected. It appeared that universities sought mutually beneficial relationships with the Commonwealth Games, which is why IOR literature was used to augment stakeholder theory. Stakeholder theory has been criticised, but supporters of the theory have
justified its rigour by arguing that stakeholder theory “is an appropriate and possibly stronger method of building inter-organizational linkages than alternatives” (Merrilees et al., 2005, p. 1060).

3.8 Application of IOR Literature and Stakeholder Theory to this Research

To better understand and analyse university–Commonwealth Games partnerships and how stakeholders can work together to leverage a MSE for legacy a stakeholder–IOR framework was developed for this study. The use of this theoretical framework can assist in examining universities’ leveraging strategies, which may include developing relationships with other Games’ stakeholders (Kennelly et al., 2017). Doherty (2013) noted that “the ability to explain phenomena is based in theory, and so the body of knowledge in sport management must derive from theory-based and theory-building research” (p. 5). Stakeholder theory recognises the complexity of an organisation’s operating environment and the impact that this dynamic context can have on interactions between an organisation and its stakeholders. IORs help organisations to create value by combining resources and sharing knowledge (Doz & Hamel, 1998). However, as Frisby et al. (2004) noted, IORs can have some challenges, which need to be understood and managed. Stakeholder theory and IOR theory are complimentary (Parent & Harvey, 2009); therefore, the use of stakeholder–IOR theoretical framework lends itself to the investigation of the stakeholder–organisation relationship.

3.9 Chapter Conclusion

This chapter provided a review of IORs and extant research on IORs in sport as well as stakeholder theory and its use in research involving sport and universities. IOR literature and stakeholder theory provided the theoretical framework for this research. The use of IORs and stakeholder theory as a theoretical framework can contribute
towards understanding the complexity of the relationships between organisations such as Commonwealth Games OC and universities. Chapter Four provides details of the research methods employed for this thesis.

Chapter 4: Research Methods

This research examined how and why universities in three Commonwealth Games host regions leveraged the Games to achieve their own legacies. Two research questions guided this thesis:

- Why, how, and what legacies have universities sought to achieve through leveraging a Commonwealth Games?
- What were the barriers to achieving a legacy?

This chapter describes the qualitative research methods used to answer these questions. It begins with a discussion of the strengths and limitations of qualitative methodology as they apply to this research. This is followed by an outline of the use of case studies as a strategy of enquiry. A discussion of the features of case study research and an explanation of why a multiple-case study approach was an appropriate research design for this project are presented. The three cases selected for this research are presented. Next, the data collection processes used are introduced. Then, the data collection and analysis processes are explained, specifically, collection of documentary evidence and semi-structured interviews. Finally, this chapter concludes with an outline of how the research results are presented.

4.1 Qualitative Research

Qualitative research is an appropriate and valuable research method when attempting to understand social situations or organisational actions (Bourdieu, 1990;
Gratton & Jones, 2004; Silverman, 1995). One of the main strengths of a qualitative approach is that it focuses on “naturally occurring, ordinary events in natural settings”, which allows researchers to better understand what “real life” is like for research participants (Miles, Huberman, & Saldaña, 2014, p. 11, emphasis in original). Qualitative research is based on the idea that the people or stakeholders involved in a situation are best able to describe and explain their experiences and feelings in their own words, and that their responses should not be constrained by either the researcher or the framework of the study (Veal, 2011).

Qualitative research methods are useful in investigations of how individuals interpret, experience, and structure the social world and their social interactions (Creswell, 2013; Denzin & Lincoln, 1994). A qualitative approach was deemed suitable for this study based on the criteria identified by Veal (2011, p. 125), whereby uses of qualitative techniques are appropriate when the focus of the research is on meanings and attitudes – in this study, the focus is on the meanings and attitudes of Games stakeholders (key informants) within universities and organisations (e.g. government, OC) with regard to leveraging the Commonwealth Games; the researcher accepts that the concepts, terms, and issues must be defined by the subjects themselves and not by the researcher in advance – which transpired in this study as the key themes emerged from the data; and interaction between members of a group is of interest – such as the stakeholder management and IORs between universities and the Commonwealth Games featured in this study.

Qualitative research gives voice to people involved with the phenomenon being studied. In line with this feature of qualitative research, this research adopted and emic approach (Tracy, 2013) to address the research questions presented. Tracy (2013) defined an emic understanding to mean that “behaviour is described from the actor’s
point of view and is context specific” (p. 21). An emic approach was appropriate for this project, as key informants shared their experiences from their point of view via semi-structured interviews, describing universities’ interactions with the Commonwealth Games. Harper (2001, p. 21) argued that “a small number of well-informed informants are, in fact, a better sample than much larger samples of minimally involved subjects.” Therefore, a qualitative approach allows the researcher to collect a large quantity of rich data about relatively few cases (Veal, 2011).

The features and criteria of qualitative research reviewed by Creswell (2013), Denzin and Lincoln (1994), Miles et al. (2014), and Veal (2011) supported the use of a qualitative approach for this type of project.

However, limitations of qualitative research have received much attention. For instance, Neuman (2011) noted that in qualitative research, there are fewer “standardized procedures” (p. 193) or specific procedures compared to quantitative research. Therefore, Neuman (2011) suggested that researchers should develop rigorous protocols and techniques because qualitative data is gathered by “documenting real events, recording what actual people say (with words, gestures, and tone), observing specific behaviours, examining written documents, and studying visual images” (Neuman, 2011, p. 175). Qualitative researchers have argued that this feature of qualitative research increases its flexibility and ability to respond to dynamic research environments (Yin, 2009).

In addition, Denzin and Lincoln (1994) and Gratton and Jones (2004) suggested that limitations of qualitative research revolve around five related issues: reactivity, reflexivity, objectivity, generalisability, and the practicalities of qualitative data collection and analysis. Reactivity is the result of knowing you are being studied (Neuman, 2011). If a participant is aware he/she is being studied, he/she may behave
differently. For example, research participants may engage in impression management (Miles & Huberman, 1994), whereby their behaviour deliberately intends to influence the researcher’s perception of them. One potential cause of reactivity that I considered during the interviews was whether a participant had prior knowledge of my preliminary research findings through a conference presentation or paper prior to our interview, which could have conceivably influenced the information they provided during their interview.

In this research, there were four such instances with the Glasgow case study because I had presented preliminary research findings at the International Legacy Network Conference in Glasgow in October 2015. Several delegates in attendance had agreed to participate in my research. However, due to time constraints and participants’ schedules, four interviews were conducted post conference. During the interviews, it was acknowledged that participants were in a unique situation, as they had been exposed to the study’s findings up to that point. This limitation is therefore recognised in alignment with reactivity and impression management.

In this study, efforts to diminish reactivity involved informing all interview participants about the nature and content of the interview. Participant identification was confidential, therefore providing them the opportunity to speak more candidly. Participants were also required by Griffith University’s Ethics Committee to give informed consent if they volunteered to participate (See Appendix A for the expression of consent form). Additionally, in order to mitigate reactivity of participants, documents were collected and analysed as a form of triangulation (Miles et al., 2014).

Reflexivity or reflectivity are often used synonymously (Alvesson & Skoldberg, 2009) and require consideration of the relationship between the researcher and the participant (Veal, 2011). For instance, Reinhartz (Reinharz, 1997) argued that
researchers not only “bring the self to the field…[they also] create the self in the field” (p. 3, emphasis in original). Specifically, the researcher must recognise their role in the practice, process, and outcomes of the research (Alvesson & Sköldberg, 2009) and be aware of how they think about thinking (Maranhão, 1991).

According to Alvesson and Sköldberg (2009), reflexivity is defined as “the interpretation of interpretation and the launching of a critical self-exploration of one’s own interpretations of empirical material (including its construction)” (p. 9, emphasis in original). Guba and Lincoln (1981) noted that reflexivity is the process of the researcher critically reflecting on the self as the human instrument. Reflexivity requires the researcher to be “vigilant, always anticipating ways in which research methods and ethics may be compromised” (Galletta, 2013).

Critical self-reflection occurred throughout the PhD candidacy, specifically during data collection. After each interview was completed, I reflected on the experience to improve my data collection practice and process. As an example, during the first few interviews, I relied on my interview schedule. However, once I became more confident with my questions, I improved my note taking and was able to have more of a conversation and ask more specific or probing questions to the participants (i.e., “what have you actually done to achieve legacy thus far?”).

Veal (2011) noted that it is preferable for the researcher to be an objective observer; however, objectivity is impossible to maintain in practice in qualitative research. Researchers must make every effort to be aware and acknowledge the need to be “fair, honest, truthful, and unbiased” (Neuman, 2011, p. 168). Neuman (2011) suggested that researchers should be “highly sensitive to [their] own views, preconceptions, and prior assumptions” (p. 168) and to then set them aside in order to see beyond their own views more clearly. In order to comply with Neuman’s
suggestions, I discussed such circumstances with my supervisors throughout my PhD candidacy regarding any potential preconceptions or prior assumptions in an effort to objectively approach this research. For instance, we discussed how, as a Griffith University PhD candidate, I should not assume how Griffith University planned to engage with the Commonwealth Games. The findings needed to emerge from the data, not my views or preconceptions.

Sarantakos (1998) provided an alternate to objectivity –“empathic neutrality”, which suggested that the researcher aims to be as objective and neutral as possible, but acknowledges that complete objectivity is impossible because in qualitative research, the researcher is often the instrument (Miles et al., 2014). It is therefore more important for qualitative researchers to acknowledge their potential biases, rather than to eliminate their influence (Miles et al., 2014). Sarantakos’ (1998) work linked to the underlying philosophy of the social constructivist approach, which argues that humans create the social world, rather than discover it.

Generalisability entails the extent to which the research findings are applicable to other contexts (Veal, 2011). This project does not purport to produce generalisable findings because it is a study of three case studies. Flyvbjerg (2006, p. 228) argued, “Formal generalization is overvalued as a source of scientific development, whereas ‘the force of example’ is underestimated”. Therefore, non-generalisable studies can still be valuable. This research seeks to address a current gap in sport management knowledge as noted in Chapter Two. The findings from the three cases can make a contribution to sport management knowledge without being generalisable. The applicability of the findings is also enhanced by the use of a theoretical framework (comprising IOR literature and stakeholder theory) and is used as a “template with which to compare the empirical results of the case study” (Yin, 2009, p. 38).
Acknowledging reactivity, objectivity, and generalisability connects with the underlying philosophy of the social constructivist approach in which individuals “construct their own views of reality and the researcher seeks to discover this” (Veal, 2011, p. 31). Therefore, I acknowledge the advantages and limitations of the research paradigm selected as well as how my social constructivist philosophy influenced the study’s design and subsequently its outcomes. Advocates of qualitative research (Creswell, 2013; Denzin & Lincoln, 2005; Given, 2008; Miles & Huberman, 1994; Patton, 2002; Tracy, 2013; Veal, 2011) support the use of a theoretical framework to relieve some of the above-described limitations of qualitative research. Malterud (2001) noted that the theoretical framework “can be equated with the reading glasses worn by the researcher when she or he asks questions about the material” (p. 486). Thus, the theoretical framework for this research of stakeholder theory augmented by literature on IORs underpinned my methodological approach (see Chapter Three).

Hence, whilst qualitative research has limitations, it was considered an appropriate methodological approach in this research due to its ability to capture the perspectives of each research participant and to examine universities’ strategic involvement with three editions of the Commonwealth Games (2006, 2014, and 2018). The next section explains the strategy of enquiry employed to address the research questions.

4.2 Case Study as a Research Method

A common method to conduct qualitative field research is the case study, in which a single or small number of cases allow the researcher to capture in-depth understanding of a phenomenon and its environment (Skinner, Edwards, & Corbett, 2014, p. 130). The case study approach offers a “means of investigating complex social units consisting of multiple variables of potential importance in understanding the
phenomenon” (Merriam, 2009, p. 50). In this research, three Commonwealth Games (cases) were studied to better understand how and why universities within each host region leveraged the Games to achieve their own legacy.

A case study is “an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon in depth and within its real-life context” (Yin, 2009, p. 18). A case study research involves selection of a specific case to establish in-depth knowledge of the case and sometimes the phenomena it represents in bounded space and time (Hancock & Algozzine, 2011). Case studies can contribute to the knowledge of individual, group, organisational, social, political, and related phenomenon (Yin, 2009; 2014).

Yin (2009) described three conditions for a researcher to consider when deciding the appropriate strategy of enquiry: (a) the type of research question posed; (b) the extent of control an investigator has over actual behavioural events being investigated (e.g. universities’ strategic decisions, planning for legacy), and (c) the degree of focus on contemporary as opposed to historical events (Yin, 2009). Yin applied these conditions to five major research methods: experiments, surveys, archival analyses, histories, and case studies.

Yin (2009; 2014) classified “how” and “why” questions about a contemporary set of events over which the researcher has minimal to no control as an appropriate context for case study research. Yin (2014) also identified that case studies can focus on dynamic contemporary events. For instance, this research sought to understand how and why universities have leveraged the Commonwealth Games, which are a dynamic contemporary event. Based on Yin’s (2009) identification of relevant situations for different research methods, a case study approach was deemed the appropriate research design for this project (2009).
In order to answer the research questions posed, I employed a multiple-case study design. The next section describes case study design with a focus on a multiple-case study approach.

4.2.1 Case study design

The research design is the “logical sequence that connects the empirical data to a study’s initial research questions and, ultimately, to its conclusions” (Yin, 2009, p. 26). Yin (2009) argued that case study designs “need to maximize their quality through four critical conditions related to design quality: (a) construct validity, (b) internal validity, (c) external validity, and (d) reliability” (p. 24).

However, Denzin and Lincoln (2005) suggested that within the constructivist paradigm, the terms credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability replace the traditional positivist criteria of internal and external validity, reliability, and objectivity. Merriam (2009) argued that trustworthiness and rigour replace the traditional terminology of validity and reliability. Furthermore, Merriam (2009) explained that in order to ensure validity and reliability in qualitative research, the researcher must conduct the investigation in an ethical manner.

For the purpose of this research, Merriam’s (2009) trustworthiness and rigour were employed. In order to address trustworthiness and rigour, I paid careful attention to the conceptualisation of this research and the way the data were collected, analysed, and interpreted and the way the findings were presented, as suggested by Merriam (2009). For instance, to establish trust with participants, my communication was transparent from the initial recruitment contact, which indicated that information provided by participants was confidential and storage and dissemination of data would adhere to guidelines set forth by Griffith University Human Research Ethics Committee.
(HREC). In addition, Myer, Brann, and Rittenour (2008) suggested that in case study research, the development of a theoretical framework to guide research can increase consistency, rigour, and trust.

A case study procedure or protocol is essential for developing a multiple-case study design (Yin, 2009; 2014). The protocol should be flexible and not too constraining (Stake, 2005), aligning with a qualitative approach, which can be flexible and evolving (Veal, 2011). Flexibility is an important feature of this research, as it examined three different cases over time (Melbourne 2006, Glasgow 2014, and Gold Coast 2018). The case study protocol contributed towards increasing the research’s rigour and was “intended to guide the investigator in carrying out the case study” (Yin, 1994, p. 63).

The following sections explain the features of multiple-case study research and why this strategy of inquiry was adopted. The next sections also identify and respond to the limitations of case study research.

4.2.2 Multiple-case study approach

Evidence from multiple-case studies is generally considered more compelling and persuasive than using a single case (Baxter & Jack, 2008; Herriott & Firestone, 1983; Skinner et al., 2014). When using a multiple-case study approach, the selection of cases “either (a) predicts similar results (a literal replication) or (b) predicts contrasting results but for anticipatable reasons (a theoretical replication)” (Yin, 2009, p. 54). In this research, theoretical replication whereby different results are likely for theoretical reasons (Yin, 2009, p. 93) was expected because of the different stakeholders involved within each case study.
Qualitative case studies are distinguished by the size of the bounded case, for instance, whether the case involves one individual, several individuals, a group, an entire institution, or an activity or program (Creswell, 2013). Stake (1995) identified three types of case study that vary in terms of intent of analysis: intrinsic, instrumental, and collective. He defined intrinsic case studies as studies conducted for the singular purpose of obtaining better insight into a specific case, for instance, evaluating a program or evaluating a student facing a difficulty.

Instrumental case studies focus on an issue or concern, and then one bounded case is used to illustrate that issue (Creswell, 2013). Refinement of theory can also take place within instrumental case studies (Stake, 2005), for instance, the use of stakeholder theory and IOR to better understand how universities have leveraged the Commonwealth Games. Finally, Stake (2005) described collective case studies as instrumental studies extended to several cases, i.e. multiple cases.

In multiple-case studies, the researcher purposively chooses multiple cases to demonstrate different perspectives on the issue. For instance, the perspective of Games stakeholders in Melbourne varied from the Games stakeholders in Glasgow and Gold Coast for several reasons, including geographical context, time, and strategic agendas. Multiple-case study design uses the logic of replication, in which the researcher replicates the procedures for each case (Yin, 2009). For example, this research utilised the same guideline for questions for each participant in each case study. However, as previously discussed, this does not imply that the findings of case study research are generalisable, as the contexts of the cases differ (Creswell, 2013).

For this research, I purposefully chose three cases based on the understanding that they would provide multiple perspectives on the phenomenon under investigation. My approach was to select the Commonwealth Games as “cases”, rather than specific
university–Games relationships. Further, universities were regarded as a stakeholder group, rather than a focus on each university. In-depth analysis of each case is provided in Chapter Five. In addition, using multiple cases enabled a comparison between cases or “cross case analysis” (Yin, 2009), presented in Chapter Six.

4.2.3 Managing multiple-case studies

Case study research can yield an enormous volume of data; therefore, Eisenhardt (1989, 2002) suggested that within-case analysis is imperative as an initial step in analysis. Following Eisenhardt’s recommendations, within-case analysis, that is, separate, descriptive write-ups of results for each case are presented in Chapter Five. Once the researcher completes the within-case analysis, cross-case patterns can be explored (Eisenhardt, 2002) (See Chapter Six).

One recommended way to conduct cross-case analysis is to use relevant categories or themes and examine similarities and differences across cases (Patton, 2002). The researcher can identify key themes from the research questions, interview protocol, and reviewed literature. Eisenhardt suggested that in order to identify distinctions in the data, it is useful to search for differences between seemingly similar cases. For example, both Melbourne 2006 and Gold Coast 2018 are within the Australian context. Another way to identify distinctions in the data is to search for similarities between seemingly different cases (Eisenhardt, 2002), such as Glasgow 2014 and Gold Coast 2018. Thus, this research adopted Eisenhardt’s (2002) recommendations to manage multiple-case studies.

I first considered each of the three cases separately in order to achieve an in-depth understanding of interactions between universities in each city and the Commonwealth Games. Through this process, I produced descriptive case notes, which
form the basis of the material presented in Chapter Five. Then, I compared each case and presented the results in Chapter Six.

This section provided a justification for the use of a multiple-case study approach in this research. The next section considers the limitations and misunderstandings of using case study as a research method.

4.2.4 Limitations and misunderstandings of case study research

There are several limitations to case study research (Baxter & Jack, 2008; Flyvbjerg, 2006; Yin 2009, 2014). For instance, qualitative case study research can be time consuming and expensive to conduct (Baxter & Jack, 2008). In addition, researchers must be cautious of collecting an overwhelming amount of data that will require management and analysis (Baxter & Jack, 2008) as well as not collecting enough data (Yin, 2009). At the beginning of my PhD candidature, I proposed examining four case studies (including Manchester 2002 Commonwealth Games); however, based on the above suggestions regarding limitations of case study research and the quantity of data collected by September 2015 for the current three case studies, my supervisors and I decided to delimit and focus on three case studies only.

Further criticism of case study research is the belief that the method maintains a bias towards verification, meaning that there is a tendency to confirm the researcher’s preconceived ideas, making the study less empirically valuable (Flyvbjerg, 2006). Flyvbjerg (2006) also noted that case studies may be perceived as “less rigorous” (p. 234) compared to quantitative methods. In response, he argued that a case study approach has its own rigour because it has the advantage of being able to “close-in” on “real-life situations and test views directly in relation to phenomena as they unfold in practice” (Flyvbjerg, 2006, p. 235). The limitations of case study research noted by
Flyvbjerg contributed to my decision to use a multiple-case study approach, in an effort to make the study more rigorous.

While the limitations of case study as a research approach are acknowledged, it was deemed an appropriate method for this thesis based on the arguments of Flyvbjerg (2006), Stake (2005), and Yin (2003, 2009, 2014). Based on the advantages of using case study research as a strategy for enquiry, this project employed a case study method. The next section explains the selection of each case for this research.

4.3 Case Selection

In case study research, the researcher first identifies the phenomenon of interest and then selects one or more cases for rigorous examination (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2007; Yin, 2009). A purposeful case selection “can best inform the researcher about the research problem under examination” (Creswell, 2013, p. 147), which is why three cases were purposively selected. Case selection was based on criteria including geographic location; accessibility (Yin, 2009); awareness of university interest or involvement with the Commonwealth Games stakeholders; and university research of the Games. Each criterion was identified during PhD supervisor meetings and was based on a realistic timeframe, financial constraints of travel and data collection, and the level of accessibility to key informants. Therefore, I purposively identified and selected Melbourne 2006, Glasgow 2014, and Gold Coast 2018 Commonwealth Games for this research. The next section explains in greater detail why each of these Games was included.

4.3.1 Melbourne 2006 selection criteria

I included Melbourne 2006 for five key reasons. First, according to the documents collected, legacy initiatives for the Melbourne case had increased from the
previous Commonwealth Games held in Manchester 2002, justifying further exploration of how other Games stakeholders, such as universities were involved with legacy. Second, Deakin University in Melbourne hosted the 20th annual Sport Management Association of Australia and New Zealand (SMAANZ) conference, which created an opportunity for me to network with stakeholders of the 2006 Games and conduct interviews with many key informants in one location. The conference contributed to snowballing (Gall et al., 2007, p. 185) of interviewees, as I was often immediately introduced to another informant after an interview was conducted. Third, the 2006 Games were held in Australia, the country where I lived when I began my PhD studies, and it is only a two and a half hour flight from the Gold Coast (the city in which I lived), making it time and cost effective to travel for data collection. Fourth, my supervisors have extensive networks in Melbourne and provided contacts to potential informants. Finally, it is the most recent Games to take place in Australia, providing a similar context for comparing and contrasting the Gold Coast case.

4.3.2 Glasgow 2014

I included Glasgow 2014 for four key reasons. First, it is the most recent Commonwealth Games to occur. Second, Games-related websites and documents suggested that legacy initiatives were embedded in the Glasgow bid and within the OC, increasing the importance of legacy to the Games. In addition, these documents also suggested that universities would have an official relationship with the Games. Second, Scotland is culturally similar to Australia with regard to customs, economy, and language, however, with an element of difference, as it is in the context of the UK.

Third, as part of my PhD professional development program, I planned to present a paper and travel to the European Association of Sport Management (EASM) conference in Dublin, Ireland. Therefore, a one-hour flight from Dublin to Glasgow
after the conference was a time and cost efficient way to collect data. Lastly, the first trip to Glasgow unearthed more potential interviewees. I was able to organise a second trip to Glasgow because Policy Scotland invited and funded me to present my preliminary research results at the First International Legacy Network Conference in Glasgow. By the time of the second trip to Scotland (October 2015), I was based in London; therefore, travelling to Glasgow was time and cost efficient. At the Policy Scotland legacy conference, I was able to conduct more interviews with key informants, which also snowballed into additional interviews.

4.3.3 Gold Coast 2018

I included Gold Coast 2018 because I was based in the Gold Coast for five years, and I am a PhD candidate at one of the universities in the host region. As an insider, I was able to gain access to key informants within my own university; however, I was aware that other universities in the region could perceive me as a threat or someone with whom they would not want to share their university’s strategic plans. I worked to overcome any uneasiness that participants felt about providing sensitive information by developing a rapport with them and building trust. I ensured that the information they provided was for research purposes only, confidential, and I would not share it with their competitors (other universities).

At the time of case selection (August 2013), Griffith University did not have any formal partnerships or associations with the Commonwealth Games. However, since this research has commenced and post interview data collection, Griffith University has become an official partner of the Commonwealth Games (as of 6 October 2015). At the time of interview data collection this relationship was still considered a commercial in confidence arrangement. Whilst interviewees alluded to these negotiations much of the interview data does not acknowledge the official partnership. Although there was a
change in Griffith University’s relationship with the 2018 Games my interview data collection took place prior to the official partnership announcement. This partnership marks the first time that a university has been an official partner of the Commonwealth Games. The official partnership contributes to the justification that further research is needed regarding the university–Commonwealth Games relationship in order to inform future universities in host regions about potential opportunities of maximising collaboration and strategies to achieve legacy.

4.3.4 Identification of universities within each case

Once the three cases were selected, I then identified universities within each host city and more specifically, key informants within those universities, to participate. First, I used Google’s search engine to explore key terms such as “Commonwealth Games” and “university” or “universities”. This search was then refined to specific Commonwealth Games (e.g. “Melbourne 2006”) plus the search terms “university” or “universities” to target specific universities involved. Using Google maps, I plotted where each of the three Games were located and identified all the universities in the city (see Appendix B).

Then, I conducted a more refined search using Google and Google Scholar to search for specific universities and any mention of Commonwealth Games (e.g. “University of Glasgow” and “Glasgow 2014 Commonwealth Games”). Next I visited the website for each of the universities initially identified. In the search engine of each university’s website, I searched for “Commonwealth Games” followed by the specific Commonwealth Games hosted in the city (e.g. “Glasgow 2014”) to try and find press releases or articles within university archives involving that specific university and the relevant Games.
After discussions with my supervisors about how best to organise the information, I categorised universities in each Games case based on criteria including university involvement with the Commonwealth Games OC; university involvement with other Games stakeholders, such as local government; university directed research on the Commonwealth Games; and university involvement with legacies of the Commonwealth Games. Based on these criteria, I created an excel spreadsheet of the search results and documents collected and identified 135 potential participants, whom I subsequently contacted to request their participation in my study.

The within and cross-case relationships analysed are displayed in Figure 4 below. Although the universities in each case had similarities, some differences were also found to be considered, including proximity to the Games Village (or competition sites); size of faculty/student body; research agendas; programs offered; and the universities’ strategic objectives. The similarities and differences underpinned the importance of conducting within case analysis (i.e. universities associated with the 2006 Melbourne Games), and these results are presented in Chapter Five.
Figure 4: Schema of case relationships examined in this research

The cross-case analysis provided understanding of each university’s strategy related to the Commonwealth Games and determined if there was a common strategy between the universities or if their strategies varied and why. The next section outlines data collection and sources of evidence collected for this research.

4.4 Data Collection

This research employed two approaches for data collection: documentary evidence and semi-structured interviews. For case study research, Yin (2009) suggested predominant principles for data collection that can increase the quality of the study and contribute towards establishing the construct validity and reliability of the case study evidence. Yin’s (2014) principles included (a) use of multiple sources of evidence; (b) creation of a case study database; (c) developing a chain of evidence, entailing explicit links among the questions asked, the data collected, and the conclusions drawn; and (d) exercising care in using sources from electronic sources of evidence (p. 105). Stake (2005) noted that the methods the researcher actually uses in each case may be slightly different, depending on accessibility. However, for this research, Yin’s (2014) principles guided the data collection process because I used multiple sources of evidence, created a case study database, and was cautious of using online sources as evidence.

Baxter and Jack (2008) and Yin (2014) identified six potential data sources for case study evidence: documents, archival records, interviews, physical artefacts, direct observation, and participant observation. Stake (2005) identified observation, interview, coding, data management, and interpretation as sources of evidence. Yin (2014) argued that the most important advantage of using multiple sources of evidence is the
“development of *converging lines of inquiry*” (p. 120, emphasis in original), which is the process of triangulation. By using multiple sources of information, case study findings are “likely to be more convincing and accurate” (Yin, 2014, p. 120), which is why I used two sources of data collection.

Triangulation creates “assurance” that key findings are supported by the data gathered (Stake, 2005). Paton (2002) noted four types of triangulation: the triangulation of (a) data sources (data triangulation); (b) different evaluators (investigator triangulation); (c) perspectives to the same data set (theory triangulation); and (d) methods (methodological triangulation). For the purpose of this multiple-case study research, documents and semi-structured interviews were used as sources of evidence. The next section outlines the two types of data sources used in this research and how I collected each type.

### 4.5 Case Study Evidence Used

#### 4.5.1 Documents

Documentary evidence is an inherent part of most qualitative case studies and may include memoranda, e-mail correspondence, diaries, notes, agendas, administrative documents, formal studies or evaluations, newspaper articles, and other articles appearing in the mass media (Yin, 2009; 2014). There are many advantages of using documentary evidence. First, it is an unobtrusive data collection method (Gratton & Jones, 2004; Punch, 2005), in that researchers can access documents online without assistance from participants.

In addition, accessing documentary data can also be simple and cost effective (Hodden, 2000), especially when documents are available via the internet (Yin, 2009). Documents are also stable, specific, broad, and precise and can contain names,
references, and details of an event (Creswell, 2003; Yin, 2009; 2014). Documents are unchanging since they have been published, and the researcher can review the material repeatedly.

Documents provide broad coverage over a long span of time, over many events, and over many settings (Yin, 2009) and can be an insightful source of historical information (Hodden, 2000). Yin (2009) noted that gathering documentary evidence can help prepare researchers for field visits and assist the researcher to “obtain the language” (Creswell, 2003, p. 187) of participants.

In this research, some documents were used during interviews to probe participants about their university’s involvement. For instance, for the Melbourne and Glasgow cases’ press releases that I found online suggesting a university-Games involvement were presented to interviewees to probe for more information. Finally, use of documents can be important in data triangulation (Punch, 2005), especially since one of the cases in this research (Melbourne 2006) took place over 10 years ago and some participants did not recall certain events that were documented online and had been archived in the university’s website. The use of documents assisted with decreasing interviewees’ “memory lapses” (Parent & Deephouse, 2007, p. 9), as participants could reflect on the documents and events that had transpired.

Document analysis is not without limitations, which include the level of retrievability, making the particular document difficult to find or re-find. Further, documents that can be found online may have website links that can be taken down or removed at any time by the website administrator. In this research, information from some of the Melbourne 2006 websites had been removed due to the Games taking place over 10 years ago. Therefore, all online documents were saved in a portable document format (PDF) at the time of collection in order to review the material repeatedly.
Other limitations can include biased selectivity, if collection is incomplete; reporting bias, reflecting the bias of the author or the desire to craft a message for a particular audience; and issues with access, as some documents may be deliberately withheld (Yin, 2009), such as meeting minutes and preliminary strategic plans. Building the trust of the interviewees was invaluable to this research because several participants provided me with internal strategic plans and meeting minutes that were not publicly available. Yin (1994) also stressed the importance for the researcher to be aware of the validity of a document and stated that “for case studies, the most important use of documents is to corroborate and augment evidence from other sources” (p. 81). Therefore, in order to corroborate and triangulate the documentary evidence, this research employed semi-structured interviews with key informants from each case.

4.5.2 Collection process of documentary evidence

I collected documentary evidence from August 2013 to December 2015. I began by gathering documents related to the Commonwealth Games and universities within the three Commonwealth Games host cities. Online documents were saved as a PDF, then subsequently uploaded into NVivo10 software. Using NVivo10 allowed me to import and manage documents that I had saved in “rich text format” (Saldaña, 2013). I coded each piece of data collected; the coding process is detailed later in this chapter in section X.

The type of documentary data collected included e-mail correspondence, administrative documents (proposals, progress reports, and other internal documents), online newspaper articles, other articles appearing in the mass media, and memoranda, which are summarised in Table 6 below. A complete list of documents (N = 145) collected is in Appendix C. These types of documents allowed an understanding of the level of involvement between universities and Commonwealth Games and identified
potential participants for this research. Documentary evidence contributed towards identifying potential university relationships with Commonwealth Games OCs and other Games stakeholders. In this research, documentary evidence was thematically analysed and supported the development, interpretation, and verification of data collected via semi-structured interviews.
Table 6: Types of documents used in this research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document type</th>
<th>Melbourne</th>
<th>Glasgow</th>
<th>Gold Coast</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E-mail correspondence</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online newspaper articles</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other articles appearing in the mass media</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memoranda</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5.3 Semi-structured interviews

Interviews are a common strategy for collecting qualitative data (DiCicco-Bloom & Crabtree, 2006). The purpose of an interview is to obtain an explanation or a description of an episode, or a relationship from a participant (Stake, 1995). According to Patton (2002), interviews allow a researcher to understand information from another person’s perspective. Semi-structured interviews are appropriate for the “exploration of the perceptions and opinions of respondents regarding complex and sometimes sensitive issues and enable probing for more information and clarification of answers” (Barriball & While, 1994, p. 330).

For instance, in the Gold Coast case, there were sensitive issues surrounding the official partnership between Griffith University and Gold Coast 2018 Commonwealth Games. However, because of the nature of interviews and the ability to build trust with participants, I was able to determine subtle cues and probe for more information, when appropriate. Specifically, once trust had been established, interviewees became more comfortable with discussing the effectiveness of university Commonwealth Games committees.
The interview is one of the most important sources for case study information (Yin, 1994; 2014) and should be a guided conversation as opposed to a structured query (Yin, 2009). Interviews for this research allowed for an in-depth understanding of the participants’ experiences and their perceptions of how their university leveraged the Commonwealth Games to achieve legacy or how their organisation engaged with universities because of the Commonwealth Games. Semi-structured interviews (Gillham, 2000) were utilised to allow for multiple participant meanings to develop, as each participant had their own beliefs. In addition, as I progressed through the interview process, engaged in reflexivity, and improved my skills as a qualitative researcher, interviews were similar to what DiCicco-Bloom and Crabtree (2006, p. 315) described as a “guided conversation”, rather than a structured query.

There are many strengths of using interviews as evidence for case study research. For instance, interviews allow researchers to target and focus directly on case study topics, and they can provide perceived causal inferences and rich explanations from participants (Gillham, 2000; Yin, 2009). Alternatively, weaknesses of using interviews as evidence for case study research include potential for bias, due to poorly articulated questions, the interviewer’s identity, experiences, and understandings; inaccuracies, due to poor recall; and the interviewees may provide information they believe the interviewer wants to hear (Yin, 2009). To counteract these limitations, documents were used as sources for triangulation. For instance, in the Glasgow case, some interviewees did not recall the Game Changer Awards, an initiative that involved several universities and colleges in Scotland. However, the use of Game Changer Award documents aided in interviewees’ recall of the programme.

Semi-structured interviews were conducted with a purposeful sample (Creswell, 2013; Merriam, 2009) of identified experts who agreed to participate in this research.
Participants included stakeholders from selected universities who had a role in initiating and/or implementing engagement with the Commonwealth Games, as well as stakeholders from the CGF, Commonwealth Games OCs, and local government.

Initial contact with potential informants was made via email or telephone in order to gauge interest in participation in the research project. I obtained initial contact details from my supervisors, university websites, and Commonwealth Games websites. All potential participants received informed consent documents via email in accordance with the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Research Involving Humans, guiding the ethical clearance of this project (see Appendix D). I identified additional participants through document analysis and through snowballing.

My research supervisors and I developed an interview guide, informed by stakeholder theory and IOR literature, which contained specific questions for all participants (see Appendix E). The guide included open-ended questions, and probing questions based on topics or areas of interest that required elaboration were used as needed (Merriam, 2009). For example, the guide asked participants to discuss any benefits, challenges, or pressures experienced in their own contexts. Examples of lines of questioning included the following: How the participant would describe how the Commonwealth Games affected their strategic planning/role at the university? How their university engaged with the Commonwealth Games? I then asked interviewees to describe what efforts they took individually to leverage the Games to achieve a university legacy; this was followed by asking the interviewees about the potential they could envision for how universities could leverage the Games to generate legacy.

I sought permission from participants to audiotape interviews and subsequently transcribed each interview verbatim. I concluded each interview with a request for a follow-up interview if needed; for clarification, none were needed. Using interview
information, it was possible to triangulate the data and identify any discrepancies across sources collected. For example, documentary evidence collected in Melbourne indicated formal university-Games engagement. However, interviewees from the Melbourne case suggested that any engagement was informal and that the media exaggerated the involvement of universities in the 2006 Games.

### 4.5.4 Sample selection and recruitment

Table 7 below presents all participants’ association (e.g. university, OC, government, etc.) from each case. Table 8 illustrates the organisations in which participants were involved within each case. Fewer interviews were conducted in the Glasgow case compared to the Melbourne and Gold Coast cases, possibly because of the timeframe of my visits to Glasgow, which were approximately one-week long each time. In addition, potential participants were scheduled to attend the legacy conference in Glasgow; however, interest in the conference declined and was almost cancelled, resulting in low attendance and less key informants available to interview.

**Table 7: Key informants interviewed**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informant’s Association</th>
<th>Melbourne</th>
<th>Glasgow</th>
<th>Gold Coast</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commonwealth Games (Federation, Association, or Organising Committee)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government (City Council)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other games stakeholders (third party organisations, student volunteers/staff)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8: Universities and stakeholder organisations with which respondents are associated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Universities</th>
<th>Melbourne 2006</th>
<th>Glasgow 2014</th>
<th>Gold Coast 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deakin University</td>
<td>University of Glasgow</td>
<td>Bond University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>La Trobe University</td>
<td>University of Strathclyde</td>
<td>Griffith University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Melbourne</td>
<td>Glasgow Caledonian University</td>
<td>Southern Cross University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victoria University</td>
<td>University of the West of Scotland</td>
<td>University of Queensland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Stirling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>University of St Andrews</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Games Stakeholder Organisations</th>
<th>Melbourne 2006</th>
<th>Glasgow 2014</th>
<th>Gold Coast 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M2006 Organising Committee</td>
<td>Glasgow 2014 Organising Committee</td>
<td>Gold Coast Organising Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commonwealth Games Federation</td>
<td>Glasgow City Council</td>
<td>Gold Coast City Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Glasgow Life</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lead 2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5.5 Interview process

Each interview was conducted at a time and location nominated by the research participant. Of the 60 interviews conducted, 47 were conducted face-to-face, five were conducted over the phone, and eight were conducted via Skype. The phone and Skype interviews were required because the informants were either not present at the same time I was on a site visit, or the snowballing technique did not lead me to those informants until after the site visit ended. Face-to-face interviews were the preferred method in order to better establish trust, build rapport, and identify non-verbal cues (Stewart & Cash, 1994).
Although interviews can be conducted face-to-face or via mail, email, or telephone (Fontana & Frey, 2000), there are limitations to phone and Skype interviews. For instance, with phone interviews, the interviewer may miss out on visual cues that may aid in establishing rapport and responses may be misinterpreted (Creswell, 2003). With regard to interviewing via Skype, there can be issues with sound quality, microphones, webcam malfunctions, and sometimes, a lag in the live feed (Sullivan, 2013). However, according to Sullivan (2013), the benefits of using Skype as a method of data collection outweigh the limitations. For example, Sullivan (2013) argued that Skype “mimics face-to-face interactions, including the presentation of self in an authentic way, almost as well as those face-to-face exchanges” (p. 56). Therefore, regardless of these limitations, it is still possible to gather insightful information and to probe and request clarification if a response is not clear (Jennings, 2001).

Interviews were conducted over a one-year period, November 2014 – November 2015. Throughout the interview process, I transcribed each interview verbatim using Transcribe, an online transcription tool, which offers an audio player that is closely integrated with a text editor on the same screen. Once each interview was transcribed, the audio file was deleted in accordance with Griffith University HREC. Then, I exported the transcript to a Microsoft Word document and subsequently uploaded it to NVivo10 for coding.

4.6 Ethical Clearance

As previously mentioned throughout this chapter, this research followed the guidelines from the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Research Involving Humans. In August 2014, prior to gathering interview data, I sought ethical clearance through Griffith University’s Office of Research. Case study research requires the
researcher to follow ethical practices in order to protect participants, and hence, Yin (2009, p. 73) identified that special care and sensitivity involves

- gaining informed consent from all people who may be a part of the case study, by alerting them to the nature of the case study and formally soliciting their volunteerism in participating in the study;
- protecting those who participate in the study from harm, including avoiding the use of any deception in the study;
- protecting the privacy and confidentiality of those who participate so that, as a result of their participation, they will not be unwillingly put in any undesirable position; and
- taking special precautions that might be needed to protect especially vulnerable groups.

In accordance with Griffith University HREC guidelines, I first developed a detailed information sheet and provided it to all the potential participants in the initial contact email. The information sheet (a) explained the nature of involvement in the research; (b) stressed the voluntary nature of participation; (c) addressed the issues of anonymity and confidentiality; and (d) explained the use and dissemination of the data. In accordance with HREC guidelines, I did not pressure participants to disclose information that they felt could jeopardise their position or reputation.

Additionally, prior to commencing each interview, I reviewed the information sheet with participants and requested that they sign an expression of consent form in accordance with HREC. The expression of consent form confirmed that the participants (a) have read and understood the information sheet; (b) agreed to their interview being audio recorded; (c) are allowed to ask any questions to me they wanted for clarification of the study; (d) were aware that they could withdraw at any point during the interview;
and (c) agreed to participate in the study. A full copy of the information sheet is provided in Appendix F.

4.7 Data Analysis

Data were analysed on two levels: within- and cross-case. First, documents and interviews were inductively coded, as described further in this section. Then, within- and cross-case analyses were conducted. The next section provides information about qualitative data analysis, followed by each stage of coding.

4.7.1 Qualitative data analysis

Qualitative data analysis allows the researcher to “improve understanding, expand theory, and advance knowledge” (Neuman, 2011, p. 507). Data analysis in qualitative research involves gathering and organising data, then “reducing the data into themes through a process of coding and condensing the codes, and finally representing the data in figures, tables, or a discussion” (Creswell, 2013, p. 180). In qualitative research, the researcher organises the raw data into conceptual categories to create themes or concepts (Neuman, 2011). Coding data consists of categorising data into meaningful sections and assigning names or a code to the sections (Creswell, 2013; Neuman, 2011).

Miles and Huberman (1994) described codes as tags or labels for assigning units of meaning to the descriptive or inferential information compiled during a study. Codes usually are attached to “chunks” of varying size – words, phrases, sentences or whole paragraphs, connected or unconnected to a specific setting (p. 56).

Saldaña (2015) noted that the nature of coding suggests that qualitative analysis is “cyclical rather than linear” (Ch. 3, para. 2). The first cycle of coding is rarely perfect and a second, third, fourth, and potentially more cycles are required to further manage, filter, and highlight the essential features of the qualitative data record to create
categories, themes, and concepts (Miles et al., 2014). Miles et al. (2014) stated that “coding is analysis” (p. 72, emphasis in original).

Strauss (1987) identified three successive stages of coding: open, axial, and selective. Both Saldaña (2009; 2015) and Strauss’ (1987) processes for analysing qualitative data guided the data analysis for this research. Figure 5 below illustrates the cycles of coding that occurred (see Appendix G for detailed cycles of coding) and the next sections provide further detail about each of the cycles and how they were used in this research.

Figure 5: Four cycles of coding for this research
Source: Adapted from Saldaña (2013, 2015)

4.7.2 Cycle one coding

In the first cycle of coding, large quantities of raw qualitative data are labelled. Open coding involves meticulously examining field notes, interviews, transcripts, and other documents with the aim to identify concepts that are applicable to the data
(Strauss, 1987). During cycle one coding, the portion of data to be coded can range from a single word, full sentences, or an entire page of a document (Saldaña, 2009). Within cycle one coding, Saldaña (2009) suggested utilising a combination of the following four approaches. The first is attribute coding (for all data as a management technique); structural coding or holistic coding (for all data as a “grand tour” overview); descriptive coding (for field notes, documents, and artefacts as a detailed inventory of either contents); and, in vivo coding, initial coding, and/or values coding (for interview transcripts as a method of attuning yourself to participant language, perspectives, and worldviews) (p. 48).

When open coding, names, categories, and themes are derived from the data (Neuman, 2011). The themes can develop from the initial research questions, concepts within the relevant literature (e.g. IOR and stakeholder management), and words or phrases used by interviewees (Neuman, 2011). New thoughts or ideas can also emerge from involvement with the data (Neuman, 2011). The documents and interview transcripts were read in detail, and people, key events, terms, and phrases were documented. The first cycle of coding produced 65 open codes (see Appendix G for detailed list of four cycles of coding). As an example of first cycle coding, “challenges that stakeholders experience in trying to leverage the Games” was coded to material that related to challenges with external communication and/or establishing trust/rapport.

**4.7.3 Cycle two coding**

Cycle two coding is more focused; it reviews cycle one coding and further refines and categorises the data. The portions of data coded can be the exact same units as in the first level, or longer passages of text and even a reorganisation of the initial codes developed thus far. Abbott (2004) compared second cycle coding to “decorating a room; you try it, step back, move a few things, step back again, try serious
reorganization, and so on” (p. 101). Within cycle two, Saldaña (2015) suggested utilising pattern coding and/or focused coding in order to create categories for the coded data as an initial analytic strategy. According to Hatch (2002), a pattern can be characterised by: similarity (things happen the same way); difference (they happen in predictably different ways); frequency (they happen often or seldom); sequence (they happen in a certain order); correspondence (they happen in relation to other activities or events); and causation (one appears to cause another) (p. 155).

During the coding process, I regularly met with my supervisors and discussed my rationale behind the initial 65 codes that emerged during first cycle coding. The 65 codes were then clustered together into sub-categories strategically to identify relationships among those open codes. These 65 codes were grouped, merged, and tiered to create 34 manageable second cycle codes. For example, first cycle codes “professional development”; “Games-focused research output”; “career development”; and “secondment” were refined into second cycle codes “staff opportunities and impact”.

4.7.4 Cycle three coding

In cycle three coding, axial and thematic coding takes place, whereby the researcher examines previously established codes to develop highly refined themes. Strauss (1987) suggested that axial coding involves intensive analysis around one category at a time: it revolves around the “axis” (p. 32) of one category. Axial coding begins with an established set of initial codes or preliminary concepts (Neuman, 2011).
The researcher should note additional codes or new ideas; however, the focus is on organising ideas or themes identified through the open coding process and identifying the axis of key concepts in analysis (Neuman, 2011).

The 34 second cycle codes were then further refined to identify relationships among second cycle codes. For instance, “employee morale”; “inclusion/exclusion of staff”; “boys’ club mentality”; “personal agendas and influence”; “hoarding information”; and “executive support” created the axial code “organisational politics and culture”. The 34 second cycle codes were grouped, merged, and tiered to create a manageable list of seven axial codes (third cycle codes).

4.7.5 Cycle four coding

The fourth cycle of coding involved selective coding, which occurred after the major themes and concepts were identified in open and axial coding. The selective coding process involves “coding systematically and concertedly for the core category” (Strauss, 1987, p. 33). Till the selective coding phase, the majority of data has been collected, and the researcher scans all the data and previous codes and looks selectively for cases that demonstrate themes to be able to make comparisons (Neuman, 2011). During selective coding, the data were revisited to find supporting data, and the researcher should identify the major themes in the data (Neuman, 2011). Selective coding elaborates on the central themes, giving a deeper understanding of the data. All the data were searched for explicit examples to describe the central themes, and the seven axial codes were reduced to three selective themes (See Chapters Five and Six). For example, the axial codes “desired and/or achieved legacies” and “missed opportunities” were refined to form the major theme “intended and unintended legacies”.
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In order to establish reliability and credibility in the qualitative data analysis process, my research supervisors, who are familiar with the literature, reviewed the themes and their definitions after each cycle of coding. My supervisors likened the coding process to coding a chair, a desk, or a lamp in an office, however, to further refine these codes into “office furniture”. This analogy and subsequent discussion produced some hilarity, but facilitated clarity in my own coding procedure and enabled development of refined themes.

4.7.6 Data coding tool

Using the qualitative data analysis software, NVivo10, facilitated my analysis of the data. NVivo10 assisted to manage the data and ideas, query data, visualise data, and report from the data (Bazeley & Jackson, 2013). NVivo10 allows the researcher to assign written data to themes during open coding, which assists in building evidence for each theme. Once I coded all 60 interviews and 145 documents according to the themes, I carefully reviewed and then further analysed the data for relationships and linkages between the various cycles of coding. During cycle three coding, NVivo10 aided me by facilitating recognition of connections among themes, which helped in identifying emerging themes as well as organising data on how and why processes and relationships interact (Gibbs, 2002). Finally, NVivo10 enabled me to efficiently access exemplary data to aid selective coding.

It is acknowledged that there are some concerns with using computerised qualitative data analysis tools. For instance, Bazeley and Jackson (2013) identified four common issues:

- The concern that computers can distance researchers from their data;
- The dominance of code-and-retrieve methods to the exclusion of other
analytic activities;

- The fear that use of a computer will mechanise analysis, making it more akin to quantitative or positivist approaches; and

- The misperceptions that computers support only grounded theory methodology, or worse, create their own approach to analysis.

These concerns were discussed with my supervisors and were overcome by acknowledging these issues, continuously re-reading the documents and transcripts throughout the data analysis process, and engaging in manual coding exercises with interview transcripts.

**4.7.7 Reporting of results**

Figure 6 below outlines how the results are presented in this thesis. Chapter Five will present the within-case results, and Chapter Six will present the cross-case results and discussion. Chapter Seven will provide a conclusion for the overall research findings.
4.8 Research Limitations

A range of research limitations were encountered during this project, as noted throughout this chapter. In addition to the time permitted to complete a PhD on scholarship being three and a half years, budgetary constraints associated with this research impeded upon the collection of data, in terms of the locations (Melbourne, Glasgow, Gold Coast) and the number of universities selected for investigation. For example, I initially included Manchester 2002 as a case study for the final thesis; however, due to time constraints, the potential for poor recall by participants (as the
Games were 15 years ago), and quantity of data collected by September 2015, my PhD supervisors and I decided to delimit and examine three case studies only.

Yin (2009) noted that case study research can be difficult due to the amount of time required to collect and analyse qualitative data. For this reason, as the research progressed, my supervisors and I met regularly to monitor the number of case studies selected and data collected. Continual referral to the research objectives was instrumental in minimising any difficulties associated with time and/or data management. In addition, Lincoln and Guba (1985) identified four criteria to determine when it is appropriate to end data collection: exhaustion of resources; saturation of categories; emergence of regularities; and overextension. Based on Lincoln and Guba’s (1985) criteria, I completed data collection because the resources were exhausted (time and scholarship), data saturation had been reached, and there was an emergence of regularities.

For example, by October 2015, I had achieved within-case data saturation, where the classifications used to code data were definitively established (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Strauss & Corbin, 1998). Further, the emergence of regularities was also apparent by this time, whereby I encountered sufficient consistencies in the data that indicated whether the phenomena represented by each construct occurred regularly or only occasionally (e.g. missed opportunity) (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

Participants selected from each case were willing to discuss their role as a stakeholder and the IORs they perceived with the Commonwealth Games; however, it is acknowledged that interviewees may have forgotten or inaccurately recalled some details (i.e. Commonwealth Games timeframe spans from pre-2006 – present), or withheld for personal or strategic reasons.
4.9 Chapter Conclusion

This chapter outlined the methodology adopted to address the two research questions posed for this study. It began by outlining the features of qualitative research and discussed how these features are appropriate for fulfilling the objectives of this study. It then described case study research and explained the choice of case study as the strategy of enquiry for investigating how and why universities have leveraged Commonwealth Games for their own legacy. It explained why the research employs a multiple-case study design. An explanation was provided for the choice of the two forms of qualitative data collected: documentary evidence and semi-structured interviews. Finally, the chapter concluded with information on the data analysis process to meaningfully reduce and interpret the data. The next chapter discusses each case study in depth.
Chapter 5: Within-Case Results

This chapter presents contextual findings on the origin, evolution, and unique features of university-Commonwealth Games interaction during the Melbourne 2006 Commonwealth Games, Glasgow 2014 Commonwealth Games, and upcoming Gold Coast 2018 Commonwealth Games. The descriptive findings presented in this chapter are the result of what Eisenhardt (2002) described as within-case analysis (see Chapter 4). The within-case analysis involved separately analysing data related to each of the three cases in this research. Within-case results are important for understanding the contextual background and for producing the cross-case analysis (Eisenhardt, 2002), presented in the next chapter, Chapter Six.

The within-case analysis drew on both documentary and interview data. Interviews with key informants were the dominant source of information on the background and evolution of university–Commonwealth Games engagement within each case because the interviewees were able to provide rich insights into the subject as well as on the information that was not publicly available.

To preserve confidentiality, in line with Griffith University ethics approval, information provided by the interviewees was referenced using a numerical system based on the type of organisation the interviewee is associated with within each case (see Table 9). For example, respondents from the Melbourne Commonwealth Games are referred to as MCG1, MCG2, etc. This protocol is adhered to in subsequent chapters. Direct quotes are used when appropriate, either as evidence supporting an argument, or because the respondent’s own words best articulated the point being conveyed.
The following sections provide descriptive findings from the Melbourne, Glasgow, and Gold Coast cases.

### 5.1 Melbourne 2006 Commonwealth Games

In 1999, the 2006 Commonwealth Games were awarded to Melbourne, which had seven years to plan and prepare the city and its stakeholders to stage this MSE. There are eight universities in the city of Melbourne: Deakin University, Monash University, Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology University (RMIT University), Swinburne University of Technology, University of Melbourne, La Trobe University, Victoria University, and Australian Catholic University (Australian Universities, 2016).

I conducted semi-structured interviews with key informants from four of the universities (Deakin University, University of Melbourne, La Trobe University, and Victoria University), highlighted in blue in Figure 7 below, as well as with other Games stakeholders. I had email correspondence with a staff member from a fifth university (Federation University) outside the city in Ballarat because documentary evidence suggested a university link; however, MU10 informed me that the Commonwealth Games research was not “in relation to [the] Uni’s setting”. The four universities located in the city that were not involved in this research were either not identified in the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisational Affiliation</th>
<th>Melbourne (M)</th>
<th>Glasgow (GL)</th>
<th>Gold Coast (GC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commonwealth Games (CG)</td>
<td>MCG</td>
<td>GLCG</td>
<td>GCCG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government (G)</td>
<td>MG</td>
<td>GLG</td>
<td>GCG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University (U)</td>
<td>MU</td>
<td>GLU</td>
<td>GCU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (O)</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>GLO</td>
<td>GCO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
document analysis as having any interest or involvement with the Games, or potential participants from these universities were not interested in participating in this research.

Table 10 provides a brief overview of each university that participated in the Melbourne case study.

*Table 10: Overview of participating universities in Melbourne*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Est.</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Interviewed</th>
<th>Distance to Games Village</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Melbourne</td>
<td>1853</td>
<td>42,600</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3.6 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria University</td>
<td>1916</td>
<td>48,000</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>9.4 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deakin University</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>51,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>13.3 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Trobe University</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>36,000</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>15.6 km</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 2006 Games provided an opportunity for Melbourne universities to leverage the Games to create their own legacies as indicated by the Department for Victorian Communities (2004) Annual Report 2003–2004 and Monash University’s (2005) media release regarding the availability of Commonwealth Games experts within the university. Examples of such legacies include student and staff opportunities, new or improved physical infrastructure, IOR development, and brand awareness. However, at the time of the interview, the Games had occurred over 10 years ago; therefore, some interviewees (MCG1, MCG2, MCG3, MCG4, MU2, MU3) had a difficult time remembering certain specific details about any university–Commonwealth Games engagement, although they provided general information.

For instance, there were challenges recalling what had occurred pre, during, and post Games, specifically with regard to who was involved and what, if anything, was
done by their organisation to create a legacy from the Games. Thirty-two documents suggesting some formal university engagement were collected and analysed.

5.1.1 Universities’ interaction with the Melbourne 2006 Commonwealth Games

Several interviewees (MU1, MU5, and MU8) explained how the 2006 Melbourne Commonwealth Games were a great experience for the city. Media releases indicated that the University of Melbourne, Monash University, and RMIT University provided facilities for pre-Games athlete training (UniNews, 2006), offered expert staff to speak about issues related to the Commonwealth Games (Commonwealth Games experts, 2014), and were thanked by the Australian Commonwealth Games Association for their “contribution to the running of the 2006 Melbourne Games” (UniNews, 2006a, para. 1).

The data from interview participants (MU1, MU5, and MU8) revealed that although such engagement may have occurred, there was no indication that any university had a strategic plan for the Games. In addition, when seeking to better understand universities’ involvement with the Games, many interviewees (see Table 11) suggested that if their university was involved, it was only in an informal manner.
Table 11: Examples of lack of university involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Selected Comments on University Involvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MCG1</td>
<td>“I honestly didn’t have any real liaison that I can remember with the universities. I didn’t really see evidence of a particular [university] actually having an integrated role in the Games.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU1</td>
<td>“In some ways, we were very casual about the Games as a community or city. We held them, enjoyed them, they moved on.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU2</td>
<td>“…obviously from [the University’s] point of view, it wasn’t a major deal. There was no driving force for being a university that we should try and link up with the Commonwealth Games…”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU3</td>
<td>“As a university, we really had very little involvement…or any involvement at all in the Commonwealth Games.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU5</td>
<td>“From the university’s point of view, there weren’t any formal relationships.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU6</td>
<td>“…so formally, [the university] didn’t have any interaction, as far as I can recall.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU12</td>
<td>“Despite being a member of the Vice Chancellor’s senior executive team at that time, I don’t believe we ever really formally discussed the Games at the executive level.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU13</td>
<td>“[University X] has not engaged with the CGA at all.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In contrast to most respondents, interviewee MU7 indicated that from two years prior to the Games at La Trobe University,

there was a clear top down desire to engage with the Commonwealth Games after [La Trobe University] decided to be stronger in sport and sport management, in particular. So I recall when I was recruited there, one of the things that the Dean said was ‘OK, now you’re going to build bridges with the Commonwealth Games, we really want to be engaged with that event.’

Since the 2006 Games, interviewee MU7 had moved to a different university. He noted that the outcomes of La Trobe University’s “desire to engage” were unclear; however; in his current role, his work was “a result of learning how you had to do it 10 years ago” and what he learned in 2006 had influenced the way he worked with the industry in 2015. Furthermore, he indicated that engaging with major events is now “strategically anchored” into the 2012–2016 strategic plan of his current employer, Victoria University.
Respondents from two universities described how conferences were used to engage with the Games. For instance, La Trobe University assisted with the organisation of the 13th Commonwealth International Sport Conference. The conference took place 9–12 March 2006, three days prior to the start of the Games and included the Sport Management Association of Australia and New Zealand Conference, which is an annual event. Typically, the SMAANZ conference takes place during the latter part of the year. However, to coincide with the Games in March, the SMAANZ conference was scheduled earlier as a part of a Commonwealth Games International Sport Conference (MU7). The joint conferences were “an effort of a number of associations to bring together sport medicine, sport management, sport science, the Commonwealth Games conference themselves, into one big packaged event that would almost be like a mega conference” (MU7). Interviewee MU2 recalled, “…the extent of [Deakin University’s] involvement, from my recollection, was really in and around the Commonwealth Games International Sport Conference, in which we played an active role on the Organising Committee” (MU2).

In addition to conferences, the document analysis revealed various research outputs that were linked to the Commonwealth Games (Kellet, Hede, & Chalip, 2006; 2008); however, interviewees MU6 and MU10 informed me that these research outputs were not a direct result of strategic engagement from their universities (Deakin University and Victoria University). The research occurred either because of a pre-existing relationship or because the study was developed on behalf of a third party. Interviewee MU6 recounted her research in the following way:

Our work…wasn’t part of a formal strategy, and in fact our work was funded by [another organisation]. So we were really looking at the social impacts and how they were actually leveraged and it was for [this other organisation].

Interviewee MU2 indicated that because the Commonwealth Games are a sport event, many university staff members in department outside of sport management were
not interested in researching the Games, regardless of any potential opportunities in their disciplines (e.g. tourism, technology, media and marketing, etc.). Interviewee MU2 explained, “It’s not an area of my research interest, nor most of the others at the time, so we didn’t have an active involvement from a research point of view in the Games.”

Some university staff members initiated their own Games involvement. For instance, as volunteers, interviewee MU11 informed me that “the University had nothing to do with my volunteering. I had to volunteer outside of my work commitments so that it had no impact on university teaching” (MU11). Interviewee MU1 provided another example, whereby he recalled that some staff members developed teaching case studies based on the Games for undergraduate students (MU1).

Interviewee MU1 recognised that Victoria University could have been more organised in an attempt to engage with the Commonwealth Games. Although the Commonwealth Games is considered an MSE (Preuss, 2006), many people, including university staff (MU1; MU2), did not see it on the same scale in terms of significance as the Olympic Games. Therefore, these interviewees suggested that there may not have been as much importance placed on the 2006 Games by university staff members. It was also proposed by interviewees MU1, MU3, and MCG5 that Melbourne is a great sports city that successfully hosts many events each year. Therefore, the 2006 Commonwealth Games were perceived to be just another event, and the opportunity to leverage the Games was “undervalued” (MU1).

Interviewee MU1 recalled that there were student opportunities from Victoria University, through a program for approximately 300 students. The program provided field placements in a range of supported Commonwealth Games programs such as media, reception, working at the venues, or organising the event. Students had the opportunity to enhance their skill set and gain valuable experience with an MSE.
Although the student roles were informal and unpaid, there were some formal components about this initiative, such as student assessment on their placement performance. However, there is limited documentation, and records of the field placements were “very, very sloppy and all over the place” (MU1).

Interviewee MU1 explained the value of Games opportunities for students:

With the Commonwealth Games and Olympic Games, we have a lot of students getting engaged with the organisation of the Games – they built up really strong skills and abilities, they’ve used that on their CV subsequently saying what they’ve done as a way of promoting themselves in the work place. It’s been a great experience overall, so we had 2000 and 2006 and during that time, we built up on the Olympics’ experience and while we didn’t do as much as we could have with the Commonwealth Games, a lot of students did well because of their own initiative, but also with respect to the way in which they located, within the course, a number of work experiences, so that was the legacy – those experiences that then followed them through in their work life (MU1).

These field placements worked well for students and “in terms of legacy, without the Commonwealth Games, they wouldn’t have had that exposure to an international event on that sort of scale” (MU1). However, MU1 felt that these opportunities were “just taken for granted” (MU1) by students and staff. Another example of student opportunities was with regard to student elite athletes. Interviewee MU6 recalled that

there were quite a number [of students] who were participating as athletes so it was supporting them and giving them an opportunity to go [participate in the Commonwealth Games] but still keep their academic activities […] That’s important in terms of legacy as well in the sense of there’s the positive for an individual to participate but also to have a career in their chosen field (MU6).

The interview data from 20 semi-structured interviews suggested that the majority of the university engagement that occurred was informal and opportunistic rather than strategic. Upon reflection, many interviewees (MU1, MCG4, MU3, and MU9) thought that with the benefit of hindsight, they would have approached the Games differently, and overall, the Games were considered a missed opportunity. For
instance, they would have been more strategic and organised in their planning to engage with the Games as well as creating and developing research opportunities (MU1, MU6, MU7, and MU8).

5.2 Glasgow 2014 Commonwealth Games

Glasgow was awarded the rights to host the 2014 Commonwealth Games in 2007. The OC for Glasgow 2014 had the vision for the Games to “help achieve a healthier, more vibrant city with its citizens enjoying and realising the benefits of sport and the wider, longer term economic, social, cultural and environmental benefits” (Glasgow City Council, n.d., p. 4). The Games were a catalyst for regeneration, specifically in the city’s East End, which provided an opportunity for the OC, city, and state government to engage with universities, in order to measure and evaluate the impact of the Games on the community.

Document analysis indicated university involvement with the Commonwealth Games as early as seven years prior to the Games. For instance, in the report of the CGF Evaluation Commission for the 2014 Commonwealth Games (2007), one of the key strengths highlighted was that Glasgow had provided “usage, control and commercial rights – from all venue owners” (p. 79), which included the University of Stirling. In addition, document analysis, specifically material related to the Game Changer Awards, suggested that universities throughout Scotland had some involvement with the Games. The Game Changer Awards were an initiative of Universities Scotland, a membership organisation for the Principals and Directors of Scotland’s 19 higher education institutions (Universities Scotland, n.d.), and Colleges Scotland, the voice of the college sector in Scotland (Colleges Scotland, 2016).
Although there are only three universities in the city of Glasgow (University of Glasgow, University of Strathclyde, and Glasgow Caledonian University), I was able to conduct semi-structured interviews with key informants from six Scottish universities: University of Glasgow; University of Strathclyde; Glasgow Caledonian University; University of the West of Scotland; University of St Andrews; and University of Stirling and with other Games stakeholders. I also had email correspondence with an informant from the University of St Andrews; however, he was not aware that his “organisation got involved apart from being spectators!” (GLU1). Table 12 provides a brief overview of each university that participated in this research.

Table 12: Overview of participating universities in Glasgow

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Est.</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Interviewed</th>
<th>Distance to Games Village</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Strathclyde Glasgow</td>
<td>1796</td>
<td>21,200</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow Caledonian University</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>5.6 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Glasgow</td>
<td>1451</td>
<td>27,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>8 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of the West of Scotland</td>
<td>1897</td>
<td>17,700</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>18.1 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Stirling</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>11,100</td>
<td>1,872</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>47 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of St Andrews</td>
<td>1410</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>117 km</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evidence from document analysis indicated that legacy was important to the 2014 Glasgow Commonwealth Games from the early stages of its planning. For instance, Glasgow’s Candidate City File (n.d.) outlined a Commonwealth Games Concept and Legacy, with concentration on legacy for the community. In total, there were over 15 legacy documents created by Glasgow City Council, Scottish Government, and Glasgow 2014. These documents included “Glasgow Legacy Framework” (Glasgow City Council, 2013), “Glasgow Legacy Annual Report”
Document analysis of 63 documents and 16 semi-structured interviews suggested that there were formal university relationships with the Games. The interview data from universities and other Games stakeholder organisations confirmed that engaged universities had strengthened their community relationships, increased collaboration with other universities and local government, and provided a platform for further engagement with other major events.

5.2.1 Universities’ interaction with the Glasgow 2014 Commonwealth Games

According to interviewee GLCG2, there were “Huge, huge relationships across the board” (GCG2) between universities and the Commonwealth Games. For example, Glasgow 2014 worked with a “number of universities on issues surrounding various legacy initiatives” (GCG2). Interviewee GLG1 recalled that “universities were also heavily involved with the Organising Committee and some of the Games related activities and the Organising Committee’s own legacy programs”, such as Lead 2014, a youth leadership programme.

Other interviewees (GLCG2, GLCG3, and GLO1) also identified that there were university-Commonwealth Games links. Interviewee GLCG2 commented that “A Games is a beautiful, natural opportunity to really invoke all of these various levels of relationships and engagement with students and the public, private, and third sector”
(GLCG2). For instance, at the University of Glasgow, an internal group was assembled to “look at the Commonwealth Games, both in terms of activities that [University of Glasgow] run throughout the Games…but also a little bit around [the] legacy piece” (GLU7).

According to interviewee GLU7, there was internal discussion about the University of Glasgow’s involvement with the Games. An internal group “spent a lot of time and effort in developing a sort of strategy” (GLU7) to bid for external and internal resources. The University of Glasgow used the Games as a “tool for engagement” (GLU7), recognising that there would be an increase in visitors to the city. The university worked collaboratively with other Games stakeholders, including Glasgow City Marketing Bureau, “to position Glasgow as an education destination during the Commonwealth Games” (GLU7).

Another way universities engaged with the Games was through the Game Changer Awards. The awards were created in order to recognise and celebrate “the many contributions that staff and students in Scotland’s further and higher education sectors are making to ensure that Glasgow 2014 is a fantastic success and will deliver an enduring legacy for Scotland’s people” (Game Changer Awards, n.d.). The event recognised universities in Scotland for their achievements in leveraging the 2014 Games. University winners received gold, silver, or bronze awards in six different categories, including Sporting Contribution; Student Achievement; Learning and Skills; Creative and Cultural; International Contribution; and Research Impact (see Appendix H).

Over 100 different projects from colleges and universities were judged on how closely they “embodied the Glasgow 2014 legacy themes” (Game Changer Awards, n.d., para. 3). Thirty projects won gold, silver, or bronze medals. For instance, in the
category of student achievement higher education institutions, the University of
Glasgow won silver for “Gym Buddies”, a program created “to support students that
have psychological or physical barriers to participating in exercise” (Game Changer
Awards, n.d., p 10). The University of Glasgow was the most successful, winning six of
the awards. The University of Edinburgh won three, while the University of Dundee,
University of Stirling, and University of Strathclyde each won two (Game Changer
Awards, n.d.).

Another indication of university-Games involvement was evidenced by the
University of Glasgow and the Scottish Government program ‘GoWell’. GoWell is a
longitudinal research program funded by the Scottish Government and led by academic
staff at the University of Glasgow. The programme investigated the impacts of
investment in housing and neighbourhood regeneration in Glasgow (Clarke & Kearns,
2015). Document analysis also suggested that academic staff from the University of
Glasgow had presented a paper ‘Impact of Regeneration & the Commonwealth Games
on Glasgow’s East End’ at the University of Glasgow Policy Scotland Workshop on the
topic ‘Cities, Universities, and the Commonwealth’. The university received a Gold
medal in the Game Changer Awards for its research impact with the GoWell program.
However, email correspondence with a key informant (GLU2) involved with the
GoWell program clarified that the study was not a direct result of a strategic partnership
between the university and the Commonwealth Games. The University of Glasgow’s
involvement with the GoWell program appeared to be an example of an opportunistic
and unintended legacy initiative.

As a part of its Commonwealth Games involvement, Strathclyde University
hosted the Global Coaches House, a partnership with the International Council for
Coaching Excellence, the CGF, sportscotland, Scottish Qualifications Authority, and
Human Kinetics publishers. The Global Coaches House was an eight-day celebration of coaching with 500 coaches from 20 Commonwealth Countries (Game Changer Awards, n.d.; Global Coaches House, n.d.). Interviewee GLU8 noted that the event was “organised to directly link to the Commonwealth Games” (GLU8). Because of the Global Coaches House, the University of Strathclyde won gold in the category International Contribution Higher Education Institutions at the Game Changer Awards (GLU8; Game Changer Awards, n.d.).

Post-Games, the question of a 2014 legacy continued to receive attention from academics, policymakers, and people living and working in the city of Glasgow (University of the West of Scotland, 2015). In February 2015, the University of the West of Scotland, in partnership with GlasgowLife, hosted a seminar titled “Sport Events and Social Change: The case of Glasgow 2014”, to continue the conversation that started pre-Games about the social legacy of Glasgow 2014 (University of the West of Scotland, 2015).

Partnering with universities for the 2014 Commonwealth Games was not a novel idea for Glasgow City Council. As interviewee GLG1 noted, “Whenever we’re looking at a particular issue, we always have expertise from universities involved…” (GLG1). Nevertheless, for the Commonwealth Games, Glasgow City Council established “the 2014 Research Partnership and that was with the Council, Glasgow Life, and the city universities” (GLG1), which included University of Glasgow, Glasgow Caledonian University, and the University of Strathclyde. City Council involved the academic institutions because council does “a lot of work with the universities and they’re a key partner in [Council’s] economic strategy for the city” (GLG1). Interviewee GLG1 highlighted the opportunities that the research partnership provided not only for City Council but also for university staff, as discussed in the next section.
5.2.2 University staff opportunities

In addition to research partnerships, presentations, and other Commonwealth Games-themed events, some university staff members were seconded to the OC. According to interviewee GLCG2:

We did something fairly unique…we actually seconded someone to come in and engage all the universities…and he was from the University of the West of Scotland, and he came in and brokered the relationship in terms of all these different areas and just clearly mapped out what is this going to look like, what is this going to be. And that person worked under the head of community engagement and legacy. So we actually created a position for engagement and legacy and we saw this as engagement. This area fit beautifully in engagement and you reaped the benefits of engagement.

Some secondments were for an extended period of time. Interviewee GLCG4 noted that she “was seconded as a university staff member to work at the Organising Committee four years out from the Games” (GLCG4). One of the interviewee, GLCG4’s responsibilities were to manage Lead 2014, a program that originally had six universities involved: University of Strathclyde, Stirling University, Edinburgh University, University of St Andrews, Robert Gordon University, and the University of the West of Scotland (GLCG4). Lead 2014 aimed to develop the leadership skills and to harness the enthusiasm of young Scots in the build up to Glasgow 2014 (Lead 2014, 2014). However, many of the directors and principals at these universities were not aware of the program because “if you’re not involved in it…nobody really knows what it was” (GLCG4).

Interviewees GLU5 and GLU8 identified that three universities (University of Edinburgh, University of Glasgow, Strathclyde University) encouraged staff to become volunteers at the Games. Interviewee GLU8 recalled that “one of the legacies for us was a number of staff were involved as volunteers, as Clydesiders…so there was institutional support for those involved…and I think that had a positive knock on effect…” (GLU8). The institutional support provided the opportunity for staff to
volunteer at the Games without negative financial consequence or use of vacation time. The Games also provided opportunities for students.

5.2.3 University student opportunities

University students had various opportunities to be involved with the Commonwealth Games. For instance, there was “a big pre-Games volunteering program called the Frontrunners Program… [the OC] used the university and college links a lot to engage and recruit students” (GLCG4). Another interviewee (GLCG1) from Glasgow 2014 recalled sport management graduate students working with the OC, and that City Council subsidised part of the graduate students’ salaries for 12 months. The experience provided during the Games built the students’ curriculum vitae and provided opportunities for future employment with other major events (GLO1). For instance, interviewee GLCG1 recalled that a legacy for one of the graduates was gaining employment with the 2015 Rugby World Cup in London.

Some students who gained roles with Glasgow 2014 returned to their university to present information and opportunities with the Commonwealth Games to their contemporary student cohort (GLO1). As interviewee GLU5 recalled, the University of Strathclyde was “linked in very early because some of our students and our graduates got into the Organising Committee at an early stage and so they would come and do presentations to our students about opportunities for internships” (GLU5). One of the opportunities included working with the Lead 2014 program, in which “university students lead workshops on event management to inspire the younger students to subsequently organise and deliver Commonwealth Games-themed sports festivals within their own school community” (Glasgow 2014 Progress Report, 2012, p. 6). In addition, university students “came into the Organising Committee as well and got
involved and sat on the boards and were on the strategic 2014 boards as well as operational” (GLCG4).

Another component of student involvement with the Games included student elite athletes competing. For instance, in Team Scotland, 133 of 310 (42.9%) athletes had links to Scotland’s colleges and universities (Game Changer Awards, n.d.). The Acting Chief Executive of Colleges Scotland stated the following:

It is important that colleges and universities continue to work closely together to ensure one of the legacies of the Glasgow games [sic] is the delivery of more highly trained athletes and sporting professionals to keep Scotland at the top of its game (Game Changer Awards, n.d., para. 8).

5.2.4 Legacies of the Commonwealth Games

Although evidence from document analysis and interviews with key informants suggested that there were university-Commonwealth Games links and opportunities for students and staff, several interviewees (GLU1, GLU3, GLU5, and GLU8) from the University of St Andrews and the University of Strathclyde suggested that their universities could have done more to engage with the Games. For instance, Interviewee GLU1 from the University of St Andrews noted, “I’m afraid I wasn’t really involved with anything to do with the Commonwealth Games…and I’m not really sure that we as an organisation got involved.” Interviewee GLU3 for the University of Strathclyde believed that her “institution was not overly active with the Commonwealth Games”.

Interviewee GLU5 felt

really disappointed with the university [of Strathclyde] in terms of [its] involvement, ownership, and understanding the opportunities that hosting the Games was going to provide….There was no real strategy to do it. It eventually fell to one of our associate deputy principals…but if we started nine months out from the Games, we’ll be lucky.

As a final example, interviewee GLU8 thought that the University of Strathclyde had done

quite a lot at the Commonwealth Games, but we could have got so much more
out of it…there was a bit of reluctance to really take it head on and go for it in a strategic way in terms of how we systematically engaged.

Although many interviewees (GLU5, GLU7, and GLU8) discussed their personal or institutional involvement with the 2014 Games, some could not recall or identify legacies of working or engaging with the Commonwealth Games. There were some links, collaboration, relationships, and partnerships that developed; however, some interviewees believed the lack of a long-term legacy planning or a strategic approach to leverage the Games represented a missed opportunity (GLG1, GLU4, GLU5, and GLU8).

Interviewee GLU4 from the University of Stirling thought that her institution had missed an opportunity with regard to a facilities legacy. For instance, Commonwealth Games Scotland is located at the University of Stirling. Interviewee GLU4 noted that in her role, she “worked quite closely with Commonwealth Games”; however, in her opinion, the University of Stirling “leveraged virtually nothing from the Commonwealth Games” (GLU4). Nevertheless, the University of Stirling hosted Team Scotland’s preparation camp, which resulted in a significant amount of publicity because the Scotland team were based at Stirling and that became their preparation camp. So got a lot of publicity for that…the cabinet minister visited, whole range of other people visited and also, we benefited financially from the staging of that camp because Commonwealth Games Scotland paid to be there, so we got money for that (GLU4).

Although Glasgow City Council and three universities (University of Glasgow, University of Strathclyde, and Glasgow Caledonian University) attempted to create and leverage a research partnership with the Commonwealth Games, several interviewees (GLG1, GLGC3, and GLU9) believed there could have been a more strategic approach for long-term planning. For instance, interviewee GLG1 commented, “…is there something we could have done to link up better – I think so. I think that’s one of the things that we didn’t do as well as we might have done” (GLG1).
Another reason interviewees thought their university missed an opportunity to leverage a Games legacy was due to significant changes in senior leadership in the years prior to the Games. Interviewee GLU8 commented that there was “a bit of frustration there because I genuinely think we missed our track. It was nobody’s fault; I just don’t think there was anyone in a senior enough role driving it.” While interviewee GLU5 also thought no one was to blame, however, the University of Strathclyde “probably wasn’t in the right place at that time to take advantage of the opportunity that was here” and thus the university “just missed a fantastic opportunity” (GLU5).

In addition to the lack of senior leadership driving university-Commonwealth Games engagement, staff members already have full-time jobs. Although there was some interest from some staff to be involved with the Games, there was hesitation by others to increase their work and responsibilities with no monetary or time compensation. For instance, interviewee GLU7 suggested that in the future, there should be a dedicated staff member appointed to coordinate and liaise between the university and the Commonwealth Games:

There were always things that we were doing fairly last minute, which is kind of off and away. The Commonwealth Games was coming at a time where we all have day jobs; we were all still doing the day job and then trying to be involved in shaping and taking this forward. I think actually in retrospect, it may have been worthwhile having a dedicated member of staff who was really just stewarding the Commonwealth Games for Glasgow (GLU7).

In summary, evidence from document analysis and interview data suggested that universities engaged with the Glasgow 2014 Commonwealth Games formally and informally. Despite this, there were also missed opportunities to leverage the Games to achieve long-term legacy.
In 2011, the Gold Coast was awarded the rights to host the 2018 Commonwealth Games. The 2018 Games will predominately take place in the Gold Coast, although some events will be hosted in Brisbane (70 km north), Cairns (1,700 km north), and Townsville (1,400 km north). There are five universities between the Gold Coast and Brisbane (Griffith University; Bond University; Southern Cross University; Queensland University of Technology; and the University of Queensland) (see Table 13 for a review). Universities in Cairns and Townsville were not included in this research, as they are outside the primary host region of the Gold Coast, and there was no documentary evidence to suggest that these universities were engaging with the Games.

Table 13: Overview of participating Gold Coast universities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Est.</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Interviewed</th>
<th>Distance to Games Village</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Griffith University</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>46,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>Less than 1 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond University</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>18 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Cross University</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>14,400</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>38.5 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Queensland</td>
<td>1909</td>
<td>48,800</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>86.8 km</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I conducted document analysis of 50 documents and 24 semi-structured interviews with key informants from four of the five universities (Griffith University; Bond University; Southern Cross University; and the University of Queensland) and with other Games stakeholders. I had email correspondence only from the fifth university (Queensland University of Technology) because there was “no existing relationship with the Commonwealth Games organisers” (GCU18). The three universities in the Gold Coast as well as the University of Queensland, in Brisbane, had
some interest in engaging with the Games. Griffith University was the most proactively engaged university to the extent that it became an official partner of the Games OC in October, 2015. This section provides descriptive analysis of the four universities’ activities.

5.3.1 Universities’ interaction with the Gold Coast 2018 Commonwealth Games

In 2011, the Gold Coast bid team wanted to “engage everyone” (GCCG1) within the community, including universities. As a part of their engagement, the bid team, and later GOLDOC, initiated meetings with universities to investigate opportunities and “establish good relationships with universities” (GCCG1). As the organisation of a Games involves “a complex governance and stakeholder arrangement” (GCG1), the bid committee staff took any “opportunity that [they] had to go and talk at the universities to engage with the universities about what [they] were proposing from a bid perspective” (GCCG1). Staff members of the bid team “provided a number of lectures on what the bid proposal entailed as well as the communication component of the bid at Griffith University and Bond University” (GCCG1).

GOLDOC and Gold Coast City Council viewed universities not only as a valuable and important stakeholder (GCCG1, GCCG3, and GCG1) but also as “a potential project partner for delivery for legacy” (GCG1). Universities are a major employer on the Gold Coast (GCU9) and “the education sector is a crucial sector contributing to [the Gold Coast] economy” (GCG1). In addition, the OC staff acknowledged that universities offer a “pool of talent and expertise that the opportunities there to work collaboratively are endless” (GCG1).
While GOLDOC and Gold Coast City Council supported engaging and collaborating with universities, interviewee GCCG1 thought GOLDOC could be “doing so much more with the universities”. However, GCCG1 described how it is “not a simple process”, as there is “a lot of red tape, because you’re dealing with sponsors and multiple partners” (GCCG1).

At the time of the interviews (March 2015), Gold Coast City Council had conducted some initial consultations with universities. However, interviewee GCG1 reflected that “there is way more opportunity than what’s already been explored” (GCG1). One reason for this was that Gold Coast City Council was waiting to see what GOLDOC initiated, and as a consequence, “probably weren’t as proactive in developing discussions of [their] own because [City Council] were waiting to see how that would eventuate because then [City Council] could tap into it” (GCG1).

GOLDOC intended to engage “with interns and engaging various departments with interns and having interns work with [GOLDOC]” (GCCG1) to provide workplace skill development. However, in May 2015, at the time of data collection, any processes to engage with interns and create research opportunities were still undeveloped and informal (GCCG1).

Although the Games were three years away during the time of the interviews, some interviewees (GCU13, GCG1, and GCCG2) felt there was a lack of strategic direction with regard to engagement, collaboration, and relationship development with universities during the four years since the Games were awarded. Interviewee GCG1 described the extent of interaction as “it’s been literally just communication to discuss the opportunity”. One challenge for City Council and universities to develop long-term relationships revolved around resources, specifically funding. During discussions between City Council and universities, there were some great ideas and research
projects proposed; however, interviewee GCG1 commented that if universities are looking for funding to do research, “from a legacy perspective, [City Council] just don’t have it” (GCG1).

The first indication of Griffith’s involvement with the 2018 Commonwealth Games was prior to the successful bid announcement in November 2011. Griffith University had a legacy champion (Professor X) that had the foresight to involve the university with the Games early and as soon as possible (GCU12). One interviewee recalled that Professor X “had worked with the higher levels at Griffith to…write a strategic plan for Griffith’s involvement in Commonwealth Games” (GCU12), the “Griffith University Involvement Strategy 2012”.

Professor X had previous experience working at a university within an MSE region and had some informal involvement with the Gold Coast bid, which may have contributed to “the foresight and the initiative to drive [the strategy] from day one” (GCU12). Interviewee GCU12 noted that there was not “an initiative” outside of Professor X, nor was there “a higher power, it was just [Professor X’s] love of sport and experience being in a university in a hosting city that had just driven that” (GCU12).

In 2012, Griffith University wrote an involvement strategy, which “formed a base, a foundation” (GCU15) for Griffith University and GOLDOC to move forward with engagement discussions. The involvement strategy as well as participating university staff members enabled Griffith University to keep “a very strong involvement with the development of the Commonwealth Games” (GCU15). For instance, in early 2014, the vice chancellor requested a meeting with key stakeholders within GOLDOC to better understand “the landscape, what can and can’t be done” (GCU15) by the university. Meetings then took place with senior level members of university staff, leading to research about what universities in other Commonwealth Games host cities
had done to determine how Griffith could leverage the Games (GCU13). This research revealed that Griffith University was taking a different approach to what universities had been doing for previous Games (GCU15). Prior university involvement with the Commonwealth Games was perceived to be “more focused in the programme area or the academic area, the research area, it hasn’t extended into being part of the Games” (GCU15).

In addition to Griffith University’s involvement strategy for the Commonwealth Games, a second strategic document was created: Griffith Sport Strategy 2013–2020. The Sport Strategy initiative “kicked off after the Commonwealth Games were announced for the Gold Coast…it was probably a catalyst to get that sort of going” (GCU10). The Sport Strategy has the “Commonwealth Games as one of…eight strategic areas embedded in it” (GCU10). Interviewee GCU5 noted that “the Commonwealth Games and the university’s commitment to sports sort of fit together”. Several interviewees (GCU1, GCU2, GCU6, GCU10, GCU13, and GCU16) were involved with both the Sports Strategy and Commonwealth Games strategy in some manner.

However, during interviews, many interviewees (GCU1, GCU2, GCU10, and GCU13) mentioned that there was confusion about the two strategies (Griffith University Involvement Strategy 2012 and Sport Strategy 2013–2020) with regard to who was in charge of which elements and the progress of each strategy. For instance, interviewee GCU10 reflected, “Yeah it’s a little bit tricky isn’t it; look I’m unclear of [sic] what the university strategy of the Commonwealth Games is at this stage”. Interviewee GCU2 reiterated that the process was “quite messy at the moment with plans for it to get a lot clearer”.
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Another indication of Griffith University’s early engagements with the Games was in April 2013. The Queensland Government in collaboration with the City of Gold Coast and Commonwealth Games’ partners aimed to develop a legacy strategy titled Gold Coast 2018 Commonwealth Games legacy plan (Queensland Government, 2013). According to the Queensland Government (2013), “the plan’s development will be informed by consultation with community members, local councils, and other key stakeholders across business and community groups”.

There were seven key activities outlined, including key stakeholder engagement; online survey; community meetings; focus groups; online polling; evaluation and monitoring; and a legacy plan for Queensland. Within the sixth key activity, evaluation and monitoring, the government intended to “develop a framework to evaluate and monitor implementation of initiatives in partnership with leading Queensland Universities”. As a part of this plan, the partners formed the Embracing 2018 Advisory Committee, which provided “advise on the development, implementation and evaluation and monitoring of the Embracing 2018 program” (Embracing 2018, 2015). This committee included membership of Griffith University’s vice chancellor because of the recognition that universities could potentially contribute towards creating significant legacies (GCU9).

In 2013, Griffith University’s vice chancellor appointed a strategic advisor for the 2018 Commonwealth Games. The appointed staff member was a senior member who had previously been involved with the development of the Sport Strategy. The role of the Strategic Advisor involved the following:

Developing strategies for the university to assist the state and local government and Commonwealth Games Committee in the running of the 2018 Games. It also involves work on community engagement, legacy issues for the university and opportunities for students in volunteering, internships and jobs (The Conversation, 2016).
The strategic advisor formed a Commonwealth Games steering committee for the university. The steering committee comprising 15 to 20 “handpicked” (GCU2) staff members was “about having the various stakeholders right across the university involved in discussion” (GCU3). The committee members had interests ranging from “conferences to legacy stuff to facilities to research to cultural, a lot of different areas” (GCU2). In addition to the steering committee, there was also a delegation of six male staff members that travelled to the Glasgow 2014 Commonwealth Games “to work with local universities there and learn about the role they have played in the games” (sic, Griffith News, 2014).

During data collection, there was some awareness among staff members that there were commercial negotiations taking place between the university and GOLDOC (GCU1, GCU10, GCU13, and GCU16). For example, interviewee GCU10 stated the following:

There’s some fairly delicate negotiations going on at this point…But I do understand there is negotiation going on somewhere fairly senior in the university with the Commonwealth Games Organising Committee but I don’t know what the basis of that discussion is and how that relationship partnership or whatever it might turn out to be is going to manifest itself.

In July 2015, interviewee GCU9 commented that the university was “currently in the process of formalising a particular type of relationship with the Games” (GCU9). It transpired that the relationship between Griffith University and GOLDOC was an official partnership announced in October 2015.

Interviewees GCU9 and GCU10 indicated that many university staff members were not aware of the negotiations between Griffith and GOLDOC. There might have been some thoughts or ideas about what would happen (GCU10); however, the discussions that Griffith University had were a “completely closed conversation” (GCU9). The details of the official partnership opportunities were arranged centrally.
among a limited group of senior staff “because of the nature of those sorts of negotiations” (GCU9).

In October 2015, three years after the successful bid and numerous internal and external meetings, conversations, and strategic documents, Griffith University became an official partner of the Gold Coast 2018 Commonwealth Games. Interviewee GLCG2 emphasised that “part of that really comes down to painting the legacy of a Games”. Key components of the official partnership include the following:

- Internships – 250 Griffith University internships with the Games organising body, GOLDOC, and its partners over the next three years;
- Facilities – Campus facilities used in the lead up and during the Games;
- Scholarships – for students from all Commonwealth nations, including Australia, for new Gold Coast 2018 Commonwealth Games Scholarships at Griffith University;
- Creative Arts Partner – Griffith University will contribute to the creative arts program running concurrently with GC2018, potentially including opening and closing ceremonies;
- Team Australia – Official University Partner of 2018 Australian Commonwealth Games Team; and
- Queen’s Baton Relay – Griffith University campuses included in the route of the Queen’s Baton Relay celebrations (Games on! Griffith official partner for GC2018, 2015).

Griffith University has ultimately established a formal partnership with GOLDOC, however, at the time of interviews, the relationship was still under negotiation and therefore not active. The negotiation may have ultimately had the effect of excluding other universities in the host region from accessing the Games.
One of Bond University’s first engagements with the Commonwealth Games occurred in March 2014 when a member of staff developed a strategic plan for the university (GCU11), which was “a document about opportunities to engage with the Games” (GCU8). Interviewee GCU11 shared the strategic plan with all university departments, which then had the opportunity to provide feedback on how their departments and staff could be involved or contribute.

The key objectives of Bond University’s strategic plan to engage with the Commonwealth Games included

- increase awareness and promotion of Bond University within the local community, throughout Australia, and internationally;
- provide unique work experience opportunities for students and staff in various roles before, during, and after the Games;
- develop relationships and provide assistance to the Commonwealth Games OC and their stakeholders;
- promote the use of Bond University’s facilities through the Games event;
- foster local community engagement and relationships (Bond University Strategic Plan Commonwealth Games 2018 Draft, 2014).

Once the document was developed, the marketing department tried to arrange meetings with key stakeholders at GOLDOC (GCU12); however, “twelve to 18 months went by and not a lot had happened” (GCU12). In early May 2015, 14 months after the initial document was shared, Bond University decision makers and key staff members from GOLDOC met to discuss opportunities to engage (GCU8). Interviewee GCU8 indicated that GOLDOC staff were “going to use that document to direct further discussion” about engagement opportunities with Bond.
While Bond has ambitions to leverage the Commonwealth Games, the university does not want “to be seen as trying to be a bigger player than [they] are. But [Bond] really want to focus on a narrow lens of quality” and concentrate on a few key strategies (GCU8). Although a strategic document has been developed and circulated, interviewee GCU8 believed that Bond was still “fairly embryonic in terms of what [the university] want to do” (GCU8). Interviewee GCU8 was in support of his university’s strategic plan because “the Commonwealth Games, and the opportunity to be involved in it, is helping my strategy within the university” (GCU8).

Interviewees (GCU4 and GCU6) from Southern Cross University also sought to engage with the Games. However, interviewee GCU4, a key decision maker at Southern Cross University noted that “there was a very hefty price tag to be involved in this project and we declined because we are so new on the coast…that just wasn’t within our strategic goals to be involved with that type of activity” (GCU4). Southern Cross University’s original campus is located south of the Queensland border, in the state of New South Wales (NSW), and its Gold Coast campus received its first intake of students in 2010 (Southern Cross University, n.d.-b).

Further, interviewee GCU4 commented that she had attended “one initial meeting about doing research with regard to legacy after the Games. But in terms of Southern Cross University, I haven’t been involved at all with any of the discussions with university’s involvement with the Games” (GCU4). She also commented that there had not been a “concerted effort” within the university to engage with the Games. Although there may not be a formal strategic plan, interviewee GCU4 indicated that Southern Cross University will still be involved with the Games in some way, such as “using students for volunteers…perhaps individual academics who will undertake some research related to the Games, and it might be a case that we host visitors”.
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Interviewee GCU6 believed that Southern Cross University had “been active but not overly assertive”. Southern Cross University’s primary focus on its campus is NSW (GCU6). The university has worked with NSW local, state, and other partners to collectively make a pitch to different countries and nations that would be visiting the Commonwealth Games as a way of trying to host training, side events…with a view of trying to leverage some economic benefit for the region to the south (GCU6).

During the time of interviews, Southern Cross University was having internal discussions about ways the university could be involved with the Games. Interviewee GCU6 identified four ways that the university could potentially leverage the Games. First, the “academic connection”, which entails how Southern Cross University can “use the whole experience of planning, hosting, and dealing with the aftermath of the Commonwealth Games as a source of rich, innovative student learning and…as a great source of research and learning and knowledge generation” (GCU6). Second, the university can “leverage the experience of the Games, to feed into the profession and the discipline” (GCU6) of the university. As an example, the university can host different “side events”, such as major international conferences that are themed around the Games (GCU6). In 2015, Southern Cross University hosted the 25th annual Council for Australasian Tourism and Hospitality Education (CAUTHE) conference. The theme for CAUTHE was Rising Tides and Sea Changes, with a sub-theme titled Impacts of sporting events and festivals, with reference to the 2018 Games (Southern Cross University, n.d.-a).

The third way that Southern Cross University could leverage the Games related to lobbying for developing infrastructure and public transport, specifically the extension of the light rail system in the Gold Coast to the south, so that it reaches the university campus. Finally, the Games could provide an opportunity to “put Gold Coast on the
map predominantly as an international student destination” (GCU6), indirectly
benefitting Southern Cross University.

Despite three years until the Games, interviewee GCU6 mentioned that the time
to capitalise on the event may have already passed. He mentioned “a lot of the leverage
now will be more about connection to the experience rather than I think substantially
leveraging direct monetary benefit out of it. I think that timeframe has passed” (GCU6).

5.3.2 University staff and student opportunities

Most Gold Coast university interviewees believed that university staff and
students could benefit from the Games (GCU1, GCU2, GCU3, GCU9, GCU10,
GCU15, and GCU17). For instance, interviewee GCU9 noted that “for our staff, it
invariably provides a range of opportunities into potential research opportunities and
research collaborations”. Interviewee GCU13 commented that university staff from a
variety of disciplines, not just sport-related departments, could be involved with the
Games:

Once the Gold Coast succeeded with its bid, then I thought ‘well we really do
need to take the opportunity, at Griffith, to develop some research on the back of
that’, this thing is happening here and it would be crazy not to look at it because
it just provides a fantastic opportunity across a wide range of disciplines,
themes, topics or anything from economic development to major event planning
to infrastructure to perception and profile building, there’s all kinds of stuff.

Additionally, interviewee GCU2 believed that the Games presented “some great
opportunities to do stuff that’s never been done before, that perhaps couldn’t have been
done before or [staff] weren’t interested. We have more opportunity I believe.” In
contrast, interviewee GCU7 believed that there were varying levels of staff interest to be
involved with the Games. For instance, when the successful bid was announced in 2011,
interviewee GCU7 indicated that there was “no sense of ‘wow, we get to participate’”.
Opportunities for university students included developing employability skills, volunteering at the Games, and competing at the Games as elite student athletes (GCU7, GCU14). Students’ involvement with the Games can provide “one of those rare opportunities that you get in a life to be involved in a big event” (GCU9). Interviewee GCU1 suggested that the “university is here forever and the students should have some benefit” (GCU1) and the opportunities to engage with the Commonwealth Games could “help their employability in the future” (GCU3).

For university student athletes, interviewee GCU2 suggested that “not only do students make great athletes, but athletes make great students. So that’s a big selling point that we need to promote off the back of Commonwealth Games as well” (GCU2). Interviewee GCU7 noted that there were discussions about delivering “as many UQ athletes as possible to the Games”. Interviewee GCU15 emphasised that “our students and our staff will feel part of something very special and that’s got to help retention and that’s got to help attraction” (GCU15), suggesting not only opportunities for students and staff but a branding opportunity for universities.

5.4 Chapter Conclusion

This chapter presented descriptive findings on the origin, evolution, and unique features of university-Commonwealth Games interaction during the Melbourne 2006 Commonwealth Games, Glasgow 2014 Commonwealth Games, and upcoming Gold Coast 2018 Commonwealth Games. Evidence from document and interview data suggested that Melbourne universities did not actively attempt to leverage the Commonwealth Games to achieve legacy. While there was some university-Games involvement, it was not strategic, and there was a sense of a missed opportunity. Alternatively, universities in Glasgow more actively attempted to leverage the Commonwealth Games by forming research partnerships and ongoing collaboration
with Games stakeholders post event. Many lessons were learned, and there are ongoing plans by universities to engage with future events in Glasgow. Finally, evidence from the Gold Coast case suggested that universities are being more strategic and engaging with Games stakeholders earlier, and for the first time in Games history, one university has formed an official partnership with the OC. However, the 2018 Games are yet to occur, and plans to leverage the Games can change. The contextual information provided in this chapter sets the scene for the cross-case results and discussion presented in the next Chapter.
Chapter 6: Cross-Case Results and Discussion

This chapter builds on the within-case results from Chapter Five, and presents the results and discussion of the cross-case thematic analysis of both the documentary evidence and semi-structured interviews. The cross-case analysis involved searching for similarities and differences in each case, identifying relevant literature and theory, in order to answer the two research questions:

- Why, how, and what legacies have universities sought to achieve through leveraging a Commonwealth Games?
- What were the barriers to achieving a legacy?

The cross-case data analysis produced three themes: (a) stakeholder leverage, (b) barriers to achieving positive legacy, and (c) intended and unintended legacies (see Appendix G for a summary of the coding process).

The three themes presented in this chapter were derived inductively from the raw data through a four-cycle coding process (Saldaña, 2009; 2015), as explained in Chapter Four. The first theme of stakeholder leverage relates to the universities’ strategic processes, relationships, and programmes designed to leverage the Games for their own legacies. The second theme of barriers to achieving positive legacy illustrates interviewees’ perceptions of the various legacy challenges experienced. The final theme of intended and unintended legacies describes both the universities’ potential, intended positive legacies as well as any unintended legacies or missed opportunities experienced. Each theme is presented sequentially below.
6.1 Stakeholder Leverage

The theme stakeholder leverage relates to formal and informal Games related interactions between universities’ internal and external stakeholders. Such interaction includes universities investing resources in legacy planning, pre-existing relationships between universities and external Games stakeholders that facilitated opportunities for engagement, proactive university engagement with the Games, and creating Games related groups or committees. The theme comprises two sub-themes: strategic relationships and processes and strategic units and programmes (see Table 14).

Table 14: Codes that formed the theme stakeholder leverage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Second Cycle Code (Focused coding)</th>
<th>Third Cycle Code (Axial Coding)</th>
<th>Fourth Cycle Code (Selective coding)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legacy planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-existing relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interorganisational relationship management</td>
<td>Strategic relationships and processes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legacy champion</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stakeholder leverage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proactive engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal internal committees</td>
<td>Strategic units and programmes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal external networks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, the three case studies evidenced increasing stakeholder leverage with each successive edition of the Games. Thus, this theme was least evident in the Melbourne data and most evident in the Gold Coast data. The findings aligned with literature, that in recent decades the university context has changed due to globalisation (Slaba, 2015; Watts & Buckeridge, 2015), and external pressure to engage with the community. As a result, universities are increasingly operating like businesses (Greatix, 2011; Hiltzik, 2016; Stoller, 2014), with greater understanding of and emphasis on the need for university brand awareness (Michael, 2004). This change has resulted in greater attention to engagement with external stakeholders to develop IORs (Jongbloed,
The following section is structured by third cycle codes to assist in answering the why and how aspect of research question one: Why, how, and what legacies have universities sought to achieve through leveraging a Commonwealth Games?

### 6.1.1 Strategic relationships and processes

The sub-theme, strategic relationships, and processes relate to universities’ stakeholder interactions associated with leveraging the Games for legacy. Data suggested that the perceived salience of universities from the perspective of Games organisers (GLCG1, GLCG2, and GCCG1) and civic authorities (GLG1 and GCG1) influenced these strategic relationships and processes. The data included material describing: universities’ formal and informal initiatives to engage with the Games, including resource investment; the importance of having a legacy champion, in order to advance university legacy plans; the value of pre-existing relationships with other Games stakeholders, potentially providing a platform for Games related opportunities; and the intricacies of formal IOR management.

The sub-theme was least evident in Melbourne and most evident in Glasgow and Gold Coast materials, reflecting the increasing importance of universities as a potential contributor to a Games legacy as well as the increasing expectation of universities to develop IORs with stakeholder groups within their community. Concurrently, sport event legacy expectations have increased (Parent, 2015; Rogerson, 2016), suggesting why universities in the Glasgow and Gold Coast cases demonstrated increased interest in and attempts to leverage the Games for their own legacies, as well as why universities became more salient to other Games stakeholders.

The data from Glasgow and Gold Coast cases suggested that the OCs believed legacy to be more important than for previous Games, and therefore these OCs appeared
to be more interested in working with other Games stakeholders, such as universities. Thus, the sub-theme strategic relationships and processes was strongly evidenced by universities in the Glasgow and Gold Coast cases compared to the data from the Melbourne case. Data suggested that the CGF, as well as Glasgow and Gold Coast local governments and OCs, viewed universities as a salient stakeholder group (GCCG3, GLCG2, GLCG3, GLCG4, GLG1, GCCG1, GCCG2, and GCG1). Interviewee GLCG2 commented that he “firmly believe[d] that universities play a very, very strong role in helping [the OC] build peaceful, sustainable and prosperous communities through the power of sport”. As universities are permanent fixtures in the community, GLCG2’s comment illustrates the importance of stakeholders in accomplishing mutually beneficial outcomes. This finding highlighted that the OC viewed universities as what Mitchell et al. (1997) described as a legitimate stakeholder, which has contributed to increasing universities’ perceived salience to Games organisers.

In contrast, interviewee MCG4 believed that universities were “seen as a peripheral stakeholder” because “Melbourne is pretty well set up, with facilities and venues and the government ran it and they were going to do it anyway” (MCG4), and that universities did not influence the success of the 2006 Games. His view aligns with the findings of Clarkson (1995), who noted that secondary stakeholders are not essential to an organisation’s survival and organisations should prioritise primary stakeholders.

Interviewee GLCG1 commented that “an Organising Committee is an over scoped vehicle to deliver a Games or an event, a multi-sport Games is a challenging thing but there are other guidelines [for the OC] that the CGF demand of us”. OCs have numerous stakeholders and can “advance or be constrained by their agendas” (Toohey, 2008, p. 1955). As a result, OCs may not be able to meet the expectations of all their stakeholders. According to Clarkson (1995) and Reid (2003), universities are not
classified as primary stakeholders to Games organisers, and therefore their claims on the OC may not be perceived as what Mitchell et al. (1997) outlined as urgent, because the OC does not have “a clear and immediate mandate to attend to and give priority to that stakeholder’s claim” (p. 878).

For individual universities that wanted to be involved with the Commonwealth Games, it was important to be perceived as a more central (primary) and salient stakeholder. Planning for legacy, in a way that could assist OCs to achieve their key performance indicators, was a way in which universities could potentially change their salience and become a legitimate stakeholder. For example, the Griffith University-GOLDOC partnership provides the OC with students, staff, facilities, and a volunteer workforce (Griffith University, n.d.), which will assist the OC meeting their objective of delivering the 2018 Games.

The process of planning for legacy was only evidenced in Glasgow and Gold Coast data. Planning for legacy involved strategic processes such as investing university resources, both human and financial. As an example, Griffith University dedicated staff members and financial resources to its strategic plan to engage with the Games. The university employed consultants to negotiate its partnership with GOLDOC, and this cost was considered to be “in the long scheme of things…a pretty minimal investment on the part of the university” (GCU16), supporting the idea that legacy is not free (Cashman & Toohey, 2002; Veal et al., 2012).

Proactive engagement also contributed to how universities sought to achieve a Games legacy, and was strongly evidenced in the Glasgow and Gold Coast case data from both interviews and documents. However, it was only evidenced from documentary evidence in the Melbourne case. For example, several interviewees (GCU2, GCU12, GCU13, and GCU17) noted that their universities in the Gold Coast
engaged with the bid committee and GOLDOC early in the Games’ lifecycle. As an example, staff members at Bond University started planning for legacy in 2014 (MCG1) and developed a strategic engagement plan to try and position the university as a competitive and salient stakeholder to GOLDOC, supporting what Bromley (2006) and Maietta (2015) described as proactive and competitive in the global university marketplace. Universities are often in competition for many reasons, including students, staff, prestige, jobs, grants, research, and high-tech development (Bromley, 2006). Therefore, university engagement with the Commonwealth Games may be perceived as adding value to the university, resulting in a more salient position in the university sector.

Eight interviewees (GCG1, GCU2, GCU12, GCU13, GCU15, GCU17, MCG1, and MCG6) identified Griffith University as the university most proactive in engaging with the 2018 Games. Griffith University’s strategic planning commenced during the bid phase and encompassed strategies for research, engagement, media, and communication (GCU2, GCU13, and GCU15). This strategic approach focused on mutually beneficial areas the university believed it could deliver to GOLDOC as well as benefit from itself. This approach aligns with the findings of Babiak (2007, p. 341) who suggested that “the desire to pursue common or mutually beneficial goals or interests” is one reason organisations choose to enter into an IOR. By creating strategic plans to engage with the Games, Bond University and Griffith University both attempted to position themselves as salient stakeholders of the Games, with the aim of developing a university–Games IOR.

Another way in which universities sought to achieve a Games legacy was through building on pre-existing relationships and trust with other Games stakeholders. According to Jones (1995), organisations can gain competitive advantage by engaging
with stakeholders on the foundation of trust and cooperation. Established relationships between universities, the OC, and local government were evidenced from all three cases (MCG6, MU10, GLU5, GCU13, GCU15, GCG1, GLCG1, and GLG1). However, these relationships were limited and informal in the Melbourne case. A possible reason that IORs were less prevalent in the Melbourne case was because at the time universities did not see the potential of a Games legacy and therefore did not plan for legacy or pursue a relationship with the OC or any other Games stakeholders. O’Brien and Chalip (2007) noted that potential benefits from sport events much be strategically planned in advance.

The strength of the pre-existing relationships appeared to be more established in the Gold Coast case. For instance, interviewee GCCG1, from GOLDOC, recalled that she “had an existing relationship with quite a few people within the university” and that many of the connections between GOLDOC and universities on the Gold Coast had eventuated because of such pre-existing relationships (GCCG1). Data from the Gold Coast case indicated that because of these established relationships some universities had more access to the OC, potentially allowing opportunities for these universities to engage with the Games (GCU4 and GCU15).

Some of the informal pre-existing relationships developed into formal university–Games IORs. For instance, the Glasgow 2014 Bid planning sub-group and the Glasgow 2014 Commonwealth Games Candidate City File (n.d.) included representatives from both Glasgow Caledonian University and Strathclyde University. The Glasgow 2014 Legacy Framework (2013) indicated that one of its key initiatives was “a partnership between the council and Strathclyde University” (p. 49). Strathclyde University was also a member of the 2014 Games Legacy Evaluation Working Group (Glasgow 2014 Commonwealth Games – Evaluation of Legacy, n.d.; GLU9, GLG1).
An increase in strategic IORs reflects both the importance that has been placed on Games legacy (Bloyce & Lovett, 2012) and the need for universities to engage more with their communities (Alves et al., 2010; Jongbloed, 2008).

Such engagement involves understanding that stakeholder relationships are bidirectional (Parent et al., 2015), but according to Babiak and Thibault (2007) and Freeman (1984), in order to have a mutually beneficial relationship one party has to activate it. In this case, universities arguably have a vested interest in leading the processes of forming IORs with the OC and demonstrating they are a salient stakeholder group. MCG8 suggested that the process of IOR formation needed to involve a university’s highest executive staff:

It needs to be the Vice Chancellor of the university. Then delegate after that but have the top dog walk in and preferably talk to the chairman, it’s those sort of people that tend to have those conversations. And then delegate it down, but absolutely at the highest level and get in early and give it your best shot.

Universities often believe that they are more important, or salient, than their stakeholders perceive them (Smith, 2015). Therefore, in addition to strategic relationships and processes involved with leveraging the Commonwealth Games, strategic units and programmes, including committees, groups, and networks need to be implemented in order to plan for legacy and create a strategic approach to leverage the Games to achieve legacy.

6.1.2 Strategic units and programmes

The sub-theme, strategic units and programmes, emerged from data relating to universities’ formal internal committees, informal groups, and formal external networks. Formal internal committees related to university staff creating formal committees with the intention of planning for and achieving a Games legacy (i.e. Griffith University and Bond University’s strategic plans to engage). Informal groups
related to interview material regarding informal and ad hoc conversations or meetings that were Games related but not strategic or structured. The informal groups were comprised of both internal and external university stakeholders, including academic staff members, OCs, and local government. For instance, interviewee GCU13 described an informal Griffith University Commonwealth Games group:

We started bringing together and having occasional meetings and trying to bring as wide a group of people as possible. And I guess that's kind of carried on with varying degrees of success and fits and starts ever since. I suppose one of the characteristics is it's a broad ranging agenda.

The result of this type of informal group led to unclear organisational legacy goals and suggested that there was interest and intent to engage with the Games, but lack of action in moving forward with legacy planning.

Formal external networks were created with the intention of achieving a positive Games legacy for universities, such as increased brand awareness (GLU7) and research outputs (GLU9). These formal groups involved both internal and external university stakeholders, including local government, other institutions, and marketing bureaus (GLG1, GLU7). For example, the University of Glasgow worked with Glasgow institutions, including the University of Strathclyde, Glasgow Caledonian University, the Royal Conservatoire of Scotland, the Glasgow School of Art, and Glasgow City Marketing Bureau as the city partner. The aim of the group was “to position Glasgow as an education destination during the Commonwealth Games” (GLU7). Overall, the Glasgow and Gold Coast cases demonstrated examples of the formation of strategic units and programmes. In contrast, there were no examples identified in the Melbourne case.

Jongbloed et al. (2008) noted there are many forms of university-industry interaction. For example, formal external networks were evidenced in Glasgow and Gold Coast data. As an example, the Glasgow case evidenced the development of a
formal research consortium between Glasgow City Council, Glasgow Life, and the three local universities (Strathclyde University, University of Glasgow, and Glasgow Caledonian University). After a competitive and open application process, an academic staff member from Strathclyde University was appointed as the Glasgow City Council research coordinator.

The coordinator’s role was to facilitate IORs with these five Games stakeholders and to generate Games research pre-, during, and post-Games (GLU9). The potential for a conflict of interest between the research coordinator and the University of Glasgow and Glasgow Caledonian University was acknowledged (GLGC3, GLU9); however, interviewees did not suggest that any conflict or problems had occurred as a result of this arrangement. However, the data indicated that post-Games research was not as successful as originally envisioned and the programme was not well documented (GLCG3, GLG1, and GLU9). Due to the temporal limitations of measuring and evaluating legacy (Cashman & Horne, 2013), it may be too soon to conclude whether or not the research consortium was a successful programme and whether or not it has or will provide any long-term benefit for any of the Glasgow Games stakeholders involved.

The research consortium illustrates a strategic programme developed to create a positive legacy for universities, the community, OC, and local government, as well as increase IORs between universities in Glasgow and other Games stakeholders. Although this programme was designed with good intentions for positive research and IOR outcomes, Smith and Fox (2007) cautioned that one of the main issues with implementing Olympic Legacy Programmes was the structures and processes that were in place. In planning for legacy, universities must be aware of the inherent challenges associated with implementing formalised structures and processes. According to Raco
(2004), event initiatives should be embedded within broader legacy plans and not act as a substitute for them.

This section on stakeholder leverage has discussed the similarities and differences of the strategic relationships and processes as well as the strategic units and programmes evidenced between each case. These findings reflect Mitchell et al.’s (1997) stakeholder salience framework, which suggested that there are stakeholders who may not have power, but who nevertheless matter to firms and managers. As many universities are becoming more commercial entities in reaction to their changing environment (Alves, 2010), their external presence has increased (Slaba, 2016), and their willingness to engage with the Commonwealth Games has influenced their perceived salience with Games organisers and other stakeholders. In the Melbourne case, universities were not perceived to be a salient stakeholder in the Games, and the universities themselves had not viewed the Games as important to their own strategic objectives. However, the trend of universities becoming more entrepreneurial was evidenced in the Glasgow and Gold Coast cases, and has spawned opportunities for university–Games IORs to develop into what Etzkowitz (2003) described as legitimate.

Nevertheless, Griffith University, Strathclyde University, the University of Glasgow, and Glasgow Caledonian University were the only universities that formed formal partnerships with the Games. Other universities in the Melbourne and Glasgow cases neglected such engagement opportunities with the Games, but even so achieved positive legacy outcomes in some instances (e.g. student/staff opportunities, research, facility use) aligning with Preuss’s (2007) definition that legacy can be unplanned. However, in order to surmount the barriers to achieving positive legacy, universities must adhere to O’Brien and Chalip (2007; 2008) and Thomson et al.’s (2013) advice to strategically plan for the maximisation of event legacy.
6.2 Barriers to Achieving Positive Legacy

The theme, barriers to achieving positive legacy, relates to internal and external challenges, obstacles, or problems that universities experience when seeking to leverage the Games for their own legacies. External university barriers experienced refers to material describing challenges with Games stakeholder relationships, such as a lack of pre-existing relationships and/or the pressure to develop new relationships with Games stakeholders. Internal barriers relates to material characterising university employee’s low morale, lack of interest in Games related activities, competing priorities, unclear legacy goals, and lack of communication from the executive team.

The theme comprises three sub-themes, and was the most dominant theme to emerge from the interview data, with 30 first cycle codes associated with barriers to achieving positive legacy (see Table 15 below). There was no data related to this theme that emerged from the document analysis for any of the cases. One of the limitations of using documents as a source of data collection is that there may be reporting bias, reflecting the bias of the document’s author or the desire for the document to convey a message for a particular audience (Yin, 2009), such as the challenges universities experienced with the OC, and therefore the lack of documentary evidence relating to universities’ barriers to achieving positive legacy was not surprising.

The Glasgow and Gold Coast cases evidenced more barriers than in the Melbourne case, suggesting that with more opportunity there may also be more challenges. Legacy has increasingly become more important (Emery, 2010), and as a result there are more ways in which Games stakeholders can be involved. Thus, there were more attempts by universities to leverage the Games in Glasgow and Gold Coast compared to Melbourne. Universities have more opportunities to be involved with the Games and potentially benefit, and therefore the increase in barriers experienced is
relevant to the increase in the importance of legacy. The following section is structured by third cycle codes and answers research question two: What were the barriers to achieving a legacy?

Table 15: Codes that contributed to the group theme barriers to achieving positive legacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Second Cycle Code (Focused coding)</th>
<th>Third Cycle Code (Axial Coding)</th>
<th>Fourth Cycle Code (Selective coding)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder relationship challenges</td>
<td>External processes and pressures</td>
<td>Barriers to achieving positive legacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of external resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflicting IOR agendas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee morale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion/exclusion of staff</td>
<td>Organisational politics and culture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys’ club mentality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal agendas and influence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoarding information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource investment</td>
<td>Internal processes and pressures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of legacy champion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclear organisational legacy goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of strategic plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competing priorities and lack of staff interest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest and intent but no action</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.2.1 External processes and pressures

The sub-theme external processes and pressures relates to material regarding any external challenges that may have prevented universities from seeking to achieve a positive Games legacy. Universities navigated several barriers related to external stakeholder relationships, such as establishing, managing, and maintaining Games
stakeholder relationships. The lack of external resources, such as grants, research funding, and adequate time with OC staff was considered a university barrier. Finally, conflicting organisational/departmental agendas such as different universities’ (i.e. the University of Glasgow compared to the University of Strathclyde) or departments’ (i.e. exercise science versus business) strategic objectives were perceived to be barriers to achieving positive legacy. Instead of working together internally as one university or externally as a university stakeholder group, conflicting organisational/departmental agendas were thought to have led to competition rather than collaboration (GCU13 and GCU14). These findings suggest there can be variance (Schilling, 2000) between what universities and Games organisers seek to achieve through their interactions.

External processes and pressures were evidenced in all three cases from interview data only. In the Glasgow and Gold Coast cases, challenges that OC interviewees (GLCG3, GCCG2, GCCG3, and GCG1) expressed relate to a lack of awareness in regard to their colleagues’ stakeholder relationships with universities as well as the process required to establish such stakeholder relationships. Further, interviewee GCCG2, from GOLDOC, explained the potential challenges for universities to engage with the OC based on the complexity and structure of the organisation:

You've got an Organising Committee that I would say 60 percent are from government and from Council. And then you've got people from specialty fields and prior Games people. So you've got locals that have been in the market, you've got ex-Games people that know Games but don't know the market, and then you've got City Council people – sort of your general, not real go getters, they're just there to mull through what needs to get done.

The composition of the OC contributed to external challenges that universities experienced when seeking to achieve a Games legacy. An OC’s priority is delivering a Games (Parent, 2015), not working with universities. This challenge reinforces the need for universities to ensure that a potential university-Games IOR is mutually beneficial; otherwise, there is no incentive for the OC to collaborate with universities.
Stakeholder relationship challenges were also evidenced by the perception that many staff members from universities, GOLDOC, and Gold Coast City Council were engaging in individual and informal conversations about potential Games related activities. Interviewee GCG1 confided that if her colleagues were working with universities the information was not being shared and was ultimately a barrier to achieving legacy:

That’s the challenge of working within such a large organisation. I think too there is a lot of potential there to miss out on what could work that might actually be happening that could be contributing to legacy, but just not aware of it. So it doesn’t get communicated more broadly (GCG1).

Another external stakeholder relationship challenge that universities must overcome when seeking to achieve legacy was explained by interviewee MCG8, who emphasised that it is important for universities to present the OC with mutually beneficial engagement plans. Universities cannot expect to engage with any Games stakeholders if the plan for engagement is one-sided. Babiak and Thibault (2008) and Turner and Shilbury (2010) emphasised that successful IORs must be mutually beneficial to all stakeholder groups involved. Thus, if a university-Games IOR does not produce mutual benefits, this may become a barrier to continued interaction.

MCG8 advocated the need to minimise such challenges and suggested that universities need to propose the “most compelling offer they can, to be compelling it means as little effort as possible from the Organising Committee with as great a value out as possible” (MCG8). This finding supports previous research by Parent (2015), which suggested that OCs’ primary focus is on delivering an event. Cashman, Toohey, Darcy, Symons, and Stewart (2004) noted that legacy planning can be difficult because legacy is “considered to be a non-core activity and so receives a low priority by the event organisers, who concentrate their efforts on operations and delivery” (p. 6). Therefore, the primary focus of OCs is not on providing universities with resources or
ensuring that university legacies are achieved. Hence, in order for universities to limit the barriers from external stakeholders, such as the OC, they must understand what the OC wants, as interviewee MCG8 noted:

> At the end of the day, you’ve got to come back to something that interests the Organising Committee. So if it’s not integral to them meeting their goal, then you’re sort of wasting their time. It becomes a distraction. You don’t want to do that; they’ve got enough to do (MCG8).

Another barrier relates to lack of external resources and conflicting agendas, which was evidenced by university staff members trying to generate their own Games related research outcomes. For instance, interviewee MU3 tried to access the OC for his own research agenda but was unsuccessful. He reiterated that the OCs’ main focus was not on facilitating or creating university research projects:

> Trying to get hold of some of [the OC] people to ask them what role they played, they were just so busy...trying to pinpoint some of their people to really ask them questions - it was just not possible. It didn’t really take off in the way...it was just one of those things. It seemed like a good idea, but it didn’t really work (MU3).

Interviewee MU3 thought that conducting research with the OC would be simple and that access would be automatic because of his role at his university. This finding reflects Smith (2015), who noted that universities often perceive themselves to be more important than their stakeholders perceive them. Mitchell et al. (1997) also noted that “claimants may or may not correctly perceive the legitimacy of their claims; likewise, managers may have perceptions of stakeholder legitimacy that are at variance with the stakeholder’s own perception” (p. 869). Interviewee MU3 had expected to easily gain access to the OC based on his perception of how salient his university was to the OC. His experience echoed that of other interviewees (GLU4, MU6, and MU8) and supported interviewee MCG8’s statement regarding the need to present ideas that interest the OC and are “integral” to the OC “meeting their goal” (MCG8).
Another example of conflicting agendas was also evidenced in the Glasgow and Gold Coast cases. For instance, individual university staff members harboured ideas of how they wanted to engage with the Games, which were not necessarily in alignment with their university’s strategic plan. Several interviewees (GLCG3, GLCG4, GCCG1, GCCG2, and GCCG3) from Glasgow 2014 and GOLDOC mentioned that numerous university staff members had independently reached out to them to try to be involved with the Games in a variety of ways, including research and university accommodation. This one-off type of communication was potentially a barrier to engagement, because instead of working towards a university-wide strategic plan, the OCs had to negotiate with individuals (GCCG1). Interviewees (MU7, GCU2, and GCU17) thought that there should be a streamlined channel for communication with the OC established as soon as the successful bid is announced. The communication with GOLDOC was mostly ad hoc and not in line with either of the universities’ strategic plans created up to that point. OCs are “outsourcing organisations” with very little time and limited resources (Parent, 2015), and so it is imperative that universities are aware of how such potential external processes and pressures may pose a barrier to them leveraging positive legacies.

Conflicting agendas were also evidenced within universities and between universities. For instance, one of the desired outcomes of Griffith University and Bond University’s internal Commonwealth Games committees was to increase interdepartmental collaboration (GCU2, GCU13, GCU12, and GCU17). However, internal employees’ agendas can often be conflicting, contributing to the perceived challenges of working collaboratively. Interviewee GCU13 highlighted the complexity of collaboration with his colleagues and the potential for conflicting agendas:

There is an interesting dance between collaboration and self-interest. We have to pretend that we’re all caring and sharing, but I want it, I don’t want you to get it, sort of thing. I don’t know how effective that [internal Commonwealth Games] coordinating committee is, probably not hugely effective (GCU13).
Another barrier to achieving positive legacy included the organisational politics and culture associated with universities and Games stakeholder organisations.

6.2.2 Organisational politics and culture

The sub-theme organisational politics and culture emerged from interview data from all three cases and refers to legacy barriers associated with the politics and culture of a university that interviewees experienced. Pfeiffer (1981) described organisational politics as “those activities taken within organizations to acquire, develop and use power and other resources to obtain one’s preferred outcome” (p. 7). Such barriers included low employee morale, inclusion/exclusion of staff, a boys’ club mentality, personal agendas and influence, hoarding Games related information, and lack of executive support.

Low levels of employee morale were perceived to be a barrier because university staff members indicated a lack of enthusiasm and impetus in being involved with leveraging the Games (GCU11). Cashman and Adair (2009) noted that such challenges within organisations can be related to the morale of staff members.

6.2.3 Inclusion/exclusion

Another perceived barrier was that some university staff members felt excluded during the formation of internal and external committees, groups, and networks, despite indicating their Games expertise and interest in being involved. For instance, perceived inclusion/exclusion of university staff was evidenced by interviewees from Griffith University. Some members of staff were “handpicked” (GCU2) and specifically invited (GCU1, GCU6, and GCU13) to be involved with internal Commonwealth Games committees. Interviewees (GCU2, GCU12, and GCU13) believed that this may have inhibited other university staff members from seeking involvement with such
committees and thus feeling excluded from any Games related involvement. Further, the official partnership negotiations only included “the Vice Chancellor and members of his core executive” (GCU15). There was a sense of exclusion and lack of awareness among other staff members about the specific ways in which Griffith intended to leverage the Games and how they would be involved (GCU1 and GCU3), suggesting the lack of what O’Brien and Chalip (2007; 2008) suggested as a strategic approach to plan for legacy.

Another perceived barrier was the sense of a boys’ club that led to some female staff members feeling omitted from their university’s internal groups (GCU12 and GCU17), and was therefore perceived as a barrier for those “outside the club”. The perception of a boys’ club mentality, personal agendas and influence, as well as hoarding information was evidenced by Griffith University interviewees (GCU2, GCU5, GCU15, and GCU17). As an example, shortly after the successful Gold Coast bid was announced, the Vice Chancellor created an appointed position entitled “Strategic Advisor to the Commonwealth Games”. The role was developed ad hoc (GCU17). Three interviewees (GCU2, GCU12, and GCU16) believed that the appointee was not the right person for the job, and was only appointed because of his executive position in the university and personal connection to the Vice Chancellor.

In contrast, interviewee GCCG1, from the OC, perceived the strategic advisor to be “really valuable” and his role was understood to be about “facilitating a connection between GOLDOC and other universities”. However, once the official sponsorship between GOLDOC and Griffith University was announced, working with other universities was not a priority for Griffith University. The various levels of awareness and lack of clarity about the purpose of this role classified the situation as a barrier to achieving legacy because of staff members’ uncertainty regarding the university’s
strategic plan to engage with the Games. For example, when asked about the strategic advisor’s role, interviewee GCU13 commented that he was “not 100% sure what [the strategic advisor’s] role” entailed and that most staff would also probably not know.

Data from Glasgow and Gold Coast cases evidenced that personal egos, status, and hoarding information from executive leadership impeded universities’ ability to leverage the Games (GLU4, GLU8, GLU11, GCU2, GCU5, GCU6, GCU8, GCU9, GCU12, and GCU14). The Melbourne interviewees discussed very few barriers associated with organisational politics and culture, as their universities did not try to formally leverage the 2006 Games.

Personal agendas and influence were perceived as a barrier because individuals with personal agendas can potentially inhibit a university wide strategic plan as these individuals may form their own subcultures, which as Sporn (1996) noted may be subversive and not contribute to achieving an organisational goal. There was evidence to suggest university staff members with personal agendas and the hoarding of Games related information contributed to the creation of a siloed culture at the University of Glasgow and Griffith University (GLU7, GCU5, and GLU12). Interviewee GCU5 thought that “academics are quite siloed…that's one of the big problems we have in universities because you focus quite narrowly on your area”, which Halbwirth and Toohey (2001) noted can have a negative impact on internal communication flows, knowledge sharing, and culture. According to the Business Dictionary a silo mentality is

a mind-set present in some companies when certain departments or sectors do not wish to share information with others in the same company. This type of mentality will reduce the efficiency of the overall operation, reduce morale, and may contribute to the demise of a productive company culture.

The silo mind-set is an ongoing issue with universities (Gleeson, 2013) and sport events (Halbwirth & Toohey, 2001; 2015). Interviewee GCU12 perceived that “other faculties
don’t really want to go outside their box and come collectively and work together”, contributing to organisational and cultural barriers to achieving a university Games legacy.

The final barrier within organisational politics and culture relates to a lack of executive support, which includes the absence of financial and organisational support provided by the executive leadership team within universities. Interviewees (MU4, MU5, MU6, GLU8, and GLU10) believed that university executives did not see the benefit of engaging with the Games and were therefore unlikely to support their staff from pursuing any interest in involvement with the Games. For instance, interviewees (MU11 and GCU11) discussed a range of Games related activities, such as volunteering, research, and committees, that they would like to be part of, but the lack of financial support from their university in terms of paid time off or using regular work hours was a barrier for them to engaging at an individual level. These organisational and political challenges, or what Getz et al. (2007, p. 104) described as event organisations’ “internal management deficiencies”, are not unique to universities. Parent (2015) noted that “power plays are seen at all levels of the organisation. Departments or functions fight for resources, have to negotiate with each other and with stakeholders, and have to make decisions, all of which are fraught with political underpinnings” (p. 4).

In summary, there were several organisational and cultural barriers that some universities in Glasgow and the Gold Coast experienced when seeking to leverage the Commonwealth Games. Other barriers to achieving legacy include internal work processes and pressures, discussed in the next section.
6.2.4 Internal processes and pressures

The sub-theme internal processes and pressures relates to the costs associated with legacy and the universities’ unwillingness to invest sufficient resources, including financial, human, and time to achieve the desired outcomes. Another internal barrier included the lack of a university legacy champion, or someone that was interested and capable of leading a university’s strategic plan, as well as unclear university legacy goals and imprecise plans on how to engage with the Commonwealth Games. Internal barriers also relate to a university’s interest and intent to engage with the Games, but without any action taken or the lack of a strategic plan.

Another internal barrier relates to competing priorities, for instance staff have a finite time to accomplish their general work tasks. Some interviewees commented how they felt conflicted about how to use their disposable time. They were unsure whether the best strategy as an individual would be to involve themselves with Games activities, or focus on work that may lead to a promotion in the future, such as research outputs (MU8 and GCU11). University interest and intent to engage with the Games but lack of any action to engage was also an internal barrier to achieving legacy. Finally, poor communication within universities underpinned the majority of internal processes and pressures, and is discussed throughout the section.

Universities in all three cases discussed several internal processes and pressures that were perceived as barriers to maximising their Games legacy (MU3, MU7, GLU5, GLU9, GLU10, GCU6, GCU12, and GCU16). One such example included legacy costs associated with leveraging the Games, which Bromley (2006), Higham (1999), and Nichols and Ralston (2015) all suggested can be a barrier to leveraging an MSE. The financial implications of planning for legacy were believed to be a barrier and were evidenced by interviewees from Southern Cross University and the University of
Queensland. For example, interviewees (GCU4 and GCU6) from Southern Cross University could see the potential benefits of the Games and were interested in engaging. However, as the newest and smallest of the universities on the Gold Coast, Southern Cross University could not afford the “price tag” (GCU4) of an official sponsorship. Griffith University’s financial sponsorship means it is now what Reid (2007) classified as a primary stakeholder and what Mitchell et al. (1997) consider a dominant stakeholder, because of the formal (financial) mechanism in place.

However, Griffith University’s official sponsorship may become a barrier for other local universities, such as Southern Cross University and the University of Queensland, becoming any sort of stakeholder, limiting their ability to achieve a Games legacy (GCU12, GCU4, GCU14, and GCU17). Interviewees’ (GCU2 and GCU17) understanding of the official partnership between Griffith University and GOLDOC prevents any other universities from directly engaging with the Games, limiting what Preuss (2007) defined as a planned legacy. According to interviewee GCU2, universities interested in formal engagement with the Games would need to go through Griffith University. Thus, the official partnership is anticipated to benefit Griffith University, but will decrease any potential planned legacies for other universities. This finding aligns with the conclusion of Preuss (2015), who argued that the same legacy may affect stakeholders in different ways and what may be positive for one stakeholder may be negative or non-existent for another.

Unclear Games legacy goals and lack of awareness among academics was mostly evidenced by those not directly involved in Games programmes or committees (GLU10). Interviewee GLCG4 reflected “if you’re not involved in [the Games], it would be very easy for something like the Lead 2014 stuff to pass. Nobody really knows what it was” (GLCG4). However, some interviewees (GLU12 and GCU13) that
were involved with Games legacy committees were also unaware of what other staff members were doing and sometimes even the goal of their committee. These examples also reflect the impact of poor communication and lack of strategic direction within an organisation. Benson et al. (2014) suggested that more communication between stakeholders about planning for legacy may lead to greater potential for legacy. While lack of awareness about what others may be doing to engage with the Games does not necessarily indicate that there is no engagement, it highlights the complexity of managing internal and external stakeholder relationships (Babiak & Thibault, 2008), especially with regard to communication. For instance, interviewee MU8 noted that at Victoria University “there’s never ever one portal to get information”.

Executive and general university staff wished to engage with the Games in all three cases (MU7, GCU8, and GCU12); however, barriers such as a lack of strategy or knowledge about how to engage prevented any formal interaction. Interviewee MU7 recalled that La Trobe University had a “clear top down desire to engage with the Commonwealth Games”; however, no strategic plan (MU7) was developed. This meant that the executive staff at La Trobe University had interest and intent to engage, but no formal action was taken to engage with the Games. Interviewee MU7 highlighted that since the 2006 Melbourne Games universities have become more strategic in how they engage with major events:

With the benefit of hindsight…the way we’re doing it now at ISEAL (Institute of Sport, Exercise and Active Living) is probably a result of learning how you had to do it 10 years ago. It’s [legacy planning] now strategically anchored in our way forward that we want to engage with the majors as in Olympics, World Championships, continental and FIFA World Cup. Wherever those events are we try to at least create exchange links for staff and students but also engage at least in one project that allows us to associate with those events (MU7).

As another example of a lack of a strategic process, Bond University’s strategic plan to engage with the Games was not acted upon. Although the plan had been developed and circulated throughout the university, some staff “hadn’t really thought
too much about universities using the Games for generating outcomes” (GCU11). The university’s executive level was expecting to leverage the Games (GCU8) for research and promotion of Bond University’s involvement in the Games; however, at the time of interviews, Bond University’s strategic plan had not progressed past the writing and approval stage and the university’s relationship with GOLDOC remained informal. This finding aligns with the work of Bromley (2006), who noted that university administrators find it hard to achieve their goals because in “most cases they are just ‘herding cats’…going in different directions” (p. 18). University staff members often experience competing priorities; therefore, they may not want to shift their attention to a task that they perceive as not beneficial to their career (Bromley, 2006). For staff members to increase their current workload and engage with the Games would require someone who “is willing, and wanting to, has an interest in and that is the interest that drives them wanting to be involved” (MCG4). Without staff interest, it was thought to be challenging for university executives to get staff to spend their time on legacy related tasks (GCU11).

Interviewee MU2 commented that some academic staff at Deakin University lacked interest in research engagement with the Games, because it was “not an area of my research interest, nor most of the others at the time”. Regardless of the range of potential research opportunities available (e.g. in media, marketing, tourism, broadcasting, art and culture, law, etc.), Interviewees (MU1 and MU2) from the Melbourne case could not see Games research opportunities for staff unless their area of interest was specifically in sport events. Cashman and Toohey (2002) noted that one of the key areas of collaboration with universities for the Sydney 2000 Olympic Games OC was in research. This highlights the need for a better understanding of the types of academic research possibilities that can use the Games, although not specifically related

In summary, all three cases evidenced perceived internal and external barriers to achieving a positive Games legacy. These barriers increased as the importance of Games legacy increased, in addition to the environmental pressure for universities to engage with their communities and expectations to operate more like businesses. As highlighted in this section, these barriers included an unwillingness to invest resources, unclear organisational legacy goals, lack of a strategic plan, competing priorities and lack of staff interest, interest and intent to engage but no action, and poor communication. These barriers impacted on the outcomes achieved by universities through the Games, linking to the final theme, which is ‘intended and unintended legacies’.

6.3 Intended and Unintended Legacies

The final theme intended and unintended legacies relates to material describing both universities’ desired and achieved legacies as a result of attempting to leverage the Commonwealth Games as well as any unintended or missed legacy opportunities. Such legacies include opportunities for students and staff to engage with the Games and benefit over the long term, new or improved university physical infrastructure, increased or strengthened university–Games IORs, and university branding opportunities to increase awareness. The theme is comprised of two sub-themes: desired and/or achieved legacies and missed opportunities (See Table 16).
### Table 16: Codes grouped to form the theme intended and unintended legacies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Second Cycle Code (Focused coding)</th>
<th>Third Cycle Code (Axial Coding)</th>
<th>Fourth Cycle Code (Selective coding)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student opportunities and impact</td>
<td>Desired and/or achieved legacies</td>
<td>Intended and unintended legacies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff opportunities and impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interorganisational relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media/marketing/branding opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missed opportunities for students</td>
<td>Missed opportunities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missed opportunities for staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underutilised physical infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undercapitalised interorganisational relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missed opportunities for media/marketing/branding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The sub-theme desired and/or achieved legacies emerged from both document and interview data from all three cases. It included material about student and staff opportunities associated with the Games, such as professional development, postgraduate opportunities, Games focused research outputs, and university staff secondment to the OC. Other desired legacies included use of or new/improved university facilities that could be used for Games related activities, such as athlete or staff training. This sub-theme also encompassed new or strengthened university–Games IORs as well as university branding opportunities. These are examples of what Preuss (2007) described as long-term, short-term, planned, unplanned, intangible, and tangible legacies.
Desired and/or achieved university legacies were categorised based on Gratton and Preuss (2008) and Veal et al.’s (2012) categories of legacy, including: sport – physical infrastructure; sport – information, education, knowledge, and skill-development; public life, politics, culture, and networks; and sport – mass participation and health (see Table 17).

**Table 17: Categories of desired and/or achieved university legacy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of legacy</th>
<th>Melbourne 2006</th>
<th>Glasgow 2014</th>
<th>Gold Coast 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sport - physical infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport - information, education, knowledge, and skill-development</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public life, politics, culture, and networks</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport - mass participation and health</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The sport - physical infrastructure category relates to the use or improvement of university facilities. For example, the newly built 2018 Games Village will be adjacent to Griffith University, Gold Coast campus. The Village is part of a “Health and Knowledge Precinct” which includes Gold Coast University Hospital and Griffith University (Mackay, 2013). The construction of a pool and other facility upgrades will also take place on the Griffith University Gold Coast campus (GCU2).

The sport – information, education, knowledge, and skill-development category includes legacies such as university led research, educational initiatives by universities, branding and media opportunities including forums and seminars, technology initiatives, and increased awareness within the university market. For example, research generated at Deakin University in Melbourne examined leveraging the 2006 Games for
community engagement (Kellett, Hede, & Chalip, 2006) and the University of Melbourne explored implications of the Games for the local property market (Reed & Wu, 2005). Further, Commonwealth Games linked student and staff activities included a Science Meets Sport forum at the University of Melbourne’s Bio 21 Institute and an International Youth Masterclass in percussion at the Victorian College of the Arts (The University of Melbourne, 2006).

The Glasgow Games collaborated with universities, as evidenced by a dedicated section on their website for Games research. The website included information about a panel of university experts, and “Lead 2014”, a partnership between the Youth Sport Trust, sportscotland, and Glasgow 2014 (Glasgow 2014 Commonwealth Games, 2014c). The University of Glasgow also had a web page dedicated to the 2014 Commonwealth Games. The web page provided information on volunteering for the Games, making connections, venues, research opportunities, facilities, scholarships, events, news, and a Commonwealth Games Group. The Group comprised colleagues from across the university to maximise its contribution to the 2014 Commonwealth Games and to the legacy of the Games (University of Glasgow, 2014). Furthermore, part of the University of Glasgow’s academic research involved a five-year community study to measure the success of the Legacy 2014 programme (University of Glasgow, n.d.).

Another example of an educational initiative was Griffith University’s integration of a new course into its sport management major. The new course examined the complexities of staging major sport events, such as the 2018 Commonwealth Games (Griffith University, 2013). An example of a technology initiative is the University of Glasgow’s “MyCity” application, which is a smartphone app-based game that used the
2014 Games as a platform to encourage people to be more physically active as well as engage more with Glasgow and the Commonwealth (Gamechanger Awards, 2014).

The category of public life, politics, culture, and networks includes new and/or improved IORs and community, social, and/or cultural benefits. An example of an IOR with a cultural benefit was the Aberdeen Youth Games in Scotland, which was an innovative citywide sport and cultural programme developed in partnership between Robert Gordon University and Sport Aberdeen. The project aimed to increase sport, physical activity, and volunteering across the city (Gamechanger Awards, 2014).

The sport–mass participation and health categories were based on evidence that many universities have sought to increase participation in sport among staff and students and thereby increase the health of their community. For instance, the University of Aberdeen in Scotland worked in collaboration with Aberdeen Sports Village to open the Aquatics Centre, which offers students and staff the use of the facility, and the opportunity to learn how to swim for free in an effort to increase sport participation and health and fitness (Gamechanger Awards, 2014). Another instance within the sport participation category was with regard to the cycling clubs from the universities of Edinburgh, Glasgow and Strathclyde which host cycling sessions at the Sir Chris Hoy Velodrome. The clubs have introduced over 300 students to the sport of track cycling since 2012. This program is an entirely student led initiative inspired by the 2014 Commonwealth Games, which sought to create a legacy program within one of the major venues of the Games (Gamechanger Awards, 2014).

As Gratton and Preuss (2008) and Veal et al. (2012) suggested, there are a variety of potential legacy outcomes. In this study, all three cases evidenced a range of legacy categories that universities desired and/or achieved through leveraging the Commonwealth Games.
The sub-theme missed opportunities emerged from interview data from all three cases and related to missed opportunities for students and staff, underutilised physical infrastructure, undercapitalised IORs, and missed opportunities for university branding. The missed opportunities were a result of a lack of strategic planning. The absence of the sub-theme missed opportunities in documentary evidence may be explained by Gratton and Henry’s (2001) suggestion that official event related documents are often optimistic in their reporting, as they are created for subjective entities such as government agencies which have invested in the event. The following section is structured by second cycle codes to answer the final component of research question one: What legacies have universities sought to achieve through leveraging a Commonwealth Games?

6.3.1 Student opportunities

Examples of student opportunities include professional development, work experience, internships, further education, such as postgraduate study, and volunteering opportunities. Data indicated that student opportunities were one of the most desired and/or achieved Games legacies (MU1, MU7, GLGC2, GLGC4, GLGC4, GLU5, GLU9, GLU12, GCU1, GCU5, GCU8, GCU10, GCU15, GCU16, and GCU17). Cashman and Toohey (2002) found that the most important reasons universities engaged with the Olympic Games were to provide opportunities for students and staff. The data from all participating universities identified that one of the primary intended outcomes for universities engaging with the 2018 Games was to benefit their students (Commonwealth Games Federation, 2011; Gould, 2011; Griffith University, 2015). This intended type of legacy aligns with the findings of Alves, Mainardes, and Raposo (2010); who suggested that students are now considered the most important university stakeholder.
One of the ways universities planned for their students to benefit was by gaining professional development through Games related internships (GLGC2, GLGC4, GLGC4, GLU5, GLU9, and GLU12). As an example, one feature of the Griffith University-GOLDOC partnership included student internships with GOLDOC and its partners (Rogers, 2015). Work experience opportunities with Games stakeholders were perceived to be used to “springboard careers for students” (GCU16). From GOLDOC’s perspective it was believed to be a way to “give back and…provide a really unique opportunity to students” (GCCG1). These findings align with Ankrah, Burgess, Grimshaw, and Shaw (2013) and Siegel, Waldman, and Link (2003), who advocated that university–industry partners often seek such partnerships to gain access to students for internships and for future employees.

Another way of gaining work experience for students who were close to graduation or had graduated from university was through paid positions and volunteering. Interviewee GCU10 commented on the variety of ways that students would be able to benefit over the long term from the Games when he commented that

One way the university can engage is having opportunities to put people in paid jobs for a period of time who are graduates or almost graduates. But also there’s the opportunity to move students into all sorts of roles on a volunteer sort of basis as well. An internship or work integrated learning seems to be a fairly sensible way to put people in all sorts of roles. It could be anything from media to general volunteering, sports medicine, sports science, hosting languages, there’s probably 20 or more areas.

In addition to work experience, education opportunities such as scholarships were a desired legacy of the Commonwealth Games and were evidenced by both Glasgow and Gold Coast data. Interviewee GLU7 recalled that the University of Glasgow provided Games related scholarship opportunities for students from Commonwealth countries. Griffith University offered “Griffith University and Gold Coast 2018 Commonwealth Games Scholarships”, which are available to selected
students from any Commonwealth country or territory commencing their study at Griffith University.

Another opportunity for enhancing student education was through classroom learning, evidenced in the Glasgow data. Interviewee GCU14 thought that the Games provided an educational resource and she used the Games as a “theme for teaching and learning”. This finding aligns with the findings of Shipway (2007) who noted that:

Olympic-related education programmes can use the power of sport within an educational setting that might engage the many young people in today’s society who may not normally have an interest in sport or education and who often feel excluded and isolated within their own community or during their time in education (pp. 121-122).

In contrast, the data suggested that Melbourne universities had limited and informal student opportunities. Some interviewees (MU1, MU3) thought that some students experienced a positive short-term outcome because of their own initiative, and not from any formal university initiative. Interviewee MU7 recalled that La Trobe University had “some facility related connections where students were placed. In some instances, we used the Commonwealth Games for some of our students to get some internships or some practical experience. Much of that to be honest was quite informal”.

Data illustrated that there were more formal mechanisms in place for students to benefit and engage with the 2014 and 2018 Games than for the 2006 Games through internships, work experience, volunteering, and scholarship opportunities. Interviewee GCCG4 noted that “universities now know the importance of the extracurricular stuff and the student experience stuff which students can get out of their time at university and that’s obviously becoming more and more important as people struggle to get jobs”. This finding supports the research of Howlett (2010) and Mainardes, Alves, and Raposo (2010), who suggested that universities have been forced to better develop their students
for life after university through internships and work experience because of the highly competitive job market.

**6.3.2 Staff opportunities**

The Commonwealth Games were also perceived as a way to provide professional development opportunities to both university and OC staff members through Games focused research output and secondments. Providing these opportunities could be beneficial to the individual staff member, the University, and also the OC. Cashman and Toohey (2002) advocated for universities to support staff members who have the opportunity to be involved with the Games, as the skills they develop through this experience can be of great value to the university on their return (Cashman & Toohey, 2002). For example, from the OCs’ perspective, interviewee GCCG1 identified the potential benefit to an OC from university staff involvement:

> A university can offer a Games diverse skill sets across different areas…from a research perspective…we can really tap into some of those unique research initiatives and whether it is in sport or communications or legacy or any of those areas…that's really important to inform planning from a major events perspective and from a Games perspective (GCCG1).

Several interviewees (GCCG1, GCCG2, GCU15, and GCU17) from the Gold Coast case discussed potential professional development opportunities for university staff. Interviewee GCU15 suggested that staff could be “involved in professional placements, secondments” and “do GOLDOC orientated work and…supplement their work force with expertise because…[GOLDOC] have to helicopter in or parachute in expertise, you can’t develop it, they need people who just know how it happens” (GCU15). Cashman and Toohey (2002) noted that OC’s “demand for trained personnel has led to greater opportunities for the higher education sector” (p. 12).
Staff secondment was also evidenced in Glasgow data. For example, the OC created a secondment position entitled “Commonwealth Games and Regeneration for Glasgow Research Fellow” with the following job description:

This innovative secondment will foster collaborative research between the three universities in Glasgow on the economic, social, physical and cultural development of the city, with particular reference to the 2014 Commonwealth Games. The aim of this post is to create a research framework within which collaborative research and knowledge exchange projects can be developed (Advert Senior Research Fellow, 2010).

As part of the research consortium, a “number of studies” were undertaken related to host city and ceremony volunteers, the Queen’s Baton Relay, as well as City Council staff members’ understanding of Games organisation and development (GLG1). Interviewee GLG1 commented that having the universities involved with the research consortium “worked well” in order to achieve “higher level research”, beyond the research capabilities of City Council. However, ongoing professional development opportunities post-Games appeared to have declined. Interviewee GLU4 commented that the Games have “just disappeared, we’ve moved on…it’s just gone, just absolutely sunk without a trace”. One year post-Games, several interviewees (GLU11, GLU12, GLCG3, and GLG1) suggested enthusiasm about universities researching the 2014 Games had deteriorated and that staff members’ research focus was now on upcoming events and projects. Cashman (1998) noted that a “dramatic fall in interest at the end of the Games” (p. 111) is common. However, Rogerson (2016) noted that it is important to capitalise on existing assets in order to harness the momentum of the event in delivering legacies.

It is intended that opportunities such as staff secondments will arise from the official Griffith University-GOLDOC partnership (GCU2, GCU15), although, at the time of this research, they had not. Further, it appears that staff at other Gold Coast based universities will now have limited opportunities to benefit from the Games due to
the exclusive nature of the commercial Griffith University-GOLDOC partnership (GCU2). Thomson et al. (2013) noted that “planning to maximize positive outcomes and limit negative outcomes is complicated by the fact that legacies may be subject to perception, and that two stakeholders may take very different viewpoints on the same legacy outcome” (p. 118). As an example, Griffith University staff members may be seconded to the OC and experience a positive legacy; while staff at Bond University, Southern Cross University, and the University of Queensland may not have the same opportunity and could perceive this experience as a negative legacy.

6.3.3 Physical infrastructure

Both documents and interviews from all three cases discussed use of university facilities for a variety of reasons, including pre and during Games athlete and staff training, hosting Games related conferences and meetings, and development of new or improved facilities. Using university facilities was seen as advantageous to universities, because it could offer promotional opportunities and contribute to the mutually beneficial university-Games IOR.

Interviewees from all three cases (MCG4, MU7, GCU6, GLCG2, GLU4, GCU12, GCU14, GCU15) thought that providing university facilities for Games related purposes would allow a university to leverage its location in a Games’ host region and contribute to its brand awareness. For instance, interviewee GLCG2 believed that “the awareness that’s built on Glasgow, in terms of event management and in terms of using a major sport event” increased the university’s “facility awareness” and that “some of the universities used the occasion to justify upgrading their facilities” (GLCG2).

Glasgow2014 coordinated with universities to utilise university facilities for pre-Games training either as a training venue for the national or visiting teams or use of
facilities such as conference rooms, meeting rooms, and classrooms to train OC staff (GLCG2). Interviewee GLU4 believed that “there is absolutely no long term benefits of being involved with the Commonwealth Games unless someone’s going to build you a facility” (GLU4), suggesting a viewpoint of legacy limited to tangible outcomes. This finding aligns with the findings of Preuss (2015), who suggests that the most commonly emphasised and measured legacies are those that are tangible and positive.

6.3.4 Strengthening of interorganisational relationships

Strengthening of IORs relates to material that discussed universities’ stakeholder salience and how it facilitated development of university–Games IORs. While the staging of an MSE can provide a unique opportunity for the creation of relationships that can benefit students, staff, and universities (Cashman & Toohey, 2002), data from Glasgow and Gold Coast suggested this was a desired rather than an achieved legacy.

University–Games IORs were developed or strengthened when universities were able to provide something of value that was perceived to be mutually beneficial, including research, staff and student workforce, and facilities. Based on the increased IORs, universities had shifted their salience and had what Mitchell et al. (1997) described as a legitimate claim, thus receiving more attention from OCs and local government. However, Mitchell (1997) argued that “entity may have legitimate standing in society, or it may have a legitimate claim on the firm, but unless it has either power to enforce its will in the relationship or a perception that its claim is urgent, it will not achieve salience for the firm’s managers.”

Universities that were able to offer something in return to the OC or government experienced an increase in Games related collaboration with other Games stakeholder groups, such as research networks, student and staff opportunities, and marketing
campaigns. Some of these IORs that were developed pre-Games were believed to have been strengthened post-Games. For instance, Glasgow City Council “developed some strong…links with universities” (GLG1) through creating an “economic evaluation group” (GLG1). Interviewee GLU7 believed that the University of Glasgow’s marketing team developed and strengthened its existing IOR with the Glasgow City Marketing Bureau and that the relationship has continued post-Games.

Data from the Gold Coast case indicated that nurturing and strengthening university–Games IORs was important to universities (GCU10, GCU13). Interviewee GCU12 noted that Bond University had a close relationship with Gold Coast City Council, so the university intended to foster that relationship for long-term benefit. A primary reason a university is interested in developing IORs is to enhance its reputation (Ankrah & AL-Tabbaa, 2015; Mora-Valentin, 2000); one such way is through university brand awareness.

### 6.3.5 University branding opportunities

The potential for Glasgow and Gold Coast universities to use the Commonwealth Games as a branding opportunity was one of the most desired legacies discussed (GLCG2, GLG1, GLU4, GLU7, GCU3, GCU5, GCU6, GCU7, GCU12, GCU13, GCU14, GCU15, and GCU16). Interviewees from the Melbourne case did not mention branding opportunities. Branding opportunities for universities were thought to have the potential to increase universities’ reputations and showcase what the universities can offer to prospective students and staff. Bromley (2006) suggested that creating a university “brand image” is a crucial strategic objective for a university (p. 10). Universities are dependent on their “images”, because a positive image can attract more high quality students, faculty, research grants, charitable donations, corporate investments, and government support (Bromley, 2006). One of the ways universities
can build their image or destination brand is through leveraging an event (Chalip, 2014), such as the Commonwealth Games.

One of the perceived benefits of using the Games as a branding opportunity was to increase a university’s reputation and attract more fee paying international students. For instance, the strategic intent of the University of Glasgow’s internal Commonwealth Games committee was to position the city of Glasgow as an “education destination” (GLU7), with the objective of increasing international students. Interviewee GLU7 thought that the desired legacy for the University of Glasgow was “fundamentally…about reputation and media”.

Data from the Gold Coast case suggested that Bond University thought the Games’ branding opportunity was through “selling points to other international students” (GCU12). Bond University intended to “increase awareness of the place and promote what we have in areas we haven’t marketed to” (GCU12), such as some Commonwealth Nations. Southern Cross University believed that it would benefit indirectly from “identity and destination marketing for the city”. Interviewee GCU6 believed the Games provide “a major opportunity for the city to build its brand and its identity”, which can be “incredibly appealing for students to come and want to study and that benefits us all…there’s a really big opportunity to put Gold Coast on the map predominantly as an international student destination” (GCU6). Universities need this revenue stream because of declining government subsidies (Universities Australia, 2015).

In addition to the desire of increasing international student enrolment, the data also suggested other branding opportunities were sought from the Games. One university adopted the approach of hosting a team, thereby creating increased exposure for the university. For instance, the University of Stirling received a “significant amount
of publicity because the Scotland team were based at Stirling” and the university “benefited in terms of cash, and…reputational benefits” (GLU4).

Another way universities tried to generate brand awareness and achieve media attention was to host a symposium, which included academic Games experts. Cashman and Toohey (2002) noted that MSEs provide a platform for Games stakeholders, including scholars to collaborate, which can potentially result in Games related research projects. Interviewee GLU12 thought that the University of Strathclyde’s “profile was raised through a number of events and people being in and around the campus”. One such event that was hosted on campus was the Global Coaches House, which celebrated coaching and coaches. The event was a new partnership between sportscotland, the National Agency for Sport in Scotland, and The University of Strathclyde. The University of Glasgow attempted to create branding awareness opportunities through hosting a legacy expert panel debate. The debate focused on the different meanings of legacy and how and what the university could do to contribute to the regeneration of the city (University of Glasgow, 2014). Interviewee GLCG2 noted that the “ongoing awareness of Glasgow as a destination has certainly improved recruitment [for universities] and…put it on people’s radars”. From the marketing and recruitment perspective, the University of Glasgow believed it experienced a branding legacy and “more benefits since the Games has finished” as a result (GLU4).

The data evidenced that universities thought that generating media opportunities could create an increased awareness of university facilities and promote accessibility for future students, staff, and the community. For instance, interviewee GCU7, from the University of Queensland, acknowledged the potential media opportunities that leveraging the Games could create for his university. He commented that it’s all about reputation as well so we want to showcase the facilities and obviously by having someone like England or Canada or India - so a larger team
perhaps- we’re going to have more media, more attention. We've got all the facilities so that won't be a challenge, and then we want to also use it to promote accessibility, the accessibility of campus (GCU7).

While several universities viewed the Games as offering opportunities to develop brand awareness of their host location, Chalip (2014) argued that branding legacies from MSEs may be small and undetectable in markets that are already familiar with the destination. The evidence from the Melbourne case data indicated no attempt to leverage the Games for branding opportunities. Possible reasons include Melbourne being a capital city, which has successfully hosted many MSEs, suggesting that it is already a well-known destination. Interviewee MU4 noted that Glasgow and the Gold Coast are non-capital cities that may be less recognised globally and can potentially benefit greatly by increasing their brand awareness through the Games.

In summary, universities in Glasgow and the Gold Coast sought to leverage branding opportunities through the Games to increase university awareness, attract international students, and create media opportunities. There was evidence to suggest that while universities had tried to leverage the Games to achieve positive legacies, including student and staff development, use of/new facilities and infrastructure, increased IORs, and branding opportunities, there were several instances of universities missing out on Games related opportunities.

6.3.6 Missed opportunities

The sub-theme of missed opportunities relates to material regarding lack of university led initiatives for students and staff, underutilised physical infrastructure, undercapitalised university–Games IORs and lack of university branding, and emerged from interview data only. According to Bramwell (1997), missed opportunities are a result of a lack of strategic planning.
Interviewees highlighted a range of missed opportunities for students and staff. These included a lack of university pathways for student engagement and a lack of work experience opportunities in a Games related environment. For example, interviewee MCG6 highlighted that there was an effort by M2006 to engage with university students. He thought that the OCs’ intention offered a “great opportunity”, but it did not translate into student involvement (MCG6). The lack of student engagement was perceived to be a missed opportunity not only for the university but also for students who could have benefitted from work experience, developing their skills for future employment (MU3).

Another reason there were missed opportunities for students was the organisational politics and culture of the university. Bonaccorsi and Piccaluga (2007) noted that one of the most common challenges related to university-IORs is dealing with the bureaucracy of universities. For instance, interviewee MCG1 believed that “educational administrators are pretty narrow thinkers…part of it is bureaucracies of universities too, they don’t want anyone else involved in it. It takes a really strong Vice-Chancellor to drive it” (MCG1), and as a result, students experienced a missed opportunity to engage with the Commonwealth Games.

Missed opportunities for university staff related to a lack of understanding how and what to leverage. For example, data from Glasgow evidenced lack of “understanding the opportunities that hosting the Games was going to provide” (GLU5). Interviewee GLU5, from the University of Strathclyde, thought that the university’s major focus was on “senior appointments that were going on at that time” and the chance to engage with Glasgow 2014 did not “get picked up at the right level and we didn't do anything” (GLU5). Strathclyde “missed a fantastic opportunity” (GLU5).
Interviewees noted several examples of undercapitalised IORs as missed opportunities. For instance, interviewee GLU4 confided that she “worked quite closely with Commonwealth Games and…obviously involved with the team, however, I’m going to be blatantly honest and say that we leveraged virtually nothing from the Commonwealth Games”. One of the potential reasons that the University of Stirling did not leverage the Games was its distance to the Games Village (GLU4). This finding aligns with Cashman and Toohey (2002), who noted that proximity was a key factor in whether or not universities engaged in the first place and that the most successful universities to engage with the 2000 Olympic Games were in close proximity. Stirling is approximately 50 kilometres from the Games Village and this meant that the University of Stirling did not appear to extensively leverage the Games.

The place of sport in a university also resulted in missed opportunities to leverage the Games. Data from Melbourne highlighted that one reason universities may not have sought a Games legacy was because “universities don’t necessarily see sport as a credible, valuable activity to associate with. It is, but it’s not high priority for many universities” (MU6). Interviewee MU1 commented that “maybe we undervalued the legacy [opportunity] - that we just sort of took it for granted” (MU1). Interviewee MU2 stated, there was “no driving force for being a university that we should try and link up with the Commonwealth Games” (MU2).

Similar to the findings of Cashman and Toohey (2002), the evidence suggested that some universities believed that they achieved Commonwealth Games legacies. For instance, students and individual staff members benefited, IORs were established, and the universities’ reputation was enhanced. However, others reported no great benefits to universities and even a sense of disappointment that an opportunity had been missed. The data evidenced the need for support from the “institutional chief” in order to engage
with the Games, create legacy, and avoid missed opportunities. It is critical for universities seeking a Games legacy to have a legacy champion and the right senior leadership in place to initiate, manage, and support Games related engagement and avoid missed Games opportunities. According to Bromley (2006), at most engaged universities, the institutional chief (president, chancellor or vice-chancellor) makes community outreach a priority, empowering a senior administrator to coordinate these activities, work with community groups, and build links with local civic, political and business leaders. Only one university in the three cases had done this specifically for the Commonwealth Games.

6.4 Chapter Conclusion

In summary, there were three key themes that emerged from the data (a) stakeholder leverage, (b) barriers to achieving positive legacy, and (c) intended and unintended legacies. Each had sub-themes which emerged from the four cycles of coding.

Universities are complex social organisations that are dependent on their external environment (Sporn, 1996). Over the past few decades, the university context has changed, and so has the expectation of MSE legacy (Howlett, 2010). The Melbourne 2006 Games were held at a time where university-Commonwealth Games engagement had not occurred formally and a Games legacy was not the universities’ priority (MCG6, MU2, and MU8). Most of the university engagement that occurred was informal, not strategically planned to create legacy, and in hindsight, the Games were considered a missed opportunity (MU3, MU5, and MU10). However, many interviewees (MU1, MU6, and MU7) emphasised that universities now engage more strategically with major events in the city.
The Commonwealth Games can provide universities with the opportunity to achieve a range of positive legacies. Until recently, universities have primarily been concerned with teaching and research. However, there has been increasing importance placed on enterprise activities, links with industry, and collaboration with the community (Howlett, 2010). As the university landscape has adapted to its changing environment and external pressures and expectations, universities have needed to become more entrepreneurial and willing to collaborate with internal and external stakeholders (Slaba, 2015), suggesting why universities are now more willing to formally engage with the Commonwealth Games. This relationship also provides an opportunity to engage with the community, businesses and industry, such as the OC, government, and other Games stakeholders. By leveraging the Games, universities are creating more opportunities for students and staff and increasing and developing their IORs (Cashman & Toohey, 2002). Universities are becoming more strategic in their approach to this Commonwealth Games engagement, as evidenced throughout this chapter.

Further, in order to achieve intended, positive legacies, planning must occur early in the pre-Games phase (Thomson, 2013). Positive university legacies cannot be left to chance or be expected to occur without adequate planning (Matheson, 2010). Although universities may have experienced barriers to leveraging the Games, such as external process, organisational politics and culture, and internal processes and pressures, universities can overcome these challenges by engaging early with internal and external stakeholders, as recommended by Cashman and Toohey (2002), Matheson, (2010), and Thomson et al. (2013).

These findings are depicted as a model for achieving university legacies from the Commonwealth Games in Figure 7 below. This model is presented as an input,
throughput, and output model that demonstrates that universities need to engage with internal and external stakeholders as well as provide sufficient resources to leverage a Commonwealth Games legacy. Universities must then develop a strategic approach and plan how and what assets to leverage through internal and external relationships, processes, and supporting units and programmes. As an example, internal Commonwealth Games committees can be established at an early stage in order to strategically plan to leverage the Games and maximise potential legacy. Based on the leveraging plan, positive, intended and tangible/intangible legacies can be achieved and missed opportunities and negative legacies can be minimised. Positive legacies include student and staff opportunities, such as research, further education, and professional development; improved physical infrastructure, including use of facilities for training athletes and staff; strengthened university–Games IORs, and branding awareness for the university.

![Figure 7: A model for achieving university legacies from the Commonwealth Games](image)

As previously mentioned, universities have felt the pressure to become more entrepreneurial and engage with their communities. Universities have a legitimate
standing in society, but unless they have what Benneworth and Jongbloed (2009) and Mitchell et al. (1997) discussed as the power to enforce their will or an urgent claim, universities will not be perceived as salient to potential MSE partners, such as the Games’ OC.

Babiak (2007) emphasised that organisations enter into IORs for multiple reasons, including: to meet specific objectives such as improved efficiency or increased stability, to gain power or control over other organisations, or to enhance their legitimacy. Evidence from Glasgow and Gold Coast suggested that some universities received greater benefit for their Commonwealth Games involvement, aligning with Cashman and Toohey’s (2002) findings that because of early planning, developing a clear sense of their aims and objectives, and establishing key partnerships, such universities experienced more benefits from an MSE. The next chapter will conclude this thesis by providing an overview of the thesis and a summary of its key findings, theoretical contributions, applied implications, limitations, and the recommendations for future investigation.
Chapter 7: Conclusion

This final chapter begins with an overview of the thesis and a summary of its key findings. The theoretical contributions of this research are outlined, with particular attention paid to its contribution to sport management knowledge, and to the understanding of university-Commonwealth Games IORs, and event legacy. An outline of applied implications is also provided, with a focus on the beneficial outcomes universities can experience through leveraging the Commonwealth Games. Finally, the limitations of this research are addressed, as are recommendations for future investigation.

7.1 Overview of the Study and Key Findings

This qualitative multiple-case study investigated university IORs from three editions of the Commonwealth Games: Melbourne 2006, Glasgow 2014, and Gold Coast 2018. The research addressed two questions:

- Why, how, and what legacies have universities sought to achieve through leveraging a Commonwealth Games?
- What were the barriers to achieving a legacy?

Through these questions this research sought to understand why universities in the event host region have engaged with the Games, the range of outcomes sought by universities and the challenges they experienced through their Commonwealth Games involvement. The research arose from a review of literature on sport events, event legacies, and the university context (see Chapter Two), which highlighted that university-Commonwealth Games interaction, and its role in facilitating university legacies had not previously been investigated.
To answer the research questions, two forms of qualitative data were collected: documentary evidence and semi-structured interviews with key informants (see Chapter Four). Data were organised, segmented, and reduced guided by Saldaña’s (2015) cycles of coding and Strauss’s (1987) three stages of coding. The analysis produced two types of findings: descriptive within-case results (see Chapter Five) and cross-case thematic results, emerging from a comparison of cases (see Chapter Six).

The research was underpinned by IOR literature and an instrumental interpretation of stakeholder theory (see Chapter Three). This theoretical framework was employed as a lens through which to interpret the management of university-Commonwealth Games engagement. Topics discussed in the IOR and stakeholder management literature, such as university IORs (Ankrah & AL-Tabbaa, 2015; Bruneel et al., n.d.), and concepts from stakeholder salience (Mitchell et al., 1997), were fundamental to the analysis and discussion of results (see Chapter Six). Thus, the research questions were answered through an integration of empirical findings with findings in the current literature, as summarised in the next two sections.

7.2 Why, How, and What Legacies have Universities Sought to Achieve through Leveraging a Commonwealth Games?

This section provides a synopsis of research findings that address the first research question. This research identified a range of reasons why universities sought to achieve a Games legacy. The primary reasons related to the changing nature of universities and the expectations and environmental pressures they faced to become more entrepreneurial and more externally focused. Other reasons included the desire to increase university IORs with other Games stakeholders, provide opportunities for students and staff members, utilise university facilities, and increase university brand awareness among prospective students, staff, and the community.
Over time, each case demonstrated closer engagement by universities with the Games. While there was limited formal engagement between universities in Melbourne and the 2006 Games, for the first time in Games history, the 2018 Games have a formal university sponsor. This increasing involvement and formality is indicative of universities changing their perceived salience; the more salient a stakeholder is the more likely management will pay attention to them (Mitchell et al., 1997). As universities became more involved with the Games, by developing formal university–Games IORs, their legitimacy gradually shifted, increasing their perceived saliency to Games organisers and local government.

Universities were engaging because of changes in their environment that are impelling them to engage with external stakeholders and demonstrate their value. However, universities also see engagement as beneficial because of the perceived university Games legacies, including university brand awareness, research, and professional development for students and staff. Universities may perceive themselves as salient Games stakeholders, whether they are or not. In any case, universities have become more instrumental to OCs than they were in the past, which is why universities may be perceived to be more salient now than in 2006. These perceived benefits are central to answering why universities sought to leverage the Commonwealth Games.

Simultaneously, in the MSE context, the event legacy agenda has grown (Matheson, 2010), and the CGF and OCs have increasingly perceived universities to be a more salient stakeholder group that can assist in augmenting a Games’ legacy quantum. Therefore, the pressure for universities to engage with the external environment and become more entrepreneurial alongside the increased need for event organisers to deliver legacy has provided a platform for two stakeholder groups to work more closely to develop IORs with mutually beneficial Games legacies. This has
impelled OCs and other Games delivery stakeholders to consider IORs with organisations, such as universities, which Babiak (2007) noted can produce mutual benefits.

These various external factors have created a “perfect storm” for IOR formation because universities have a strong motive: managing environmental change plus benefits, and OCs have a motive: managing environmental change plus benefits. The types of environmental pressures and benefits that universities and the OCs sought differ, but overall, through university–Games IORs both stakeholder groups can achieve outcomes that they could not achieve alone, which Babiak (2007) identified as a classic motivation for IOR formation. These motivations also apply to potential IORs with other Games stakeholders, including local government and other universities.

This research identified a range of legacies that universities sought to achieve through leveraging the Games. Such university legacies included professional development for students and staff members, strengthened university–Games IORs, new and/or improved facilities, and university brand awareness. Legacies for the Commonwealth Games and other Games stakeholders (e.g. government) included upskilling their departments through university staff secondment, a pool of tertiary trained student volunteers, developing IORs with a previously underutilised stakeholder group, research outputs, and use of university facilities.

Although some universities sought to achieve legacy, there were what Preuss (2015) labelled unintended legacies, or what Bramwell (1997) and Weed and Dowse (2009) called missed opportunities, in all three cases. Reasons for missed opportunities varied between universities within each case and between cases. For instance, in Melbourne, there was minimal strategic intent because engagement with the Games was not perceived to be core to universities’ mission. Any engagement with the Games was
ad hoc and those that were involved did it of their own volition rather than through a formal university pathway. Therefore, any legacies achieved in Melbourne were at an individual rather than an institutional level.

Interviewees from universities in Melbourne commented that looking back on the 2006 Games, with the knowledge they have since gained about legacy, they would have done things differently and tried to be more strategic. Nevertheless, as a result of learnings from the 2006 Games, Victoria University’s strategic plan for 2012–2016 incorporated engagement with major events. The missed opportunities and lack of legacy achieved aligns with the findings of Thomson et al. (2013), who noted that in order to achieve a positive legacy, it must be planned for in advance. Missed opportunities were relevant as a sub-theme for Glasgow and Gold Coast, illustrating just how strategic and proactive universities need to be to maximise their opportunities.

In Glasgow, there was evidence to suggest some formal engagement between universities and the Commonwealth Games. Universities were more involved due to a desire to increase collaboration with their local communities, other universities, and other Games stakeholders, such as local government and the marketing bureau. In addition, universities sought to increase research outputs and increase their brand awareness through engagement with the 2014 Games. According to interview data, university staff knew that they should take advantage of the Games, but they did not always know how or what to leverage, again resulting in missed opportunities to maximise their involvement. For instance, a formal research partnership was established between three local universities, Glasgow City Council, and Glasgow Life. However, the research outcomes from this were not perceived to meet expectations and the IORs were not as strong as originally intended.
Universities within the same region are typically in competition with each other for students, staff, and resources, and so while there was formal intent to strengthen university–Games IORs, in practice this proved to be challenging as illustrated in both the Glasgow and Gold Coast cases. Moving forward, if universities intend to leverage other major events, the challenge for universities will be “to foster collaboration and co-ordinate leveraging efforts among various stakeholders” (Beesley & Chalip, 2011, p. 324). In addition, since no previous strategy was in place to guide universities on how or what they could leverage, some interviewees perceived the Games to be a missed opportunity. As Veal et al. (2012) argued, in order to leverage MSEs to achieve legacy, it is “necessary to know what levers to pull” (p. 176). These findings also support the need for the strategic model for university engagement, presented in Chapter Six, which can assist universities in achieving university legacies from the Commonwealth Games. The model informs universities of the importance of and need for internal and external stakeholder involvement, the need for a strategic approach, and the potential Games legacies that universities can achieve.

Although the 2018 Games are yet to be staged, the Gold Coast case demonstrated greater university engagement with the Games than during past events. The evidence suggested an increased awareness among university staff members that universities need to be strategic to leverage the legacy opportunities presented by the Games, including through proactive engagement, having a legacy champion, and leveraging pre-existing relationships. However, some Gold Coast university strategies were still ad-hoc and disorganised. Similar to the previous two cases, the Gold Coast universities evidenced a range of approaches to engaging with the Games. For instance, two universities developed a strategic plan to engage with the Games. One of the universities became an official Games partner, which was the "first University in history to partner with a Commonwealth Games" (Griffith University, n.d.).
As one Gold Coast university has been more proactive and willing to invest significant resources, its strategic approach has decreased the formal opportunities for other universities to maximise their potential Games legacy. This finding illustrates that the different strategic approaches to engagement resulted in different outcomes for each university. Further, this finding highlights that legacies can affect stakeholders differently; Preuss (2015) noted that legacies can be positive for some and negative for others. For instance, Griffith University’s engagement was strategic for their interests, but had the unintended outcome of excluding other universities in the area, which is now forcing these other universities to think laterally about other ways to leverage the Games.

All universities in host regions have to have an idea of their strategic objectives and think about what leverageable opportunities exist that could help them achieve these objectives. Chalip and Leyns (2002) suggested that it is important to identify, in advance, those assets of the event which can be leveraged, requiring relevant stakeholders to have access to relevant information and to have the opportunity and resources to act on it. Data from Gold Coast interviewees suggested that they perceived that there were already missed legacy opportunities and several barriers to leverage the Games, despite interviews taking place three years prior to the Games. It seems that while there was more strategic planning there were still legacy barriers, including legacy costs. Interviewee GCU2 noted:

The university has to be willing to invest, pay money to make money, or pay money to see a good return. They can't just hold it and go and run with what we've got because it won't happen. Whether it be just employment and more staff to roll certain things out (GCU2).

Kellet, Hede, and Chalip (2008) emphasised that one of the challenges of event leverage is being able to identify leverageable event assets, and then formulating the necessary
means to capitalise on those assets. Thus, universities in the future seeking to leverage the Games must plan for increased legacy costs as they seek increased legacies.

Overall, the research found that the core reasons why universities engaged with the Games were because of an increased pressure to be more entrepreneurial and involved with their communities. Universities were trying to provide opportunities for their students and staff members, develop new and/or improved university–Games IORs, utilise university facilities and infrastructure for Games related training, and increase university brand awareness. The way universities engaged with the Games was through strategic relationships and strategic programmes, such as the research consortium in Glasgow and the Commonwealth Games committees in Gold Coast universities. Finally, the research revealed that many respondents identified missed opportunities. In line with literature on legacy planning, it therefore appears of paramount importance for universities seeking to leverage the Games in future to have a strategic approach.

7.3 What have been the Barriers to Achieving a Legacy?

This section provides a synopsis of findings on the second research question. All universities experienced barriers to achieving legacies, although this theme is particularly pertinent to those institutions that proactively attempted to leverage the Games. Barriers identified in this research included internal and external process and pressures, such as stakeholder relationship challenges, lack of external resources, conflicting agendas, lack of a legacy champion, unclear organisational legacy goals, lack of a strategic plan, and poor communication.

Other barriers identified were organisational culture and politics, such as low employee morale, the perception of inclusion/exclusion of university staff in/from
Games related groups, a boys’ club mentality, personal agendas and influence, hoarding information, and lack of executive support. Interviewees in all case studies perceived that the legacy potential of the Games was not fulfilled and that if universities invested more resources and were more strategic they could have achieved better quality legacies.

In Melbourne, there was minimal engagement to achieve legacy and therefore universities experienced very few barriers. However, in Glasgow and the Gold Coast, universities experienced barriers while planning for a Games legacy. A possible explanation is that universities’ planning was mostly ad-hoc and the implementation of the planning was not strategic. Overall, it appeared that the more universities attempted to leverage the Games, the more barriers universities experienced. This finding should not prevent universities in future trying to leverage the Games; it should encourage more strategic, proactive planning with internal and external stakeholders.

These findings concur with previous research on the factors that impact the outcomes of IORs. For instance, the personalities of the people involved, the leadership capacity, and the resources contributed can inhibit/facilitate successful IOR formation. In addition, these findings also align with the challenges related to legacy planning that Matheson (2010) noted, including challenges with identifying who is responsible for legacy planning and funding.

7.3.1 Theoretical contribution

This research provides a theoretical contribution to sport and event management literature by examining a previously unexamined MSE stakeholder, universities. The review of literature revealed that there was a lack of research on universities as a stakeholder of the Commonwealth Games, or the ways in which universities can
leverage the Commonwealth Games for their own legacies. This research begins the process of addressing this situation by explaining how MSE legacy expectations and the university context have changed over the past few decades, independent of each other. Further, this research brings the two areas together as universities seek relationships with, and legacies from involvement with the Commonwealth Games. Universities as a stakeholder group have become increasingly salient to Commonwealth Games organisers with each of the three cases studied. However, within this stakeholder group, there were universities that have been more strategic than others, aligning with Smith’s (2015) findings that some universities might not be as capable in their efforts toward engagement. Therefore, this research may assist universities in future host regions with information about how to strategically leverage MSE to expedite their own agendas and generate benefits for their own stakeholder groups, including students, staff and the community.

In addition, this research extends the theoretical use of legacy, leveraging, and IOR to a new stakeholder group (universities) thus broadening the reach of these theories. Further, this thesis provides a critical lens to explore event leveraging in regard to missed opportunities and potential barriers to leverage an event. Although there have been leveraging criticisms of legacy, this research demonstrates the complexity of leveraging and legacy in relation to sport events. Thus, while leveraging involves strategic intent, both leveraging and legacy planning involve more than intent and success relies on a range of stakeholder relationships.

In the past, universities have not necessarily been considered salient stakeholders but they are stakeholders that have legitimacy because they are permanent stakeholders in the host region that contribute to their local community. Thus, they can contribute to the sustainability of legacy in addition to adding to an event’s legacy
quantum. To achieve their goals and expedite their own agendas, universities have used IORs as a network enabler. Therefore, the study’s theoretical contribution is that universities have been neglected stakeholders who through their leveraging activities can provide mutually beneficial legacies.

**7.3.2 Applied application**

This section highlights several management implications arising from this research. It focuses predominantly on the applied implications for universities. However, overall, this research shows that strategic university-Commonwealth Games engagement can also produce benefits for universities, the CGF, OCs, governments, and other Games stakeholders.

Through strategic university-Commonwealth Games engagement, universities can: experience and/or create positive student and staff opportunities; increase or strengthen IORs with Games stakeholders; and increase brand awareness amongst prospective students, staff, and the community. As these examples suggest, the overarching applied conclusion of this research is that strategically structured university-Commonwealth Games engagement can produce direct and indirect benefits for universities, the OC, and the host region.

If a university decides to engage with the Commonwealth Games it should first take into account its internal stakeholders and resources, including university students, staff, facilities, and finances as well as its external stakeholders and resources, such as the OC, government, facilities, and finances. A legacy champion should be designated to lead the university’s engagement plan. Then, legacy planning must commence as early as possible; universities must identify what assets they can use to leverage (i.e. student and staff workforce, facilities, research, etc.); if any pre-existing relationships
are established, these should be nurtured in order to increase and strengthen any university–Games IORs in the future; and strategic units and programmes should be created, including formal internal/external Commonwealth Games committees.

In order to proceed, universities must avoid barriers to leveraging the Games by being aware of and minimising external processes and pressures, such as lack of or poor communication with stakeholders, lack of external resources, and conflicting agendas with other Games stakeholders. In addition, universities must understand their own organisational politics and culture, which includes employee morale and whether staff members are interested in being part of a Games strategy; the perceived inclusion/exclusion of staff, leading some staff to avoid engagement altogether; a boys’ club mentality, preventing female staff members from involvement with Games related activities; acknowledging that there will be personal agendas and hoarding of information; and whether there is executive support. Universities must also understand the potential internal processes and pressures that they will face when trying to leverage a Games legacy. For instance, staff members will have competing priorities and/or a lack of interest in being involved; there may be interest but not action, leading to a lack of strategic planning and wasting time; and poor communication with internal stakeholders, leading to misunderstanding ways of getting involved or how the university intends to get involved with the Games. These potential barriers must be considered and addressed during the legacy planning stage and monitored throughout the process.

If the university can avoid these barriers, potential university legacies include student opportunities, such as professional development, work experience with the Games, further education (i.e. Masters or PhD study), and volunteers. Another legacy is staff opportunities, including professional development, Games related research outputs,
career development, and secondment to the OC. Universities can also aim to increase or
develop university–Games IORs, leading to increased university salience to Games
organisers and relationship development post-Games. Universities can also leverage
their facilities and utilise them for pre-Games and Games athlete training, staff meetings
and conferences, and new and/or improved facilities. As a final example of a potential
university legacy, universities can use the Games as an opportunity to increase their
brand recognition in other Commonwealth countries and among prospective students,
staff, and the community.

If the barriers to achieving legacy are not addressed, universities may experience
missed opportunities for Games legacy. For instance, if students and staff are not
considered in the initial strategic plan then there may not be any formal ways for them
to engage, leading to missed opportunities for students and staff. If universities do not
offer their facilities or make improvements, they could potentially experience a missed
opportunity with their facilities. In addition, if universities do not seek to work with
external stakeholders or the communication is poor, undercapitalised IORs may occur.
Finally, if universities do not promote the various opportunities that the Games provide
for students, staff, facilities, and IORs then there will be missed opportunities for media,
marketing, and branding of the university.

Universities must be aware of the potential to increase their salience to the
Commonwealth Games and ensure that if they plan to engage with the Games the
experience will be mutually beneficial for both stakeholder groups. Having discussed
these applied implications, this chapter now considers the limitations of this research.
7.3.3 Limitations of the research

The limitations of this research predominantly revolve around the temporal nature of the Games studied. Specifically, people’s recollection and memory of the 2006 and 2014 Games proved to be a challenge during some interviews. Further, the 2018 Games have not yet occurred; therefore, some interviewees were projecting that certain things might happen in terms of Games legacy, making cross-case analysis challenging. In addition, findings are based on people’s perceptions of what happened or is planned to happen, rather than a quantitative measurement of legacy outcomes. However, when to measure legacy is a vexed issue (Toohey, 2008). Relying on people’s memory and perception of a situation can be problematic, even for a recent event because people perceive the world differently (Creswell, 2003); therefore, the use of documentary evidence was necessary for triangulation to create assurance and accuracy (Stake, 2005; Yin, 2014). The shortcomings of both qualitative research and a case-study approach were reviewed in Chapter Four.

Another limitation of this research related to the topic of the increasing importance of legacy. Universities from previous Games now see the benefit of university–Games IORs; however, in 2006 universities had not implemented any strategies to leverage previous Games, also making cross-case analysis challenging. For the specific case they were interviewed about, there may have been inaction or a missed opportunity. In addition, with regard to the importance of legacy, the OCs have realised that the university-stakeholder relationship can be mutually beneficial. For instance, GOLDOC realises this more than M2006, because legacy is now a more important key performance indicator for OCs. Further, the CGF requires a Games legacy (GLCG2), suggesting why OCs are seeking engagement with Gold Coast universities compared to Melbourne universities for the 2006 Games.
Another limitation was related to stakeholder theory, which taken at its original meaning describes everyone as a stakeholder (Freeman, 1984; Donaldson & Preston, 1995), and therefore it was not possible to interview all stakeholders involved within each case. Additionally, access to some key informants due to time and commercial confidentiality issues was a limitation. It is hoped that for future research these key informants would be available and willing to participate. Nevertheless, the 60 interviewees provided valuable insight of their own perceptions and experiences.

A final limitation considered is this research was based on pragmatic case studies. The cases chosen were the next and last host nations as well as nations that have been the most common hosts. However, there are many other nations that have hosted (e.g., India, Malaysia, Jamaica) and a limitation is that these findings may not translate across to these multicultural contexts. As the UK and Australia are wealthier Commonwealth Games countries, findings would exclude countries that do not fit into top 10 wealthy nations. This study focused on three iterations of the Commonwealth Games in Australia and the UK, therefore it is not generalisable.

In summary, this section identified and explained several limitations of this research. The limitations described here are in addition to the general limitations of qualitative research and case-study inquiry, such as that the method maintains a bias towards verification (Flyvbjerg, 2006) acknowledged in Chapter Four. The methodological design of this research aimed to eliminate and/or minimise the impact of the limitations described. For example, by delimiting a fourth case study (Manchester, 2002), collecting too much data was avoided. In addition, two types of data were collected so as to triangulate the data. The limitations noted here may be overcome and provide opportunity for future research that may advance academic understanding of university–Commonwealth Games relationships.
7.4 Recommendations for Future Research

This empirical research provided evidence that since 2006 universities have become more involved with the Commonwealth Games; however, these relationships have not yet reached their full potential. Since the engagement between universities and the Commonwealth Games had not previously been extensively explored or acknowledged in the literature, there are many opportunities for future research on this topic.

First, research could explore future Commonwealth Games, including Gold Coast 2018 post event, to determine whether there are more ways that university–Games IORs can be strengthened to benefit all parties involved. Second, future research could also examine whether it is best for universities in the same host region to be collaborative, competitive, or a combination of both to maximise Games legacies, and what the challenges and costs associated with these approaches may be. For instance, each university may have different strategic goals and resources (financial and human), and so for some universities a Games involvement might be more relevant than for others.

Successful bids are typically announced seven years in advance of hosting the Games, which is a long time for a university and its staff in a rapidly changing industry. As universities continue to adapt to environmental pressures, academic employment patterns may change. Maintaining pre-existing relationships in addition to whether staff members are still employed at the same university within those seven years may also be a challenge. Further, as Smith (2015) noted, universities differ in their capacity to engage with their stakeholders. Therefore, future research could explore ways in which a university’s strategic plan to leverage the Commonwealth Games can adapt to accommodate fluctuating staff and student cohorts.
Third, research can focus on better understanding the factors that impact university salience (power, urgency, and legitimacy) as a Games stakeholder group, and determine how universities can increase their salience to Games organisers. Fourth, future research could also explore universities in a different Commonwealth Games cultural context to the ones studied in this thesis because the pragmatic choice of case studies explored in this research means there are multiple cultural contexts in which this issue can be examined further. Future research could consider university leveraging efforts and any barriers encountered in different event and cultural contexts to see if similar or different outcomes are pursued, and why and how. Research on event leveraging efforts in different socio-political contexts is particularly germane as the future and sustainability of expensive large-scale sport events such as the Commonwealth Games has increasingly been questioned. This underpins the importance of research understanding event leveraging and how stakeholders can work together to generate benefits within the host community. Alternatively, a different MSE, such as the FIFA World Cup, Olympics Games, or any other large-scale event within the region could be studied to see if there are similar or different legacies, and barriers to achieving legacy, for different MSEs.

Fifth, future research can also explore the Gold Coast case post-Games to see what university legacies eventuated and whether there were any surprising missed opportunities or additional barriers to emerge in the three years leading up to the Games. In addition, it would also be worth examining whether the official partnership between Griffith University and GOLDOC, the first of its kind, excluded other universities in the host region from being able to leverage the Games to achieve their own legacies. Finally, a larger version of educational stakeholders could be conducted. A larger study would include other Games stakeholder groups, such as schools, colleges, technical and further education (Holmesglen Institute of TAFE), and/or
secondary stakeholders to see if there are any ways of developing IORs for mutual benefit from the Games and/or different legacy planning and outcomes. A larger study could also incorporate a quantitative approach such as through conducting surveys of internal and external university stakeholders’ pre, during, and post Games to determine additional factors that can impact leveraging a Commonwealth Games.

To conclude, these suggestions for future research can build on the findings of this study. They can focus on extending the knowledge on the role of universities, MSEs, and university-Commonwealth Games engagement in facilitating a positive Games legacy. In addition, researching the topics suggested here would build knowledge on the role of these organisations in IOR literature and their interactions from the perspective of other MSE stakeholders, specifically the CGF, OCs, and government.

In a crowded sport event marketplace, the Commonwealth Games’ continued relevance has been questioned (Brown, 2010; O’Connor, 2013) and scholars have suggested that the Games have an uncertain future (Ewart, 2014; Kidd, 2011). Hence, understanding potential legacies is germane not only for Games stakeholder groups, such as universities, but also for the CGF, OCs, host regions, and countries. Further research into Games legacies can contribute to the strategic planning of the CGF, future OCs, and other Games stakeholders, as well as potentially influencing the Games’ sustainability.
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EXPRESSION OF CONSENT

Research Team:
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By signing below, I confirm that I have read and understood the information package and in particular have noted that:

- I understand that my involvement in this research will include a taped interview;
- I have had any questions answered to my satisfaction;
- I understand the risks involved;
- I understand that there will be no direct benefit to me from my participation in this research;
- I understand that my participation in this research is voluntary;
- I understand that if I have any additional questions I can contact the research team;
- I understand that I am free to withdraw at any time, without comment or penalty;
- I understand that I can contact the Manager, Research Ethics, at Griffith University Human Research Ethics Committee on +61 7 373 54375, or via email, research-ethics@griffith.edu.au if I have any concerns about the ethical conduct of the project; and
- I agree to participate in the project.
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Date:_____________________________________________________________________
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Appendix B: Universities in each Commonwealth Games Host City

Universities in Melbourne

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key</th>
<th>University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Victoria University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>University of Melbourne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Australian Catholic University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>La Trobe University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Swinburne University of Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Deakin University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Monash University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Universities in Glasgow

Key

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>University of Glasgow</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>University of Glasgow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Glasgow Caledonian University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>University of Strathclyde</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Universities in the Gold Coast

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key</th>
<th>University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Griffith University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bond University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Southern Cross University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C: List of Documentary Evidence Collected

This appendix contains a list of documentary evidence collected and analysed in this study (see section 4.5.2). The documents are arranged into the five categories as listed in Chapter Four, Table 6.

E-mail correspondence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>Federation University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The University of Melbourne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victoria University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>La Trobe University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>Development and Regeneration Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of St Andrews Sport Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Glasgow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Strathclyde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold Coast</td>
<td>Queensland University of Technology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Administrative documents (proposals, progress reports, and other internal documents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Game Changer Awards. (n.d.). Award winners legacy brochure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University/Organisation</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold Coast</td>
<td>Bond University. (2013). Inter-Disciplinary Colloquium on Sport and Diplomacy, Development and Governance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold Coast City 2018 Commonwealth Games Organising Committee.</td>
<td>(2011). 2018 Gold Coast City Candidate City File (Vol. 1, 2).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### Online newspaper articles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RMIT University.</td>
<td>Elite Athletes. from <a href="http://www.rmit.edu.au/students/elite-athletes">http://www.rmit.edu.au/students/elite-athletes</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melbourne 2006.</td>
<td>Event Management. from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Game Changer Awards. (2014). More than two fifths of Team Scotland athletes competing at XX Commonwealth Games in Glasgow have links to Scotland’s colleges and universities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Game Changer Awards. (n.d.). About. from <a href="http://www.gamechangerawards.org/about2/">http://www.gamechangerawards.org/about2/</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of the West of Scotland. (2013). UWS receives grant from the Big Lottery Fund to support Digital Commonwealth project.</td>
<td>from <a href="http://www.uws.ac.uk/newscategories/corporate/uwsreceivesgrantfromthebiglotteryfundtosupportdigitalcommonwealthproject/">http://www.uws.ac.uk/newscategories/corporate/uwsreceivesgrantfromthebiglotteryfundtosupportdigitalcommonwealthproject/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Glasgow. (2013). University of Glasgow &amp; The Commonwealth Games.</td>
<td>from <a href="http://www.gla.ac.uk/about/commonwealthgames/research/">http://www.gla.ac.uk/about/commonwealthgames/research/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Glasgow. (2013). Research at Glasgow.</td>
<td>from <a href="http://www.gla.ac.uk/about/commonwealthgames/research/">http://www.gla.ac.uk/about/commonwealthgames/research/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Strathclyde. (2010). The sky's the limit for Strathclyde hockey stars.</td>
<td>from <a href="http://www.strath.ac.uk/press/newsreleases/20">http://www.strath.ac.uk/press/newsreleases/20</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Strathclyde Glasgow. (2010). Strathclyde students fly the flag for Glasgow 2014.</td>
<td>from</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n.d.</td>
<td>DELL Commonwealth Games Opportunities.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.strath.ac.uk/capitapartnership/dellcommonwealthgames/">http://www.strath.ac.uk/capitapartnership/dellcommonwealthgames/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Bond University to lead $14 million research project.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.strath.ac.uk/press/newsreleases/2012/headline_616964_en.html">http://www.strath.ac.uk/press/newsreleases/2012/headline_616964_en.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>URL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29hdb.html</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Griffith University. (2014). Congratulations Team Griffith. from griffith.edu.au/sport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other articles appearing in the mass media**

|-------------| Griffith University. (2012). Griffith alumni and community. |

**Memoranda**

Appendix D: Ethical Clearance of this Project

GRiffith University Human Research Ethics Committee

28-Sep-2014

Dear Professor Toohey,

I write further to your application for ethical clearance for your project "NR: Universities and Commonwealth Games Legacies: A Stakeholder Perspective" (GU Ref No: HSL/25/14/HREC). This project has been considered by Human expedited review 1.

The Chair resolved to grant this project provisional ethical clearance, subject to your response to the following matters:

Please provide an estimate of the approximate total number of participants expected or required.

The expected number of interviews is 20-25, however, the final number will depend on data saturation.

Please provide the text that will be used for participant recruitment purposes (e.g. copy of the telephone script or email invitation calling for volunteers). Recruitment materials should also contain contact details for the researchers (phone and e-mail addresses) and the GU Human Research Ethics reference number.

Please see attached document: s2796668_Kirkpatrick_Participant Recruitment

In the participant Information Sheet and Consent Form please correct the contact details of the Manager, Research Ethics to 373 54375 or research-ethics@griffith.edu.au.

Complete, please see attached revised participant Information Sheet and Consent Form.

Because some participants may be identified, please amend the legal privacy statement in the informed consent package to the disclosure form. Sample wording for such statements is set out below:

"The conduct of this research involves the collection, access and/or use of your identified personal information. As outlined elsewhere in this information sheet, your identified personal information may appear in the publications/reports arising from this research. This is occurring with your consent. Any additional personal information collected is confidential and will not be disclosed to third parties without your consent, except to meet government, legal or other regulatory authority requirements. A de-identified copy of this data may be used for other research purposes. However, your anonymity will at all times be safeguarded, except where you have consented otherwise. For further information consult the University’s Privacy Plan at http://www.griffith.edu.au/about-griffith/plans-publications/griffith-university-privacy-plan or telephone (07) 3735 4375."

Complete, please see attached revised participant Information Sheet.
Please provide your response to the conditions/concerns raised by the Committee in the body of an e-mail to research-ethics@griffith.edu.au or in a separate document forwarded by e-mail (please do not try to amend the Expedited Ethical Review Checklist in the online system). Please ensure you respond directly to each condition/concern raised, and provide copies of any amended recruitment and/or informed consent materials. Section 5.2.23 of the National Statement (2007) specifies that all documents and other material used in recruiting potential research participants, including advertisements, letters of invitation, information sheets and consent forms, should be approved by the review body, prior to their use.

This decision was made on 28-Sep-14. Your response to these matters will be considered by Office for Research.

The ethical clearance for this protocol runs from 28-Sep-14 to 01-Aug-16.

Please forward your response to Rick Williams, Manager, Research Ethics, Office for Research as per the details below.

Please refer to the attached sheet for the standard conditions of ethical clearance at Griffith University, as well as responses to questions commonly posed by researchers.

It would be appreciated if you could give your urgent attention to the issues raised by the Committee so that we can finalise the ethical clearance for your protocol promptly.

Regards

Rick Williams
Manager, Research Ethics
Office for Research
Bray Centre, N54 Room 0.15 Nathan Campus
Griffith University
ph: 07 3735 4375
fax: 07 373 57994
email: rick.williams@griffith.edu.au
web:

Cc:

Researchers are reminded that the Griffith University Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research provides guidance to researchers in areas such as conflict of interest, authorship, storage of data, & the training of research students. You can find further information, resources and a link to the University's Code by visiting http://policies.griffith.edu.au/pdf/Code%20for%20the%20Responsible%20Conduct.pdf
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This email and any files transmitted with it are intended solely for the use of the addressee(s) and may contain information which is confidential or privileged. If you receive this email and you are not the addressee(s)
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Appendix E: Interview Guide

This appendix contains a list of interview questions. The interview schedule was used to prompt the researcher on topics to cover, rather than to prescribe exact questions or to dictate the sequence of the interview. This approach was adopted to allow respondents to emphasise information that they considered important, as well as to enable unanticipated information to emerge. Sometimes, the specific questions were not always asked because the respondents addressed the topics without prompting.

- What was your job position and role pre- and/or during the Games?
  - What did you do in regards to involvement with the Commonwealth Games?
  - What did you want to do?
  - Who were you communicating with in regards to the Games?
- Was there a whole university approach to engagement with the Games?
- Was university involvement with the Commonwealth Games formal or informal?
  - Were you aware of other staff, universities, organisations engagement with the Games?
  - What were your views about such involvement?
  - Which Department/College/Faculty were involved?
  - What did you perceive as the strengths/weaknesses or such involvement?
- Was there a strategy approach? If so, was it formal or informal?
  - What policies if any were implemented?
  - Who was responsible for:
    - Developing/Creating/Implementing/Managing/Evaluating such policies?
- What were the impact/outcomes/benefits of university involvement with the Games?
  - Pre-Games/During/Post-Games
- What was/is collaboration (uni – uni/ uni-Games) like?
- What does legacy mean to you?
  - Do you have any further comments on university-Commonwealth Games relationships?
- Is there anyone else you could recommend that I should speak to?
Universities and Commonwealth Games Legacies: A Stakeholder Perspective

INFORMATION FOR PARTICIPANTS

1. Who is conducting the research?

Halley Corbett  
(student researcher)  
Dept. of Tourism, Sport & Hotel Mgt.  
+61 7 0402 370 776  
h.corbett@griffith.edu.au

Professor Kristine Toohey  
(supervisor)  
Dept. of Tourism, Sport & Hotel Mgt.  
+61 7 555 29204  
k.toohey@griffith.edu.au

Dr Millie Kennelly  
(supervisor)  
Dept. of Tourism, Sport & Hotel Mgt.  
+61 7 555 28455  
m.kennelly@griffith.edu.au

2. Why is the research being conducted?

This research is interested in examining if and how universities have leveraged Commonwealth Games to achieve lasting, beneficial legacies. It will investigate the strategic planning required to ensure desirable sport event legacies in a university setting. This research will provide understandings of interorganisational relationships between universities and industry, and stakeholder sport event leveraging and legacy outcomes.

This research will use universities within the regions of the Manchester 2002 Commonwealth Games, Melbourne 2006 Commonwealth Games, Glasgow 2014 Commonwealth Games, and Gold Coast 2018 Commonwealth Games. I have approached you because there is a university – industry relationship that can be explored.

3. What you will be asked to do?

This research will involve an interview. During the interview I will ask you some background questions about your organisation’s interaction with the Commonwealth Games (such as how and when this interaction began). I will also ask questions about
how the Commonwealth Games affected your organisation’s strategic planning/role at the university and how your university engaged with the Commonwealth Games. The interview will involve questions related to any benefits, challenges, or tensions experienced in your own context. Your participation in this research is entirely voluntary and this research will not require you to impart any information that is confidential to your organisation or any information that you do not feel comfortable providing. You will also have the option to remain anonymous.

The interview will take between 30 minutes and one hour and will be audio recorded for later transcription. Once the interview is transcribed the recording will be deleted and the details of your identity will be removed and stored separate from the transcribed notes.

4. The basis by which participants will be selected

I would like to interview staff from your organisation that interacted with the Commonwealth Games and/or the Organising Committee.

5. The expected benefits of the research

This topic has relevance for universities and other stakeholders of future Commonwealth Games and host destinations. The research can provide valuable insights on how universities can leverage the Commonwealth Games to achieve legacies aligned with their strategic plans. Further, the proposed research will make a contribution to the relatively scant literature on the Commonwealth Games, as well as to understandings of interorganisational relationships between universities and industry, and stakeholder sport event leveraging and legacy outcomes. Thus, the results will offer management implications for universities, the Commonwealth Games Federation, future host Organising Committees, and Commonwealth Games’ stakeholders.

6. The potential risks associated with participation

This research involves a case study of four Commonwealth Games. You will be given a choice as to whether you would prefer your comments to be kept anonymous or not. If you agree to have your identity known the comments you make during the interviews will be identifiable when the final report is published.

7. Your confidentiality

You will be given a choice as to whether you would prefer your comments to be kept anonymous or not. In either case, recordings of your interview will be deleted once they have been transcribed. Your interview will be identified by a code name and your details will be stored in a separate location. All material will be kept in locked cabinets and will not be accessed by anyone except the research team and will be destroyed after five years.

8. Your participation is voluntary

Your participation in this research is voluntary. You are free to withdraw from this research at any time without comment or penalty.
9. Further questions

If you have any further questions regarding this research please do not hesitate to contact me via phone +61 7 0402 370 776, or email, h.corbett@griffith.edu.au. If you prefer you may contact my research supervisor, Professor Kristine Toohey on +61 7 555 29204 or k.toohey@griffith.edu.au.

10. Concerns about ethical conduct

If you have any concerns regarding the ethical conduct of this project please contact the Manager, Research Ethics, at Griffith University Human Research Ethics Committee on +61 7 373 54375, or via email, research-ethics@griffith.edu.au.

11. Feedback to participants

It is anticipated that this research will conclude in August, 2016. At that time a summary of the research findings will be emailed or posted to all participants who have indicated that they are interested in receiving this information. You will be asked to provide an email or postal address at the time of interview if you would like to receive this information.

12. Privacy statement

The conduct of this research involves the collection, access and/or use of your identified personal information. As outlined elsewhere in this information sheet, your identified personal information may appear in the publications/reports arising from this research. This is occurring with your consent. Any additional personal information collected is confidential and will not be disclosed to third parties without your consent, except to meet government, legal or other regulatory authority requirements. A de-identified copy of this data may be used for other research purposes. However, your anonymity will at all times be safeguarded, except where you have consented otherwise. For further information consult the University’s Privacy Plan at http://www.griffith.edu.au/about-griffith/plans-publications/griffith-university-privacy-plan or telephone +61 7 3735 4375.
Appendix G: Detailed Cycles of Coding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Cycle Code (Open coding)</th>
<th>Code found in Documents (D) and Interviews (I) data: Second Cycle Code (Focused coding)</th>
<th>Third Cycle Code (Axial Coding)</th>
<th>Fourth Cycle Code (Selective coding)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>Gold Coast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Resources/investment</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Processes for planning legacy:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Structured/unstructured</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Formal/informal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Positive/negative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Pre-existing network, connection, or relationship between university and other Games stakeholders, which allows/presents opportunities for engagement</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Management of commercial negotiations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Networking, collaboration, and partnerships between organisations e.g., GU-GOLDOC</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Individual that drives legacy initiative</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Proactive relationships between Games' stakeholders to create a legacy</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Committees or structures created with the intention of achieving legacy</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Internal/external groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Informal discussions and plans to achieve legacy</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Formal research groups</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Official partnerships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Challenges that stakeholders experience in trying to leverage the Games i.e., communication, establishing trust/rapport</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Lack of external resources to facilitate university involvement i.e., research funding, staff support</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Inter/organisational agendas e.g., Uni. 1 v Uni. 2 and/or government</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Staff reaction towards engaging with the Games</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Interest in getting involved with projects or groups</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. The process in which staff are 'handpicked' to be part of committees</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. The culture of the organisation</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Male dominated committees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Melbourne: D
Glasgow: I
Gold Coast: D
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21. Lack of females involved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Hidden agendas</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Egos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Lack of information transfer</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Keeping information to oneself</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Looking out for individuals'/perceived best interest long term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Financial and organisational support from university executives</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Legacy costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Resources that include human, financial, time</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. No individual driving initiatives or engagement</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Unclear goals</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Lack of awareness to create a Games strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Unclear what and how the organisation wants to achieve</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. No formal strategy implemented</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Existing/competing staff responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Time constraints</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Staff are not interested in getting involved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Games are not perceived to benefit staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. All talk no action</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Conversations and discussions about what could and should happen but no follow through</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Lack of strategic process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Minimal information shared with staff about engagement</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Lack of communication from executive team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Professional development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Work experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Internships/career opportunities</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Post-graduate opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Volunteering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Professional development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. Games focused research output</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Career development</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Personal agendas and influence**

**Hoarding information**

**Executive support**

**Resource investment**

**Lack of legacy champion**

**Unclear organisational legacy goals**

**Lack of strategic plan**

**Competing priorities and lack of staff interest**

**Interest and Intent but no action**

**Poor communication**

**Student opportunities**

**Desired and/or achieved legacies**

**Intended and unintended legacies**

**Staff opportunities**
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>53. Secondment</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Physical infrastructure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>54. Use of facilities pre and during Games for training</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Physical infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. Conferences/meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. New or improved facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Interorganisational relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. Increased stakeholder salience</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Media/marketing/branding opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. Relationship development pre and post-Games</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. Market awareness of university</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Media/marketing/branding opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. Lack of formal ways for student participation</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Missed opportunities for students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61. Lack of formal ways for staff participation</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Missed opportunities for staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62. Lack of physical infrastructure use or development</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Underutilised physical infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63. Undeveloped relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64. Lack of cooperation with Games stakeholder organisations</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Undercapitalised interorganisational relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65. Underutilising media for university-Games activities</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Missed opportunities for media/marketing/branding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL: 65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Appendix H: Game Changer Award Winners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Gold</th>
<th>Silver</th>
<th>Bronze</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sporting Contribution</td>
<td>Make a significant contribution or substantial difference in sport, sporting performance or activity levels.</td>
<td>Robert Gordon University – Aberdeen Youth Games</td>
<td>The Glasgow School of Art – Glasgow School of Art Sports Association</td>
<td>The University of Aberdeen – Learn to Swim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Achievement</td>
<td>Student led project or initiative.</td>
<td>Universities of Edinburgh, Glasgow and Strathclyde – On Track for Success</td>
<td>University of Glasgow – Gym Buddies</td>
<td>University of Stirling – Disability Tennis Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning and Skills</td>
<td>Opportunity to develop skills and capabilities.</td>
<td>University of Aberdeen – Commonwealth Sports Tour</td>
<td>Glasgow Caledonian University – Gaming for Glasgow 2014</td>
<td>Open University in Scotland – Personal Best</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative and Cultural</td>
<td>Develop creative or cultural activity within the institution, locally, nationally or internationally.</td>
<td>University of Glasgow – “MyCity” App</td>
<td>University of Glasgow – Commonwealth Music in the University</td>
<td>University of Dundee – Celebrating Sport in Film and Comics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Contribution</td>
<td>Opportunity to operate and engage in a global environment</td>
<td>Joint: University of Edinburgh – Building Legacy Relationships with India &amp; University of Strathclyde – Global Coaches House</td>
<td>University of Edinburgh and University of Glasgow – 33Fifty</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Impact</td>
<td>This award recognises the impact of research relevant to the Glasgow 2014 Games, its legacy goals and/or to the enhancement of sport or understanding of the Commonwealth in Scotland.</td>
<td>Joint: University of Glasgow – GoWell in the East End (GoEast) &amp; University of the West of Scotland – Leveraging Parasport Events for Sustainable Community Participation</td>
<td>University of Glasgow, University of Dundee and University of Stirling – The Security Legacy</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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