

December 2016

The Ontario Parasport Legacy Group: A Case Study of a Collaborative Partnership as an Event Legacy

Robert Carlisi

The University of Western Ontario

Supervisor

Dr. Laura Misener

The University of Western Ontario

Graduate Program in Kinesiology

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree in Master of Arts

© Robert Carlisi 2016

Follow this and additional works at: <http://ir.lib.uwo.ca/etd>

Recommended Citation

Carlisi, Robert, "The Ontario Parasport Legacy Group: A Case Study of a Collaborative Partnership as an Event Legacy" (2016).
Electronic Thesis and Dissertation Repository. 4263.
<http://ir.lib.uwo.ca/etd/4263>

This Dissertation/Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by Scholarship@Western. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Thesis and Dissertation Repository by an authorized administrator of Scholarship@Western. For more information, please contact tadam@uwo.ca.

Abstract

The strategic formation of collaborative partnerships for leveraging sport events to achieve social impacts is becoming a critical component of large-scale sport events, evidenced in London 2012 Olympics and 2014 Commonwealth Games in Glasgow, among others. There have been relatively few studies that focus on improving our understanding of how collaborative governance influences the formation and collaborative dynamics of such cross-sector collaborations. The purpose of this study is to contribute research in this area by examining the collaborative governance components encompassing the formation and collaborative dynamics of the cross-sectoral partnership, the Ontario Parasport Legacy Group, which emerged as part of the leveraging strategy for the Toronto 2015 Parapan American Games. This study draws upon the Integrative Framework for Collaborative Governance proposed by Emerson, Nabatchi, and Balogh (2012) to examine the factors influencing the formation and collaborative dynamics of cross-sector collaborations. The study findings are presented through an analysis of resources, drivers, participant fit, principled engagement, shared motivation, and informality of management processes. Practical and theoretical implications as well as directions for future research are provided.

Keywords: Cross-sector partnerships; collaborative governance; leveraging; sport events; disability sport

Acknowledgements

I would like to start by thanking Dr. Laura Misener; without you I would not have had the opportunity to pursue this research that I have come to enjoy so much, nor get to enjoy all the wonderful experiences that I did over the past two years. Your guidance on this project and throughout graduate school was invaluable, keeping me grounded when I needed it. I am forever grateful for what you have done for me.

A huge thank you is required for the friends I have made throughout my time at Western. The fact that there are too many people to name individually speaks to how blessed I was to have been part of a great Kinesiology Grad community. A special thank you to the members of Team Misener; without your assistance and encouragement I would have had a far more difficult time accomplishing all that I did. I am forever thankful for the many experiences we shared and challenges that we conquered.

I would like to thank Drs. Alison Doherty, Katie Misener, and Kyle Paradis for putting in their time, effort, and expertise into improving the academic integrity of this paper.

Finally, I want to thank my family for their unconditional love and support, which made it possible for me to accomplish all I have. As always, you helped keep me on track and were always there for me when I needed you. There is so much more than that for which I am eternally grateful for, but that would require an entire paper by itself to acknowledge.

Table of Contents

Abstract	i
Acknowledgements	ii
List of Tables	v
List of Figures	vi
List of Abbreviations	vii
List of Appendices	viii
Chapter 1: Introduction	1
Overview of Research	2
Rationale.....	3
Delimitations and Limitations	4
Chapter 2: Literature and Theoretical Framework Review	6
Literature Review	6
Event Leveraging.....	6
Partnerships and Collaborative Governance.....	8
Theoretical Framework	19
The Integrative Framework for Collaborative Governance	22
Chapter 3: Research Context and Methodology	36
Research Context.....	36
Methodology	38

Chapter 4: Findings and Discussion	44
Contextual Factors Influencing the Formation of the Ontario Parasport Legacy Group	44
The Collaborative Dynamics of the OPLG	54
Chapter 5: Implications and Conclusions	71
Implications	71
Theoretical Implications	71
Practical Implications	72
Conclusion and Future Research.....	75
References	79
Appendices	91
Curriculum Vitae	96

List of Tables

Table 1: Interviewees	42
-----------------------------	----

List of Figures

Figure 1: The Integrative Framework for Collaborative Governance. Adapted from Emerson et al. (2012, p. 6).....	23
---	----

List of Abbreviations

CPC.....	Canadian Paralympic Committee
DSO.....	Disability Sport Organization
LTAD.....	Long-Term Athlete Development (Model)
MSO.....	Municipal Sport Organization
MTCS.....	Ministry of Tourism, Culture, and Sport
NPGB.....	National Parasport Governing Body
OPLG.....	Ontario Parasport Legacy Group
PPGB.....	Provincial Parasport Governing Body
TO2015.....	Toronto 2015 Pan/Parapan American Games Organizing Committee

List of Appendices

Appendix A: Summary of Propositions.....	91
Appendix B: Western University Non-Medical Research Ethics Board Notice of Approval	93
Appendix C: Interview Questions.....	94

Chapter 1: Introduction

Large-scale sport events present unique leveraging opportunities for host organizations to accomplish a number of social, economic, and environmental objectives for the benefit of host communities (Misener, Darcy, Legg, & Gilbert, 2013; Misener, 2015). Objectives of this nature have become a required component of the bid process for many sport events (e.g., Olympic Games Impact reports; IOC, 2016) and are considered a major aspect of event legacy; the long-term, positive outcomes that are derived from the event (Misener et al., 2013). Legacy objectives are generally sport-based objectives such as increased participation rates, improved facilities, and access to sport programs (Smith, 2014). In order to accomplish legacy objectives, Harrison-Hill and Chalip (2005) determined that alliances between event stakeholders are needed to successfully design and implement a strategic plan around the event, known as event leveraging. Although research is emerging on sport event-leveraging collaborations (Bell & Gallimore, 2015; Christie & Gibb, 2015; Misener, 2015), very little is known about the ways in which events can be strategically used to create partnership opportunities that impact event and related participation outcomes. Thus, the aim of this thesis is to address this gap by examining one strategic partnership that emerged as an event leveraging tactic. The focus of this research is on the Ontario Parasport Legacy Group [OPLG], which developed in conjunction with the hosting of the Toronto 2015 Parapan American Games as a means to increase opportunities for persons with disabilities to access and participate in sport.

This thesis is written in a monographic format, which is presented in five chapters. Chapter one is an introductory chapter providing rationale and an overview of the research. Chapter two includes a detailed literature review and examination of theoretical frameworks. Chapter three provides the context of the study and methodology that was used to collect and

analyze data. Chapter four presents the findings and discussion of the research synthesised to demonstrate the connections herein. Lastly, chapter five highlights the theoretical and practical implications of the findings, as well as offering some directions for future research.

Overview of Research

The purpose of this study was to examine the formation and collaborative dynamics of a cross-sectoral partnership strategically formed to leverage a large-scale sport event. The OPLG, which formed to strategically leverage the Toronto 2015 Parapan American Games, was the focus of this research. The OPLG is a non-incorporated partnership of individuals and organizations chosen by the National parasport governing body [NPGB] to lead, plan, and implement the leveraging effort for the Games. The individuals and organizations involved were chosen based on their capacity to secure and mobilize resources as well as their ability to capitalise on the Games through current parasport programming and initiatives or potential for new initiatives. Although the Games are now over, the OPLG continues to function and is working towards building a more effective parasport system in the province of Ontario.

I used the Integrative Framework for Collaborative Governance posited by Emerson, Nabatchi, and Balogh (2012) to investigate the factors influencing the formation and collaborative dynamics of the OPLG. Using a collaborative governance framework that organizes different variables into a multileveled structure allows for the investigation of the internal dynamics, processes, and structures used by the OPLG. By examining the OPLG using collaborative governance in this way, more can be learned about how strategic partnerships are able to plan and implement a leveraging strategy to accomplish targeted objectives. The following three research questions (RQ) guided the research process:

RQ1: What factors led to the formation of the OPLG?

RQ2: How were the tactics, strategies, and structures the OPLG used (and continue to use) to leverage the Toronto 2015 Parapan American Games shaped through the collaborative dynamics of the OPLG?

RQ3: How has the OPLG navigated the challenges that arose over time?

Through this research, I intend to contribute to the emerging body of literature on cross-sectoral partnerships that develop as part of the legacy planning for a large-scale sporting event. I have examined the initial formation and subsequent structural and strategic development of the OPLG from its formation to its current state, helping to address the need for research examining collaborations that evolve over a period time as expressed by scholars such as Cousens, Barnes, and MacLean (2012). This research is also an opportunity to focus on the antecedents of formation and the management process of sport partnerships that Babiak and Thibault (2008) suggested merit further investigation.

Rationale

There is a paucity of research examining the partnerships that arise to facilitate legacy as a result of hosting events, despite the increasing prominence of these organizational forms (e.g. Legacies NOW 2010; London Legacy Development Corporation 2012). Yet, partnerships between community organizations, governing bodies, and municipal organizations have been argued to be a sustainable means of developing a long term legacy plan (Misener, 2015; Weed & Dowse, 2009). The OPLG is a cross-sectoral collaborative strategically formed to leverage a large scale parasport event to achieve legacy objectives. As such, this study presents an opportunity to examine a distinct organizational form in the context of parasport in Ontario. Misener and Darcy (2014) noted that there are low levels of sport participation among persons with a disability and suggest that parasport events can be a catalyst for creating social change

opportunities for person with a disability. The OPLG acts as a catalyst for enabling these social changes in the form of increased participation, increased awareness, and system alignment and integration (Canadian Paralympic Committee [CPC], 2014a). Examining how a cross-sectoral partnership forms and collaborates will provide insight on how sport events can be leveraged through these collaborations to achieve legacy objectives.

As the strategic creation of cross-sectoral collaborations are becoming more commonplace in sport and recreation, critiquing the formation and collaborative dynamics of the OPLG might offer similar collaborations ways to integrate formal and informal management processes (Babiak & Thibault, 2008). Critics of event legacies suggest that event leveraging is merely a public relations tactic used to justify the large expenditures associated with hosting major games (Minnaert, 2012; Preuss, 2007), in reality legacy initiatives often receive inadequate financial commitment and therefore contribute very little socioeconomic benefit to host communities (Smith, 2014). Although this study has been completed before the effectiveness of the OPLG and its impact on legacy outcomes of the Toronto 2015 Parapan American Games can be properly evaluated, my intent is to provide insight on the developments made thus far. The evolution of the OPLG will extend beyond the writing of my thesis, but I intend to provide a starting point from which other research concerning the effectiveness, management and sustainability of cross-sector collaborations can build on going forward.

Delimitations and Limitations

I delimited interviews to individuals identified as part of the core group of parasport partners (those contributors most frequently attending meetings and collaborative events) in order to capture the perspectives of the more involved individuals who have the greatest understanding of how the group formed and collaborates. I ceased data collection from the date

of the final interview (April 27, 2016) placing a self-imposed limit on the time which the OPLG was examined, correlating with a break between post-Games meetings and future planning sessions. While group leadership was discussed during interviews, this particular topic became larger than was possible to address in this thesis. In addition, the data collected represented a future-oriented dialogue and falls beyond scope of this paper.

As a case study, my research is limited to cross-sector partnerships formed and developed in the Canadian parasport system in the context of leveraging a sport event. Whether the results of this study might be transferrable to other cross-sector partnerships is unknown given the multitude of factors that play a role in the formation and development of a collaborative partnership. Lastly, while the research partner status of Western University greatly eased access to the OPLG partners and data, it is important to consider the possible impact that this may have had with respect to the answers given during interviews. For example, although the interviews were confidential, interviewees may have been hesitant to discuss areas that could have been a source of discomfort and/or may have given responses that are more positive as a result.

Chapter 2: Literature and Theoretical Framework Review

Literature Review

To understand the formative and collaborative dynamics of the OPLG, I draw upon the literature from event leveraging, partnerships, collaborative governance, and conceptual frameworks aimed at directing research of collaborative governance in sport. The OPLG is unique to the event-leveraging realm as a group formed to achieve positive social outcomes to improve parasport system alignment. In the context of this study, system alignment refers to the extent which parasport delivery in Ontario is able to provide sport development and participation services in accordance to the Long-Term Athlete Development [LTAD] model and accompanying No Accidental Champions strategy for athletes with a disability (Canadian Sport for Life, 2013).

The review of the collaborative governance literature is used to ground the research in the collaborative dynamics involved in the complex management processes and mechanisms of a cross-sector partnership. The literature review is divided into two sections: (1) an overview of event leveraging research with a focus on leveraging parasport events; and (2) an overview of the literature surrounding cross-sector partnerships and collaborative governance.

Event Leveraging

The distinction between the impacts of hosting an event and event leveraging to create outcomes is key. Impacts of an event are considered automatic effects (intended or not) that are realized through the required activities and projects necessary to host an event. Examples of impacts include the generation of jobs and business opportunities as well as an increase in tourism during the event (Smith, 2014). Event leveraging, as defined by Chalip (2004), refers to “activities which need to be undertaken around the event itself which seek to maximise the long-

term benefit from events” (p. 228). In this context, the event acts a resource by which other benefits can be levered (Smith, 2014). The types of benefits sought after through leveraging vary, but generally target the achievement of economic or social outcomes (Chalip, 2006; Chalip & Leyns, 2002; Misener et al., 2013; Smith, 2014). Event leveraging for social outcomes has become a required component in the bidding process for several larger sport events, often framed around the concept of legacy (Misener et al., 2013). Maximizing the leveraging opportunity of hosting a sport event requires employing a leveraging approach prior to, during, and after hosting the event. This approach must focus on the tactics, strategies, and implementation procedures needed to generate specific outcomes through hosting an event, rather than focusing on the outcome in isolation (Chalip, 2006).

The leveraging approach marks a shift away from previous legacy planning characterized by *post-hoc* evaluation and planning by those who did not have a long-term interest in the prosperity of the host city (Smith, 2012). O’Brien and Chalip (2007) describe the leveraging approach as sustainable, *ex ante*, long-term strategy planning and deem it an improvement over previously retrospective *ex post*, impact and outcome style research. This revised focus on leveraging strategy over impact allows researchers to identify which specific strategies and tactics were effective in generating specific outcomes (Chalip, 2006). Leveraging also considers the efficacy of which the host destination utilizes their resources to accomplishing event outcomes. As a result, the “ultimate objective [of researching leveraging strategy] is not merely to evaluate what was done, but rather to learn in order to improve future leveraging efforts” (Chalip, 2006, p. 113).

Leveraging parasport events. There is a scarcity of research focusing on leveraging or legacy of parasport events of any size and scale (Misener et al., 2013), although other research

has shown that hosting parasport events can potentially offer up leveraging opportunities to implement social and economic change (Darcy & Cashman, 2008; Dickson, Benson, & Blackman, 2011; Misener, 2015). Those opportunities revolve around common barriers to parasport participation such as a lack of awareness for including people with a disability in sport, limited opportunities and programs for participation, training, and competition, and limited access to information (DePauw & Gavron, 2005). The benefits of participating in community activities like sport and recreation for persons with a disability include improved physical well-being, improved job prospects, increased social inclusion, and enhanced self-esteem (Misener, 2015).

Weed and Dowse (2009) argued that there is currently an absence of evidence furthering our understanding of the processes and outcomes of parasport events, serving to compromise leveraging strategies aimed to create social or economic legacies from such events. Similar to previous notions of event impacts, it is assumed that the hosting of an event would automatically create opportunities to address issues in parasport (Smith, 2014). Attempts to research parasport event leveraging strategies have been limited thus far, the London 2012 Olympic Games being the first to have targeted strategies focusing on legacy for persons with a disability (Misener, 2015). As such, targeted research on legacy and event leveraging of parasport events is scarce (Misener et al., 2013; Misener, 2015; Misener, McGillivray, McPherson, & Legg, 2015) or inconclusive as the long-term effects of strategies have yet to be realized (Weed et al., 2012).

Partnerships and Collaborative Governance

Partnerships between sport organizations and others has become an increasingly common mechanism in the planning and delivery of sport policies and programs (Lindsey, 2011). The word ‘partnership’ itself is difficult to define due to the multitude of structures that

interorganizational relationships, such as partnerships, can potentially take (Babiak, 2003). Examples of other interorganizational relationships include joint ventures, strategic alliances, sponsorships, collaborations, joint development projects, contracting agreements, and other resource or knowledge sharing relationships. Many of these examples are broadly labelled as ‘partnerships’ in the literature about interorganizational relationships (Babiak, 2007). For the purposes of this study, Babiak’s (2003) definition of partnership as “a voluntary, close, long-term, planned strategic action between two or more organizations with the objective of serving mutually beneficial purposes in a problem domain” (p. 6) was used. In addition, the terms collaboration, interorganizational relationship, and partnership are used synonymously to describe the interaction between organizations defined as partnership.

Challenges in cross-sector partnerships. In their study examining complex interchanges in multiple cross-sector relationships (i.e., public-nonprofit, nonprofit-commercial, and public-commercial), Babiak and Thibault (2009) identified a number of challenges that can be attributed to “environmental constraints; diversity in organizational aims; barriers in communication; and difficulties in developing joint modes of operating, managing perceived power imbalances, building trust, and managing the logistics of working with geographically dispersed partners” (p. 117). Those challenges could be categorized as either structural or strategic challenges. Two structural challenges were identified as most prominent, the first of which is challenges relating to governance, roles, and responsibilities. These challenges relate to the degree of formalization in rules, policies, and procedures; the definition of roles in the partnership, and the responsibility for making major decisions in the partnership (Babiak & Thibault, 2009). The findings suggested that the efficiency outcomes the partnership sought were compromised by the lack of established governance and unclear roles and responsibilities. There

was also a noted lack of accountability “for managing, evaluating, and measuring outcomes” (Babiak & Thibault, 2009, p. 125).

The second structural challenge identified was the complexity associated by involvement in multiple cross-sector relationships. More complexity within partnerships requires proper management of different organizational relationships, backgrounds, perspectives, goals and objectives, which is difficult because it requires a variety of skills and knowledge in order to address those differences (Babiak & Thibault, 2009). These challenges resulted in issues relating to miscommunication, unclear/unreasonable expectations, frustration over power of decision making, competition for scarce resources, and disagreements over partner expectations (Babiak & Thibault, 2009, p. 134). According to Misener and Doherty (2013), the lack of human capacity in non-profit community sport organizations is also a significant barrier to managing different sector relationships. Having someone dedicated to managing relationships and/or someone with a personal connection to partners makes it more likely that a partnership will be successful. However, many non-profits, which include the majority of organizations in parasport, lack the capacity to dedicate an employee to manage these relationships (Misener, 2015).

Strategic challenges can be split into two broader categories, the first of which is the focus on competition over collaboration, the second involving changing missions and objectives (Babiak & Thibault, 2009). Although partnerships are meant to be collaborating efforts, they must face the reality of an environment with limited resources such as funding, athletes, coaches, facilities, and so on. The limitation of resources is more pronounced in parasport because of the extra associated costs of participating in parasport, fewer accessible facilities and means of transport, and limited opportunities for participation, training, and competition (DePauw & Gavron, 2005). Competition underscored by regional interests and the struggle for greater power

and legitimacy among partner organizations are also issues of concern (Babiak & Thibault, 2009).

Changing missions and objectives as collaborative relationships evolve can also present challenges. Shifting interests in terms of where to invest resources (i.e., high performance vs. grassroots programming) occur as a result of changed objectives among the partner organizations, leading to tension when objectives that were originally common are no longer so among partners (Babiak & Thibault, 2009). This can result in partners feeling threatened by a loss of legitimacy or power, uncertainty about their ability to provide for their individual needs, and increased vulnerability to environmental pressures.

Another challenge presented to cross-sector partnerships is the difficulty of properly evaluating the effectiveness of the partnership in a quantifiable manner. Babiak (2009) categorized and compared evaluation of effectiveness among the different partner sectors (public, non-profit, and commercial) as well as criteria at the community, network, and organizational level. These findings highlighted the difficulty in assessing the effectiveness of complex partnerships involving numerous stakeholders with competing interests and values.

Benefits and desired outcomes of cross-sector partnerships in sport. Organizations are motivated to collaborate with others for many reasons, some of which are limited in practicality and scope while others are imperative to organizational strategy (Lindsey, 2011). The potential benefits motivating organizations to collaborate can differ significantly between partners because of the diverse agendas associated with the different sectors in which members of cross-sectoral partnerships are located (Lindsey, 2011). In a study examining interorganizational determinants of partnerships, Babiak (2007) identified partnership formation

objectives (asymmetry, reciprocity, necessity, legitimacy, efficiency, and stability), which can serve to highlight some of the expected benefits of partnership formation.

With respect to the goals of cross-sectoral partnerships from a collective standpoint, a number of desired outcomes have been identified. Partnerships can benefit from information sharing, avoidance of service duplication, access to funding, enhanced delivery of products and services, and the integration and coordination of sport development policy and planning (Lindsey, 2011). Information sharing is desirable among partner organizations because it improves the practices of all organizations involved, but it is also a precursor to the other expected outcomes of partnership working (Lindsey, 2011) and is the discovery component of the principled engagement process discussed later in the chapter. Avoiding duplication is connected to the concept of increased efficiency through economies of scale and results in greater purchasing power (Babiak, 2007). Related to efficiency is the notion that membership in collaborative partnerships can lead to new funding opportunities, whether it is generated internally from the collaborative or externally because of their membership status (Bloyce, Smith, Mead, & Morris, 2008). Integrating the capacities of the different partners can result in enhanced delivery of programs and services, particularly important to sport development programs whose objectives are socially oriented (e.g., reducing fees for persons with a disability to participate in sport); (Frisby, Thibault, & Kikulis, 2004). Similarly, collaborating with members in a cross-sectoral partnership can allow for easier integration of government policy to improve delivery of sport (Lindsey, 2009). However, Shilbury and Ferkins (2015) argued that adherence to good governance principles can lead to situations where “the broader positioning, development and strategic direction of the sport may be compromised as a consequence” (p. 381)

because of dissimilar beliefs between organizations on how to implement sport development strategies, citing examples from Australian sport.

The ability for cross-sector partnerships to achieve these aforementioned benefits and desired outcomes are largely influenced by the rules, processes, structures, and norms that define the interactions between individuals and organizations within a partnership setting. These components are encompassed by the notion of collaborative governance.

Collaborative governance. The word “governance” refers to “the activity of governing a country or controlling a company or an organization” (Oxford University Press, 2016).

Governance differs from government in the sense that government represents a system of social control acting as the “main agent of collective power in society” (Daly, 2003, p. 115), whereas governance implies a networked form of control related to the activities of diverse agents (Daly, 2003; McDonald, 2005). Of critical importance to the concept of governance, according to Daly (2003), is the shifting distribution of power between government and the public sector, where the government may no longer hold a privileged position. In this context, “the locale and exercise of power are central to governance” (p. 116).

Collaborative governance extends this definition by adding the collective action dynamic (Ostrom, 1990); actors from different sectors (public, private, civic, etcetera) engage with each other. In this way, governance becomes a set of rules, processes, structures, and/or norms that guide the actors towards a common resolution of a complex, multi-faceted problem (Emerson et al., 2012; Robertson & Choi, 2012). The collective action dynamic is at the heart of the various definitions found in the literature developed over time to account for variations in peripheral conceptual aspects such as degree of formality, sector-involvement, the involvement of non-

stakeholder citizens, and so on (Ansell & Gash, 2008; Crosby et al., 2006; Emerson et al., 2012; Ostrom, 1990).

The definition of collaborative governance used in the context of this study is put forth by Emerson et al. (2012), which builds upon previous definitions in public administration and collaborative governance literature. Collaborative governance is defined as:

The processes and structures of public policy decision making and management that engage people constructively across the boundaries of public agencies, levels of government, and/or the public, private and civic spheres in order to carry out a public purpose that could not otherwise be accomplished. (Emerson et al., 2012, p. 2)

This definition of collaborative governance is intentionally broad, making it adaptable to a number of study settings and leaving room for distinction among the agencies involved (Emerson et al., 2012). Unlike prior definitions, this one is expanded to include emergent forms of interorganizational relationships and governance that were not previously considered. Prior definitions focused on the public sector and public managers, limiting collaborative governance to formally arranged partnerships between government and nongovernment organizations and individuals (Emerson et al., 2012). This definition also considers participatory governance and civic engagement in the governance process, adding another significant dimension that should be considered with partnerships in the public domain.

The concept of collaborative governance draws from several realms of research in public administration, the findings of which were used to inform management practices in a wide variety of settings (Emerson et al., 2012). Analyses of collaborative governance can be traced back to studies concerning intergovernmental cooperation from the 1960s (Agranoff & McGuire, 2003), the onset of American federalism (McGuire, 2006), group theory (Bentley, as cited in

Emerson et al., 2012), game theory (Axelrod, 1984, as cited in Emerson et al., 2012), and common-pool resourcing (Ostrom, 1990). The management practices that have been informed by work on collaborative governance are quite diverse; the broader themes cover practices regarding shared administration (McGuire, 2006), intergovernmental relations and network theories (Agronoff & McGuire, 2003), negotiation and bargaining practices (Fisher, Ury, & Patton, 2012), and resolution management strategies across several realms of policy and management (Emerson et al., 2012).

Many scholars consider partnerships to be an example of networked forms of governance (Daly, 2003; McDonald, 2005, Rhodes, 2000). Ideally, partnerships in the public sector act as “a more effective, democratic, and participatory form of service delivery” (McDonald, 2005, p. 580) within its own network operating outside the control of one particularly dominant agent while facilitating the involvement of agents that may normally be excluded in the delivery and shaping of policy. However, many hold critical views of partnerships in the public sector, taking the position that the ideals of inclusiveness, trust, efficiency and effectiveness are not synonymous with reality. For example, McDonald (2005) identified a number of empirical case studies in social services, health, education, and urban regeneration that have demonstrated this gap between the ideal and the reality in contemporary social policy. Newman (2001) noted that partnerships in this context could just as easily be characterized by “instrumentalism, bargaining and pragmatic compliance” (p. 123). Rummery (2002) suggested that partnerships actually reproduce existing inequalities and power relations while reinforcing the power of government, the private sector, and the public sector over local governments, the public sector, and the volunteer/community sector, respectively.

Collaborative governance in sport. Although collaborative governance has its roots in public administration, it is applicable to many management and administrative realms, including sport. The term sport governance refers to the practice of governance applied to sport organizations in a sport context (Hoye & Cuskelly, 2007). Ferkins, Shilbury, and McDonald (2009) provide a more detailed definition of sport governance: “The responsibility for the functioning and overall direction of the organization and is a necessary and institutionalized component of all sport codes from club level to national bodies, government agencies, sport service organizations and professional teams around the world” (p. 245). This definition is based on the central need for sports to adhere to an accepted set of rules utilizing some sort of hierarchical governing system to implement those rules from the international governing level down to the local or club level (Shilbury & Ferkins, 2015).

Although there has historically been a need for sport governing bodies to govern the respective rules and regulations of their sport, the continuing shift away from amateurism towards professionalization in sport has necessitated that governance cover a larger scale of functions previously reserved for the private and non-profit sectors (Shilbury & Ferkins, 2015). The transition from amateur to professional sport has led to tensions for high-level decision-makers who must balance powerful commercial sport forces with the need to provide community-based sport programming focused on participation (Hoye & Doherty, 2011; Shilbury & Ferkins, 2015). Important to this shift is the change in the decision-makers as full-time paid staff instead of volunteers, resulting in different management styles existing in the same sport delivery system (Shilbury, 2001). This leads to tensions between different organizations in the same sport delivery system, despite the fact that they often share the same overarching mandate to promote and develop their respective sport (Shilbury, Ferkins, & Smythe, 2013). These

circumstances would seemingly create an environment where collaboration is critical to the effective delivery of sport, but there is evidence showing a lack of genuine cooperation (Shilbury & Ferkins, 2015). Ansell and Gash (2008) suggested that this is in large part due to adversarial relationships that exist between collaborating organizations. Collaborative governance acts as a method to change those adversarial relationships into cooperative ones. Further evidence of this was found in the lived experience of a high-level sport manager in a study conducted by Shilbury et al. (2013). The findings showed adversarial encounters (as well as volunteer/cultural and structural encounters) to be a recurring theme for a high-level sport manager in a federal model in Australia.

Governance in Canadian sport policy. Collaborative governance is necessary in the Canadian sport system because of the numerous organizations required to service the needs of all geographical regions, competitive levels, and sport categories in Canadian sport. Sport organizations in Canada operate in a federal system that demonstrates support of sport through monetary funding and policy. That support comes with the expectation that sport organizations align themselves with higher levels of governing policy, although organizations are able to maintain some degree of autonomy to develop their own sport development strategies based on what will be most effective in their respective realms (Shilbury & Ferkins, 2015).

Although partnerships in sport are not a new phenomenon, only over the past couple of decades have policy documents acknowledged the importance of partnerships and collaborative governance in sport. A government review performed by the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage stated that “the future of sport in Canada depends on strong leadership, partnerships, and accountability. It is necessary to create stronger partnerships between the public and private sectors and between the various levels of government throughout this country” (Mills, 1998, p.

1). Shortly thereafter, the importance of collaboration within the Canadian sport system would be embedded into the 2002 Canadian Sport Policy. In this policy document, partnerships are lauded as an effective method for raising financial capital from non-traditional sources (e.g., private sector sponsorship) as well as a way for broad networks to increase participation and enhance high performance athlete development systems (Canadian Heritage, 2002). The most recent Canadian Sport Policy (2012) also lauds partnerships and collaboration as key to the sport development in Canada, focusing on partnerships as a means of increasing organizational capacity and emphasizing the importance of government linkages with the education and recreation sectors (Canadian Heritage, 2012).

None of the overarching Canadian Sport Policy documents go beyond a brief acknowledgement of parasport, nor mention partnerships or collaborative governance specific to the parasport sector. Instead, Sport Canada put forth a separate *Policy on Sport for Persons with a Disability* in 2006 outlining context, vision, objectives and strategies, policy implementation, and evaluation (Sport Canada, 2006). The policy is vague in terms of objectives, strategies, policy implementation, and evaluation concerning partnerships and collaboration.

In a similar vein to the *Policy on Sport for Persons with a Disability*, an updated version of the *No Accidental Champions* policy acts as a supplementary document to the existing LTAD model used for able-bodied athletes (Canadian Sport for Life, 2013). A notable addition for athletes with a disability include the First Involvement and Awareness stages at the beginning of the LTAD model, the identification of ten key success factors influencing athletes with disabilities, and identifying ten “pillars of support” to ensure athletes with a disability can reach their optimal sporting potential (Canadian Sport for Life, 2013). Both the *Policy on Sport for persons with a Disability* and the *No Accidental Champions* policy stress the need for system

alignment within Canadian sport system in order to optimize high performance sport development and recognize partnerships and collaborative governance as key to the process.

Governance theory. A number of theories have been applied to the study of organizational governance in sport, but in line with Cornforth (2003), such theories are only able to give a limited account of governance. In addition, theory exploring governance in non-profit organizations is less developed than theory surrounding corporate governance. The theories commonly used by sport management scholars to investigate governance in sport organizations include agency theory, stewardship theory, institutional theory, resource dependency theory, network theory, stakeholder theory, managerial hegemony theory, the democratic perspective, and the newly emerging collaborative governance theory (Hoye & Cuskelly, 2007, Shilbury et al., 2013).

Collaborative governance theory has begun to gain traction in research focusing on the public and government sectors, but is not yet commonplace in sport management literature (Emerson et al., 2012; Shilbury et al., 2013). In a public administration setting, a large network of organizations from any number of sectors are required to cooperate in order to achieve an objective(s) for a particular community (Shilbury et al., 2013). This setting is highly comparable to the one in which the OPLG functions in the Canadian sport system, making collaborative governance theory and the subsequent conceptual frameworks bourn from the theory most applicable for investigating the formation and collaborative dynamics of the group.

Theoretical Framework

As Cornforth (2003) noted, using singular theoretical perspectives to understand organizational governance in either non-profit or corporate sectors uncover limited information. Instead, approaching the issue of organizational governance using multiple paradigms allow “the

paradoxes, ambiguities, and tensions involved” (Cornforth, 2003, p. 15) to be recognized and brought to the forefront, thereby extending the understanding of governance in sport organizations. Scholars have developed conceptual frameworks designed to synthesize the broader work surrounding collaborative governance theory from a wide array of empirical research in applied fields such as public administration, conflict management, and environmental governance (Ansell & Gash, 2008; Crosby, Bryson, & Stone, 2006; Emerson et al., 2012).

The conceptual framework used in this study is the Integrative Framework for Collaborative Governance developed by Emerson et al. (2012). The framework was developed with the intention of being better able to “understand, develop, and test theory, as well as improve practice” (Emerson et al., 2012, p. 4) relating to organizational governance. Similar to other collaborative governance-based conceptual frameworks developed, this synthesizes literature and previously designed frameworks from applied fields using theoretical and empirical research to see how they could influence “the drivers, engagement processes, motivational attributes, and joint capacities that enable shared decision making, management, implementation, and other activities across organizations, jurisdictions, and sectors” (Emerson et al., 2012, p. 4-5). This framework is not specific to one sector, setting, region, political realm, or process, although specific frameworks informed the categories and variables used, ensuring that the framework would be generalizable. The framework is also balanced in that it is not overly simplistic nor overly detailed, which Ostrom (2007) noted as a common issue for conceptual frameworks acting as a policy “panaceas” in social-ecological systems.

Other frameworks considered for this research include the model of collaborative governance proposed by Ansell and Gash (2008) as well as the framework for understanding cross-sector collaborations proposed by Crosby et al. (2006). Like Emerson et al. (2012), both

sets of scholars attempted to address the growing trend of cross-sector collaboration by providing a conceptual framework or model consisting of cause-and-effect relationships and contingent propositions that act as “a basis for further empirical testing and theory elaboration” (Ansell & Gash, 2008, p. 562). As Emerson et al. (2012) noted, there is significant overlap between these two and the integrative framework I have chosen, but the integrative framework represents a better overall embodiment of collaborative governance. The integrative framework is also a better fit for the context of the OPLG because it places a greater emphasis on the system context and general environment, which is necessary considering the formative impetus was the Toronto 2015 Parapan American Games and the potential leveraging opportunities it enabled.

The model of collaborative governance proposed by Ansell and Gash (2008) is structured in such a way that it does not have a specific dimension for the system context, instead manifesting itself through a set of starting conditions, facilitative leadership, and institutional design. The cross-sector framework proposed by Crosby et al. (2006) includes system context components as part of their initial conditions citing “turbulence” and “competitive and institutional elements” (p. 45-46) along with required antecedent factors and the concept of sector failure – where attempts to address a problem by a single sector has failed. For the purpose of this research, a more focused and detailed emphasis on the system context is desirable because the underlying motivations (event leveraging opportunities) occurred because of system context influences. The integrative framework sets up the system context as its own dimension, giving it a more prominent position with the framework while also taking into consideration more features related to the external environment of a collaborative group. The system context is explored further in the examination of the integrative framework in the next section.

The integrative framework chosen also has the advantage of being the more recent framework, allowing the creators to draw upon other frameworks coming before it and incorporate improved elements. While that also means it is relatively untested in the realm of sport, the framework has been scrutinized by sport management scholars who found that the integrative framework could be used to theorise about concepts and stakeholder relationships in a federal model of sport (Shilbury, O’Boyle, & Ferkins, 2015). The context was a collaborative of Australian sport organizations (all separate entities) responsible for governance and management of a sport (lawn bowling) and is affected by varying strategic aims, interests, a sense of mistrust, power struggles, and historically adversarial behavior (Shilbury et al., 2015). Although not responsible for one single sport, the OPLG shares comparable characteristics and operates in a similar system. Shilbury et al. (2015) suggested that the integrative framework is an ideal mechanism for further exploring sport governance research themes and theory concerning power and structure, leadership and motivation, and decision making.

The next section is a detailed overview of the Integrative Framework for Collaborative Governance and its components as laid out by Emerson et al. (2012), followed by a summary of my particular focus within the framework and how it influenced the approach taken in the research process.

The Integrative Framework for Collaborative Governance

The Integrative Framework for Collaborative Governance (depicted in Figure 1) contains three main dimensions: (1) *system context*, (2) *collaborative governance regime* (CGR), and (3) *collaborative dynamics*. The central feature of the framework is the CGR, depicted by the middle box. The term “regime” encompasses “the particular mode of, or system for, public decision making activity” (Emerson et al., 2012, p. 6). The CGR is situated within the general system

context, drawn as the outermost box (with solid lines). The system context refers to legal, political, socioeconomic, environmental, and other stimuli that can affect (or be affected) by the CGR by generating various opportunities and constraints to the collaborative dynamics of the CGR over time. Embedded in the system context are *drivers* that initiate and provide strategic direction for the CGR. Within the CGR are the collaborative dynamics that iteratively interact to produce collaborative actions. The collaborative dynamics are contained within the innermost box (with dotted lines) and contain three components, drawn as cogs, of *principled engagement*, *shared motivation*, and *capacity for joint action*. The cogs represent the interactive and iterative nature of the components that produce collaborative action on behalf of the CGR. The consequences of these actions have subsequent *impacts* and *adaptions*, depicted through arrows that span both the CGR and system context to show the effect on both dimensions.




Figure 1: The Integrative Framework for Collaborative Governance. Adapted from Emerson et al. (2012, p. 6)

The system context and CGR components of the framework are described in detail below, as they are the most relevant to the research questions. While collaborative actions are necessary to complete the overall integrative framework, its elements fall beyond the scope of this case study. Many OPLG initiatives are incomplete at this time, making a proper analysis of the collaborative action elements (impacts and adaptations) difficult. However, an examination of the formation and collaborative dynamics of the OPLG can provide insights on the leveraging approach taken towards the Toronto 2015 Pan/Parapan American Games.

The integrative framework also puts forward ten propositions that act as basic rules of interaction between the different components, creating “general preliminary working assumptions about what factors lead to collaboration and how the components work together to produce desired states” (p. 8). The propositions act as a means of integrating existing theory or potentially developing new theory within the context of the integrative framework. The propositions are relevant to this study because they help indicate areas where the collaborative governance of the OPLG may be working effectively as well as where collaborative governance is hindering the OPLG’s ability to leverage the Games. Propositions will be cited throughout the findings to explain and highlight the relationship to the framework. See Appendix A for a full list of propositions.

System context. Collaborative governance begins and evolves within the multilayered setting of political, socioeconomic, legal, environmental, and other influential factors (Emerson et al., 2012). System context provides the circumstances in which a CGR operates, presenting a number of opportunities and constraints. As a result, the system context shapes the CGR, but the CGR is also able to affect the system context through impacts made by its collaborative actions.

A number of contextual elements can influence the nature and objective of a CGR. The elements recognized among scholars include resource conditions that need to be addressed (Ostrom, 1990); policy and legal frameworks (Bingham, 2008); prior attempts and subsequent failure to address issues through conventional channels or authorities (Bryson & Crosby, 2008); political dynamics and power relations (Ansell & Gash, 2008); degree of connectedness existing across networks (Selin & Chavez, 1995, Barnes, Cousens, & MacLean, 2007); prior history and previous levels of conflict and trust between collaborating organizations (Ansell & Gash, 2008); and socioeconomic and cultural health and diversity (Sabatier et al., 2005).

The integrative framework differs from previous frameworks and models in that starting conditions do not make up the entirety of the system context component. Instead, the system context surrounds the CGR and collaborative dynamics, visually representing the ability of the general environment to influence the performance of the collaboration at any time during the lifespan of the CGR, not just at the outset (Emerson et al., 2012). This allows for new challenges and opportunities to be factored in at any point in time.

Drivers. While system context provides the contextual variables that influence the formation and management of a CGR, it does not separate out the essential drivers of collaboration (Emerson et al., 2012). It is important to separate essential drivers because they represent the necessary requirements needed for organizations to form a CGR. The integrative framework visually separates the drivers from contextual variables to illustrate this important distinction, an important distinction from previous frameworks. The essential drivers include leadership, consequential incentives, interdependence, and uncertainty (Emerson et al., 2012). The first proposition notes that drivers need to be present for collaborative action to take place, although not necessarily all at once (See Appendix A).

Leadership entails the presence of a recognized leader who is “in a position to initiate and secure resources and support for a CGR” (Emerson et al., 2012, p. 9). The leader is likely a member or close confidant of one or more of the collaborating entities. Ideally, the leader is committed to collaborative problem solving, maintains a sense of impartiality and equity towards the needs of participating stakeholders, and is open to new ideas and solutions for existing issues (Crosby et al., 2006; Emerson et al., 2012). The leader, whether an individual or organization, should also be willing to commit resources for costs associated with initiating a collaborative effort (human resources, facility rentals, technology, etcetera).

Consequential incentives are internal or external drivers for collaborative action that can be either positive or negative. Incentives are considered consequential when there are issues relevant to the participants, the timing for a solution is ideal, and/or the ignorance of a problem could have negative consequences (Selin & Chavez, 1995). Such incentives are a necessary condition for inducing leaders to work together (Emerson et al., 2012).

Interdependence refers to the need individuals and organizations have for each other when they cannot accomplish a task on their own. This factor is accepted in governance literature as a precondition for collaborative action, represented under different labels such as “sector failure” (Crosby et al., 2006) and “constraints on participation” (Ansell & Gash, 2008).

Uncertainty is generally a concern for all organizations and individuals since they do not often have access to perfect information regarding future issues or solutions to problems that may or may not ever be relevant. Collaborations represent a way to manage, share, or eliminate the risks of uncertain situations.

Collaborative governance regime. The collaborative governance regime symbolizes “a system in which cross-boundary collaboration represents the predominate mode for conduct,

decision making, and activity” (Emerson et al., 2012, p. 10). A CGR’s form, direction, and objectives are initially shaped by the drivers, but change over time as the CGR develops; Both collaborative dynamics and collaborative actions can change as the CGR moves forward in an effort to more operate more effectively and efficiently to achieve goals and objectives. A description of the two components and their embedded elements follows.

Collaborative dynamics. After a CGR is formed in response to drivers emerging from system context, the components of collaborative dynamics begin to impose influence within the CGR (Emerson et al., 2012). The actions produced by these dynamics are what shapes a CGR over time. The three components of principled engagement, shared motivation, and capacity for joint action are presented in the integrative framework as interacting cogs, representing the iterative interactions occurring within collaborative dynamics. This is consistent with recent frameworks (Ansell & Gash, 2008), but contrasts to the previously linear sequencing of steps or stages to represent the collaborative dynamic process (Selin & Chavez, 1995).

Principled engagement. Principled engagement can occur through face-to-face interactions, meetings (both public and private), in cross-organizational networks, or through virtual formats such as video conferencing (Emerson et al., 2012). Principled engagement includes many different stakeholders defined by their own unique set of “content, relational, and identity goals [who] work across their respective institutional, sectoral, or jurisdictional boundaries to solve problems, resolve conflicts, or create value” (p. 10). The word “principled” is used to reflect accepted principles observed in both research and practice, including impartial and civil discourse, open communication, balanced representation of “all relevant and significant different interests” (Innes & Booher, 1999, p. 419) and discussion informed by the knowledge and perspectives of all participants (Emerson et al., 2012).

Before discussing the elements embedded in principled engagements, the importance of the participant fit and their selection needs to be recognized. Participants in a CGR (may be called stakeholders, members, partners, etcetera) can represent any number of entities including “themselves, a client, a constituency, a decision maker, a public agency, an NGO, a business or corporation, a community, or the public at large” (Emerson et al., 2012, p. 11). Each participant brings their own “set of individual attitudes, values, interests, and knowledge in addition to the cultures, missions, and mandates of the organizations or constituents they represent” (p. 11). Participant selection occurs any number of ways at any point in time during the lifespan of a CGR.

Getting the “right” participants to the table is considered to be of critical importance (Ansell & Gash, 2008; Emerson, Orr, Keyes, & McKnight, 2009). Having the right participants ensures an inclusive and diverse group that is not only desired as a normative organizing principle, but can give rise to multiple perspectives on issues and interests that allow for broader, more thoughtful considerations when making decisions (Sirianni, 2009). Furthermore, the combined strength of the participants opens up more courses of action that may not have otherwise been available. However, it is also possible for increased diversity to have negative consequences including higher levels of conflict, reduced cooperation, and courses of action taken that could potentially be inferior to those taken by a less diverse group (Emerson et al., 2012; Korfmacher, 2000).

The basic process elements of principled engagement are discovery, definition, deliberation, and determination originate from the collaborative building phases posited by Daniels and Walker (2001). These elements work together as an iterative collaborative process where a shared sense of purpose and course of action is developed through mutual understanding

of the challenges faced and the scope by which the CGR is addressing that challenge (Emerson et al., 2012).

Discovery refers to “the revealing of individual and shared interests, concerns, and values, as well as to the identification and analysis of relevant and significant information and its implications” (Emerson et al., 2012, p. 12). Early on, discovery focused on determining shared interests among participants. As a CGR evolves, discovery might involve joint fact-finding missions and deeper investigations.

Definition describes the continuous process whereby shared meaning is built within the CGR and its participants by:

Articulating common purpose and objectives; agreeing on the concepts and terminology participants will use to describe and discuss problems and opportunities; clarifying and adjusting tasks and expectations of one another; and setting forth shared criteria with which to assess information and alternatives. (Emerson et al., 2012, p. 12)

Deliberation is an essential part of successful engagement. Deliberation creates the “safe” space for difficult discussions, asking difficult questions, expressing honest opinions, providing constructive criticism, and other such conversations that can be difficult to have outside that environment. Just as important is the ability of participants to actively listen to others so they may collectively make decisions that are for the good of all involved and those they represent (p. 12). The success of deliberations largely depend on the skills of the participants to advocate individual and shared interests within the group as well as the effectiveness of any conflict resolution strategies utilized (Emerson et al., 2012, p. 12).

Lastly, joint *determinations* are when participants come to resolutions about procedural decisions (e.g., assigning work, agenda setting) and substantive determinations (e.g., agreeing on

action items or recommendations) that can reoccur and change over time (Emerson et al., 2012). Determinations are more equitable, sustainable, and effective when produced by a strong engagement process such as consensus building (Innes & Booher, 1999), although there is little research-based evidence to connect quality of collaborative determinations to effectiveness and implementation of actions (Bingham, 2008).

Shared motivation. Initiated by the principled engagement process, shared motivation is characterized in the context of the integrative framework as a self-reinforcing cycle containing four elements: mutual trust, understanding, internal legitimacy, and commitment (Emerson et al., 2012, p. 13). Shared motivation focuses on the interpersonal/relational aspects of collaborative dynamics, often referred to in terms of social capital (Coleman, 1988).

The first element of shared motivation is the development of *trust*, which begins at the early stages of principled engagement (Emerson et al., 2012). Building trust occurs as participants take time to get to know each other, work together, and demonstrate dependability. Trust is considered an indispensable piece of collaboration instrumental for reducing costs, stimulating learning, knowledge exchange, and innovation. Having trust among the participants enables each to look past their own defining characteristics, enabling understanding and consideration of the barriers, needs, and interests of others (Emerson et al., 2012; Thomson & Perry, 2006).

Developing trust is the pre-requisite for generating *mutual understanding*. Once trust is established, participants are able to recognize and appreciate the differences between themselves and others on an interpersonal level (Daniels & Walker, 2001). Mutual understanding is the ability for participants to understand and respect these differences between themselves and others, even in cases where they may not agree with the positions taken (Emerson et al., 2012).

This contrasts to the idea of “shared understanding”, explained by Ansell and Gash (2008), as a situation where all participants agree on shared values and goals.

The result of mutual understanding is a sense of “interpersonal validation and cognitive *legitimacy*” (Emerson et al., 2012, p. 14). Legitimacy achieves ongoing collaboration by confirming that participants are all credible and trustworthy while having interdependent and compatible interests, legitimizing and motivating participants to continue collaborating (Emerson et al., 2012; Thomson & Perry, 2006). The continued strengthening of bonds between participants leads to a shared *commitment* of a common path. Participants become willing to contribute to collaborative efforts that may fall outside their respective boundaries (geographical, sectoral, organizational, etcetera) because, as Ansell and Gash (2008, p. 17) noted, there is a “commitment to the process”.

Capacity for joint action. One of the primary drivers of collaboration is interdependence; the need to collaborate with others in order to accomplish something that could not be done separately. As such, one of the objectives of a CGR is to generate new, improved capacities for joint action that can be sustained until the shared purpose(s) of a CGR is achieved (Emerson et al., 2012).

Capacity for joint action is defined as “a collection of cross-functional elements that come together to create the potential for taking effective action” (Saint-Onge & Armstrong, 2004, p. 17) and serve “as the link between strategy and performance” (p. 19). As part of the integrative framework, capacity for joint action is comprised of four elements: procedural and institutional arrangements, leadership, knowledge, and resources (Emerson et al., 2012, p. 14). The capacity level of each element needs to be high enough in quality and/or quantity to achieve shared goals. As part of the interacting collaborative dynamic cycle, capacity for joint action is

both an intermediate outcome of principled engagement and shared motivation as well as a way to strengthen engagement and motivation through more effective actions and impacts as capacity for joint action develops (Emerson et al., p. 15). It is also possible that elements of capacity for joint action are used as incentives to collaborate, offered prior to the development of principled engagement and shared motivation.

Procedural and institutional arrangements are the organizational structures and process protocols used to manage participant interactions repeated over the duration of the CGR's lifespan (p. 15). Procedural elements such as mediating ground rules, decision-making, and operating agendas are determined by conflict resolution methods (p. 15). The complexity of those procedural and institutional arrangements are dependent on the size of collaborative network; larger, long-term networks need clearer, formalized institutional arrangements (rules, regulations, charters, and so on) to supplement informal norms that may be sufficient for smaller networks (Milward & Provan, 2000).

The second element of capacity for joint action is *leadership*. Leadership is an essential aspect in both the formation and growth of a CGR (Ansell & Gash, 2008; Saint-Onge & Armstrong, 2004). In addition, collaborative governance generates several opportunities for leadership roles within a CGR (e.g., facilitators, topic experts, etcetera). Some roles are required from the outset, others are needed to champion ideas through to the implementation stage, and others are needed to respond to certain conflicts or deliberation issues that may occur (Agranoff & McGuire, 2003; Crosby et al., 2006).

The next element of capacity for joint action is *knowledge*. Knowledge helps to guide the actions of the group, making the sharing and discovering of knowledge crucial (Emerson et al., 2012, p. 16). Sharing knowledge builds both the joint capacity of the collaborative network and

the individual capacities of all participants. Knowledge sharing also leads to identifying gaps where knowledge is needed to better understand and provide solutions for issues facing a CGR. With respect to the integrative framework, knowledge refers to “the social capital of shared knowledge that has been weighed, processed, and integrated with the values and judgments of all participants” (p. 16).

The increased need for specialized knowledge is a factor in the increased demand for collaboration (Ansell & Gash, 2008). As more and more roles require specialization, it becomes necessary for organizations to collaborate with each other (both intra and inter-organizationally) to perform at the levels necessary for sustainability and, in some cases, survival (Ansell & Gash, 2008; Emerson et al., 2012). Without the specialized knowledge of others, many organizations are unable to run efficient or effective initiatives.

The final element of capacity for joint action is *resources*. The ability to share and leverage resources is a primary benefit of collaboration that is also a significant driver (through consequential incentives to acquire more resources; Thomson & Perry, 2006). There are a number of resources to be gained through collaboration such as funding, technical and administrative support, and various forms of expertise, among others. Often, resources are not distributed evenly across the members of a CGR (Crosby, 2006). This can lead to tension among participants who feel marginalized by the collective group as a whole. Through the collaborative dynamic process, resources must be managed, leveraged, and distributed in the manner most appropriate for achieving common goals of the CGR (Emerson et al., 2012). The real and perceived fairness, legitimacy, and efficacy is usually dependant on how well resources and the discrepancies in distribution are managed.

Collaborative actions. Although the intention of this case study is not to analyze the collaborative actions of the OPLG, it is critical to report on as collaborative actions represent what the group is planning to do. Collaborative actions have received a limited amount of scholarly attention, often being viewed as the major outcome of a linear process or conflated with impacts (Emerson et al., 2012, p. 17). The notion that actions should not be separated from processes is supported by Innes and Booher (1999) because of the way in which process and outcome are naturally tied together (p. 415). Still, a CGR is ultimately created to “provide new mechanisms for collective action determined by collaboration partners in accordance with their expressed or implied theory of action for accomplishing their preferred outcomes” (Emerson et al., 2012, p. 17). Actions a CGR can take range significantly, some being very broad (e.g., strategic development in a particular policy arena) or very narrow (e.g., lobbying for or against a new law or regulation). Such actions can be taken by the CGR as a whole, by individual participants on behalf of the CGR, or even through external entities taking direction from the CGR.

Determining the correctness of collaborative actions is dependent on the shared theory of action within the CGR viewed within the system context (Emerson et al., 2012). Many barriers exist to properly assessing collaborative actions. A lack of explicit goals and objectives makes the efficacy of collaborative action unclear since there is no definitive target to measure against. Tracing influence and causation back to the CGR is an issue because actions can take place over a long period of time. In addition, many actions are taken by individual participants and organizations (internal or external to the CGR) that are subject to influence outside the CGR’s control (Conley & Moote, 2003). These challenges present several methodological challenges for scholars seeking to assess the performance of collaborative governance.

Impacts. In the context of the integrative framework, impacts are a “result from the actions spurred by collaborative dynamics. Impacts are intentional (or unintentional) changes of state within the system context; they are alterations in a pre-existing or projected condition that has been deemed undesirable or in need of change” (Emerson et al., 2012, p. 18). An impact could be anything from a technological innovation to creating additional value and can be political, social, economic, environmental, or physical. Impacts also vary in terms of duration, scope, and severity. Ideally, the impacts made by a CGR should be consistent with the desired outcomes emerging from the principled engagement process. Measuring impacts suffer from many of the methodological challenges described above concerning confirmation causal linkages and accounting for external forces not related to the CGR.

Adaptations. Adaption represents the transformative change that occurs within the different dimensions of the integrative framework as a consequence of the impacts of actions taken by the CGR (Emerson et al., 2012). An example may be that impacts of collaborative action did/did not result in the solving of a problem, or that the impact gave rise to new opportunities or challenges. An example of adaption occurring within the CGR may be the addition of a new stakeholder as a response to previously ineffectual actions taken. Essentially, adaptations act as a feedback mechanism for the different dimensions of the integrative framework. The integration of the adaptive feedback loops into the framework provides a space for the study of adaptation within the CGR and system context.

Chapter 3: Research Context and Methodology

Research Context

The Parapan American Games is an international multisport event involving athletes with a physical disability. Athletes from North, Central, and South America compete at this event, which occurs in the year preceding the Olympic and Paralympic Games. The Parapan American Games debuted in Mexico City in 1999 with 20 countries competing in four sports. The 2015 Pan/Parapan American Games were hosted by Toronto and the Greater Golden Horseshoe region of Ontario from August 7-15, 2015. The Games were awarded to Toronto in 2009 by the Pan American Sports Organization and the Americas Paralympic Committee on the strength of the bid document put together by Toronto 2015 Organizing Committee [TO2015] in collaboration with a number of partners. The Toronto 2015 Pan/Parapan American Games marked the first time that the Pan and Parapan American Games were officially held simultaneously by a single organizing committee.

In the bid document, TO2015, with input from the National parasport governing body [NPGB], identified four areas of focus specific to parasport legacy: accessible facilities, training and development, grassroots parasport development, and volunteer recruitment (TO2015 Bid Document, 2009). In order to realize these parasport legacy goals, the NPGB noted that collaboration within the parasport community at the national, provincial, and municipal levels would be needed. After Toronto was awarded the 2015 Games, the NPGB was intent on finding a way to collaborate with participants of the parasport community to leverage the event to achieve the legacy objectives.

The OPLG serves as the case herein to examine the formation and development of a collaborative partnership created during the course of a major grant awarded to the NPGB for the

legacy of the Toronto 2015 Parapan American Games. This grant came from the Ontario Ministry of Economic Development and Growth through the Accessibility Directorate of Ontario whose mandate is to improve accessibility for Ontarians with a disability. The grant outlined a number of key objectives that the NPGB would work towards by engaging other key stakeholders in the parasport system in Ontario (CPC, 2014b). The overarching objective of the project is to:

Raise awareness and enhance opportunities for people with a disability to participate in sport, while leveraging sport to promote awareness and understanding of accessibility and the AODA (Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act). These programs will also build awareness and interest towards the 2015 Pan/Parapan American Games and contribute to a meaningful post-Games legacy. (CPC, 2014b, p. 1)

The idea of creating a working group to collaborate on legacy initiatives occurred at the Ontario Parasport Summit event held in December of 2012, which was used to discuss the future direction of parasport in the province (CPC, 2013). The summit was a critical starting point for many of the legacy plans outlined in the original bid document, but the most important outcome was the unanimous realization that a leadership group was needed to create stronger linkages between stakeholders in the provincial parasport system leading up to the Games so that leveraging opportunities could be pursued (Misener & Carlisi, 2015). However, apart from creating stronger linkages there was no explicitly agreed upon strategy for how the leadership group should go about leveraging the Games, but rather a general consensus that something should be done to take advantage of the opportunity the Games presented. The leadership group that developed from this general consensus became the OPLG that would henceforth be responsible for building and implementing a leveraging plan for the Games and beyond.

Shortly after the Ontario Parasport Summit event, a list of key individuals and organizations that would be part of the OPLG was created by the NPGB. These individuals and organizations represent many different interests (e.g., high performance, grassroots programming, coaching) and sectors (e.g., government bodies, Provincial parasport governing bodies [PPGBs], Municipal sport organizations [MSOs], Disability sport organizations [DSOs]). These individuals and organizations were chosen by the NPGB based on their capacity to secure and mobilize resources as well as their ability to capitalise on the Games through current parasport programming and initiatives or potential for new initiatives. As the OPLG developed, new members were added, others became less involved as their organizational priorities shifted, and others became more involved throughout. Although there were no explicitly defined “levels” of membership, a number of organizations and individuals emerged as key partners. These contributors were more frequently present at meetings and events and were generally active contributors during OPLG discussions. For the purposes of this paper, these contributors are referred to as “core” partners.

Methodology

A holistic, instrumental single case-study method was used to conduct the research for this study (Yin, 2009). The rationale for using a single case-study method was that the OPLG represents a unique case in that it was a cross-sector collaboration strategically created to leverage an event for enhancing opportunities for a targeted population. Given the distinctiveness of the OPLG, the opportunity to examine such a group in this context has not previously been afforded to research inquiry to my knowledge, making it a revelatory case-study example worthy of further inquiry (Yin, 2009).

As this case study involved a diverse group of partners that brought their own defining characteristics, attention was given to the way in which the different sub-groups contributed and are affected by the formation, structure, and management processes of the OPLG as a whole. This was achieved using a holistic single case-study design instead of an embedded one, which allowed me to draw from the different stakeholders to create a synthesized understanding of the different aspects being examined (MacQuarrie, 2010). A holistic approach ensured that the focus was not on one particular sub-unit or organization (Yin, 2009). I reflected regularly on my investigative focus throughout the research process to ensure that the required sub-units were given consideration in all phases of the study. The most important aspect of this study was to examine and describe how the collaboration formed, examine and describe the collaborative dynamics and the interactive structures it adapted, and investigate both the formal and informal processes associated with managing the OPLG as it sought to fulfill its legacy objectives.

Philosophical Paradigm

I approached this research with an understanding of my own assumptions about collaborative partnerships. I believe that collaborative partnerships can be extremely positive for individuals and organizations choosing to engage in them because of the possible range of achievable benefits discussed in chapter 2. I also believe there needs to be mutual benefit for all individuals and organizations involved in partnerships and collaborative groups in order for them to develop. Ontologically, I recognize that every individual has their own separate interpretation of reality shaped by their unique experiences. (Guba & Lincoln, 2005). Knowing this, it is important to gather the perspectives of different individuals in order to gather as much evidence about the OPLG as possible. By gathering and interacting with the data as much as possible, I am better able to assemble the evidence based on the holistic view of the group.

Research Design

The purpose of this study was to examine the formation and collaborative dynamics of a cross-sectoral partnership formed to leverage a large-scale sport event. By exploring the OPLG as a cross-sectoral partnership, I hope to provide a better understanding of how sport-based collaborations form and develop in the Canadian sport system. This research can also provide insights to the question of whether or not hosting sport events is a meaningful way to build and develop partnerships. Furthermore, this research is an opportunity to offer valuable insights to the core partners of the OPLG itself as it continues to operate post-games. The questions used to guide the research process throughout my study were:

RQ1: What factors lead to the formation of the OPLG?

RQ2: How were the tactics, strategies, and structures the OPLG used (and continue to use) to leverage the Toronto 2015 Parapan American Games shaped through the collaborative dynamics of the OPLG?

RQ3: How has the OPLG navigated the challenges that arose over time?

The structure of the OPLG is such that it did not have any single individual, employee, partner, or governing body whose primary mandate lay with the group. As a result, any documentation created by the OPLG was recognized as having been a collaborative effort to reach a consensus among an array of organizations and individuals with differing interests, opinions and perspectives regarding the correctness of any initiatives put forth by the OPLG.

Data Collection

Three sources of evidence were used to gather data; documents, interviews, and direct observation notes. Having a variety of data sources allowed for the convergence of evidence addressing the research questions that can be confirmed through document analysis, interviews,

and direct observation (Yin, 2009). Data collection received approval from the Western University Non-Medical Research Ethics Board (See Appendix B) and was completed in accordance with Western University internal ethics policy.

Documentation including websites, planning documents, and event reports were analyzed using the open coding technique provided by Strauss and Corbin (1990) to reduce any subjectivity and bias I may have had towards the material by allowing the themes to emerge through constant comparison. The purpose of coding was to identify both the initial formation and the consequent development of structural and strategic components of the OPLG. The document analysis procedure was the first stage of collection initiated as it identified the appropriate persons to interview and aided in the creation of interview themes and questions. Collecting evidence from documents outlining pre-Games and post-Games strategies for the Toronto 2015 Parapan American Games is a critical aspect of the data collection that tracks the development of the group and their legacy planning tactics, which largely began well before the event actually takes place (Vigor, 2004).

The second stage of data collection was semi-structured interviews. The interviews were performed with key personnel involved in the planning, organizing and development of the OPLG, as well as with individuals who were/are part of organizations comprising the core membership OPLG. 10 interviews were conducted with core members of the group who come from organizations across the different levels of governance (National, Provincial, and Municipal). The interview questions were carefully selected with the goal of addressing the necessary components of the integrative framework while allowing the participants the space to discuss topics that they feel are relevant to the formation and collaborative dynamics of the OPLG. The interviews addressed legacy programs and tactics, the effects these tactics have had,

the formation and structure of the OPLG, the challenges the OPLG group faces, and the benefits they have derived from their membership with the OPLG (See Appendix C).

Name of Interviewee (Pseudonym)	Generic Title and Governance Level
James	CEO, National Sport Governing Body
Linda	Director, NPGB
Mary	President, Provincial Sport Organization
John	Coordinator, NPGB
Michael	Program and Service Manager, MSO
Barbara	CEO, NPGB
Emma	Coordinator, NPGB
Patricia	Manager, NPGB
William	Program and Service Director, MSO
Kevin	Director, DSO

Table 1: Interviewees

Interviewees were recruited by E-mail, telephone, or in person. The contact information of the participants was publically available. Nine of the interviews were conducted by telephone and one was conducted in person. Informed consent was obtained for all interviews. Each interviewee was given my contact information as well as that of my supervisor in order to make follow-up inquiries if desired. Throughout the findings, only the pseudonyms are used when referencing interviewees to avoid redundancy of acronyms.

The last form of data collection was through field notes taken from direct observations at select events. Notes were used from two separate meetings (one pre-games and one post-games) as well as observation notes from two parasport awareness-based programming initiatives that involved collaboration between multiple partners. More than one observer was present at three of the four events in order to compare notes and observations, which is ideal for corroborating data according to Yin (2009). Through Western University's partnership with the OPLG, I was able to attend events and meetings as a participant observer to take notes. The field notes taken at these events add another valuable source of data collection, which played an important role in

developing converging lines of inquiry, aiding both data and investigator triangulation to address construct validity concerns (Yin, 2009).

Data Analysis

Interviews were audio-recorded and then transcribed verbatim with identifying information removed as much as possible. Prior to the interviews, I familiarized myself further with the documents and field notes I had available and took notes on my initial thoughts. Using my initial knowledge of the data collected so far and the conceptual framework, I created an initial set of generic codes that would serve as a starting point for analyzing the data collected. At this point, I conducted the interviews, and then applied the initial codes to the interview transcriptions, allowing emerging themes to be systematically organized. Next, I reviewed the transcripts and emerging themes with my supervisor and determined their relation to the components in the conceptual framework as well as themes existing in background literature. I then recoded and reorganized the data to hone in on emergent themes within the conceptual framework that were guided by my research questions. Analysing the data in this way, I was continually guided by the conceptual framework and literature throughout the process. The major themes and sub-themes were gathered and then presented in alignment with my research questions, covering the formation and collaborative dynamics of the OPLG while addressing challenges throughout. Excerpts chosen to illustrate themes representative of the data collected were provided to support the findings.

Chapter 4: Findings and Discussion

The findings focus on the formative and collaborative dynamics of the Ontario Parasport Legacy group as applied to the integrative framework of Emerson et al. (2012). Examining the leveraging approach taken by the OPLG allows for the identification of the specific strategies that were effective (or ineffective) at generating specific outcomes as well as how effective the OPLG utilized available resources (Chalip, 2006). As such, my examination of the findings aims to take away lessons that can improve future leveraging efforts rather than merely evaluate what was done (Chalip, 2006).

Some themes fit into a distinct part of the framework, but many are not limited to one component and influence several others, if not all other, components. Separating the findings by framework component would limit the understanding we can attain from using an integrative framework where the different pieces are constantly interacting and interdependent on each other. As such, I present the findings based on the overarching themes that emerged from the data analysis rather than examining each individual component of the framework. Firstly, I outline themes most associated with the initial formation of group, which are: (1) resources; and (2) drivers. Next, I discuss the themes relating to collaborative dynamics, including: (3) participant fit; (4) communication and networking; (5) shared motivation; and (6) lack of formal controls. Each theme is accompanied by quotations from data sources to support the findings.

Contextual Factors Influencing the Formation of the Ontario Parasport Legacy Group

The OPLG formed and developed within a complex and multilayered parasport system in Ontario that encompasses many political, legal, socioeconomic, and other environmental influences. These influences created the system context in which a number of opportunities and constraints provided the parameters necessary for the OPLG to form and develop as it did. Those

parameters are shaped through elements such as resource conditions, government policies and frameworks, political dynamics, and sociocultural events. Interviewees noted a wide-range of environmental influences, highlighting the complex setting in which the OPLG formed. Of those influences, resources as well as the key drivers of leadership and consequential incentives were the most predominant themes.

Resources

Resource conditions emerged not only as an important formative factor, but as an imperative theme with significant influence on the collaborative dynamics of the OPLG as well. As such, the constraints caused by a lack of resources and the desire to improve resource conditions for parasport in Ontario is a theme that underpins all other areas and is an ideal starting point. Three sub-themes emerged specifically addressing the influence of resources on the formation of the OPLG: (1) the role of the Toronto 2015 Parapan American Games; (2) the lack of sustainable system resources; and (3) the uncertainty of resource availability and acquisition. These themes serve as the beginning of the discussion surrounding resources, but the impact of resources is evident in the sections that follow as well.

Event-induced funding. The Toronto 2015 Parapan American Games provided the leveraging platform for funding to be made available for legacy objectives, a necessary component of bid documents requiring financial support. In the case of the OPLG, the identification of legacy objectives in the bid document helped facilitate the necessary steps and discussions that led to the creation of the group and their responsibility for executing the greater legacy plan. The interviewees repeatedly mentioned the importance of the Games for acquiring the necessary start-up funding to support legacy initiatives. William, a parasport Program Director at a MSO, noted how the initial funding made available led to the creation of the group:

From the project funds, we were able to put together a project or initiative where we brought key stakeholders from education, recreation, sport, and health to the Ontario Parasport Summit in 2012. So that is where the project [OPLG] came from, as a desire to bring together key people that could help us run sport systems in Ontario knowing that we have got the games in 2015, so have a very targeted strategy leading up to the games and post games. That would not have been possible if the Accessibility Directorate of Ontario did not believe that this could happen, they funded it.

Although successful in acquiring the initial funding that lead to the formation of the group, the amount allocated was perceived as inadequate for the group to operate at the capacity needed to leverage the Games. Barbara, a CEO with the NPGB, reflected on the ability of the OPLG to operate efficiently with what it had, but lamented the fact that more could have been accomplished with increased capacity:

We really borrowed a lot of our capacity here, which meant that we might not have been focusing on other things to help support the Ontario piece of development. If we had more capacity just in terms of people power I think perhaps the bar might have been moved a little bit further. I think that in terms of the funding or the investments from the government, I think the group has done a lot of work and it has been on a veritable shoestring. If ever there is a group that I think makes a dollar go a long, long way, it is the [OPLG].

One example where the perceived inadequacy of initial funding manifested itself as a critical issue was in the ability of the group to develop strategies and execute plans for host municipalities attempting to implement para-legacy initiatives in their communities. Emma, a coordinator with the NPGB, commented on this impact:

I think the overall funding initiative has been a challenge, not having it available to help implement some of these plans for the municipalities especially. One of the key barriers for them was budget and money to be able to implement some of the things that they wanted to do.

Lack of sustainable system resources. Most of the OPLG partners are non-profit organizations that are reliant on government grants to deliver programming. Government funding in Ontario works through the different Ministries and is structured so organizations running parasport programming are required to consistently re-apply for funding without any assurance that any funding will be received (Gumulka, Barr, Lasby, & Brownlee, 2005; Thibault & Harvey, 1997). Interviewees expressed their frustration with the funding structure of parasport, noting that it is “convoluted and complicated” (John), “has not kept up with the growth and change of parasport” (Emma), and that the “para components of the system are stretched quite thin in terms of capacity” (Patricia). The complexity and uncertainty of the current funding structure helped foster contentious relationships between parasport organizations competing for the same dollars from a limited resource pool. Kevin, a Director of a DSO, describes the impact of the funding structure:

You have to understand, it is a really competitive environment as well. There is not a lot of ministry funding out there. All of our groups are competing after the same dollars to try to create programming. Already that creates kind of this rift between groups.

The current funding structure promotes a competitive environment, particularly for non-profit sport organizations (Gumulka et al., 2005), that has impeded the development of partnerships in the parasport sector. Parasport organizations have competed with each other in order to maintain and/or increase their share of the resources made available. If an organization successfully

increases its share through government funding, it means that another organization has lost its share and must take measures to compensate for the financial loss (e.g., eliminate programming, increase participation/membership costs)

Resource uncertainty. There was a significant amount of uncertainty regarding resources linked to legacy initiatives and the OPLG. Interviewees referred to the fact that there was an expectation of additional funds being made available to the group from government sources in the lead up to the Games, but that it never materialized, or at least not to the extent expected. Barbara summed up the difficulty in acquiring extra government funding:

We got some original, initial responses from the government that there might have been some money available, that there were different pockets of money available. [With the Games being] overwhelming... because it is like a tsunami that takes over everything during the games, so many resources were fully baked. The only way we could have gotten some was from either some hidden pockets or some additional funds. Those were tough to come by because there was such a mad scramble to host the games and host them well.

This quote highlights the shifting priorities and competing demands that come with the territory of hosting a major sport event and how they can impact less-prioritized considerations such as legacy (Misener et al., 2015). The effect this had on the OPLG was that it created a sense of uncertainty surrounding the implication of additional funds, which had major repercussions on developing strategies to execute the different pieces of the greater legacy plan, especially since additional funding did not come as expected. This was evident in the work done with the host municipalities:

We really hoped there was going to be a cash injection to help [the municipalities] do the work. But when it became apparent that was not going to happen, then it is [NPGB] starting to pay. I think it was creating some aspirational ideas, but because some of the funding did not come in, we had to recalibrate and figure out what can we do here.

(Barbara)

The difficulty in working with governments was frequently discussed during interviews. Interviewees reflected on the “lack of clarity of parasport within the government agenda” (Barbara), recognizing they were less of a priority in the lead up to and during the Games, and the difficulty of working with government representatives and not getting as much attention as they felt was warranted given the expertise of the group. It is worth noting that the direct involvement of provincial government representatives, who are listed as members coming out of the Ontario Parasport Summit in 2012, was reduced in the year prior to hosting the games based on the meeting minutes that were available. Mary, President of a Provincial sport organization, noted that several scheduled meetings with government officials were cancelled and postponed, which contributed to the uncertainty surrounding government priorities and their funding agenda.

The findings here showing a reduction in government attention, support, and shifting of priorities are similar to those found by Thibault and Babiak (2005), who noted that the Canadian government shifted finances away from grassroots sport towards high-performance athletes in the years preceding Olympic Games. The shifting priority of government is also characteristic of a sport-event leveraging model using legacy as a justification tool for hosting an event (Smith, 2014). Many of the parasport-specific leveraging initiatives piggyback on the able-bodied Pan American Games (e.g., new facilities that would be accessible). In comparing the legacy sections of the initial bid document, the legacy plans for the Pan American Games outline several priority

areas and have very detailed plans. Conversely, the Parapan American Games legacy “plan” merely states overarching focus areas (facilities, grassroots development, training, volunteers) and defer responsibility to the CPC without any clear indication of what the strategies are (TO2015 Bid Document, 2009). Smith (2014) suggests that the low prominence of parasport legacy at the outset and subsequent failure to embed this leveraging opportunity into the overarching hosting strategy is characteristic of a “tokenistic” effort to justify the event, deter opposition and press criticism, and get host communities on board (p. 21). The lack of follow-through in supplying further funding suggests that the legacy of the Parapan American Games either stopped being a priority, or became less of a priority as other needs (such as funding high-performance athletes) arose. Without adequate funding dedicated to leveraging initiatives, many projects and programs inevitably fail to be implemented, as the delivery of the event becomes the priority (Smith, 2014). Although it is too early to evaluate the success or failure, parasport legacy initiatives were not prioritized within the overarching hosting strategy.

Another practical issue for organizations in the Canadian parasport system is the over-reliance on government support in the form of grants. Many of the actions that the OPLG were able to take (e.g., distributing an equipment grant) were only possible because of the grants they received from external sources. The lack of additional funding made it extremely difficult for the OPLG to take action and build strategies that required financial capital to initiate. The reliance of external funding extends to PPGBs as well with approximately 90% of PPGB funds are acquired through government grants (CPC, Personal communication, August 8, 2016). This highlights the current inability of the OPLG (and individual parasport organizations) to generate their own financial resources internally through revenue generating activities (ticket sales, sponsorship, member fees, etcetera). Without improving the ability of the OPLG and parasport organizations

to generate their own sources of revenue, there will be a continued reliance on external government grants to drive the parasport agenda. A further repercussion of this reliance is that parasport organizations will continue to be bound by the parameters set by grants instead of having the flexibility to better serve the needs of persons with disabilities participating in sport.

Drivers

Of the four drivers listed in the integrative framework, the predominant themes emerging were the influence of a leading individual as well as specific consequential incentives, which the Games could help leverage. The drivers are important to separate out from the system context because without the presence of these essential influences, the impetus for collaboration would be highly unlikely to occur. What follows is an overview of the findings regarding the drivers of leadership and consequential incentives.

Leadership. The leading individual (Barbara) and organization (NPGB) of the OPLG was clearly recognized by all interviewees. Barbara became the *de facto* leader of the OPLG based on her high-level position within the NPGB, the status of the NPGB as the organization assigned to the task of executing the greater legacy plan, and the lack of capacity among the other partners to assume a primary leadership role. Barbara took the initiative and dedicated her organizations resources to host the Ontario Parasport Summit event as a platform to drive the leveraging agenda of the Games and bring together key leaders to create and execute a leveraging strategy (Misener & Carlisi, 2015). It was at this event where key parasport leaders came together to form the OPLG. William, an original member of the OPLG, discussed the importance of Barbara as the leading force behind the OPLG that was expressed by all the interviewees: “[Barbara’s] background, relationships, and contacts were a big reason as to why we got initial buy-in and I think that’s got to be... That kind of vision really brought the group

together”. This quote lends credence to the integrative frameworks definition of a leader as someone with the ability to initiate support from other individuals in positions of power and is committed to collaborative problem solving. The interviewees also demonstrated a high level of trust in Barbara and her leadership capabilities, which was a critical factor in securing the initial “buy-in” from other individuals. Barbara, in her capacity as a high-level executive with the NPGGB, put forward significant financial and human resources to absorb a lot of the costs that lead to the formation and consequent development of the group and continues to do so. This further demonstrates her position as a driver of the OPLG, maintained from the early formative stage throughout the group’s evolution, and to the present point in time.

Consequential incentives. Consequential incentives refer to internal or external incentives that are consequential because the issues are salient to participants, are timely issues with a window of opportunity to find a solution, and there are potential consequences to ignoring those incentives (Selin & Chavez, 1995). Having the Games coming to Toronto was widely acknowledged by all as the catalyst leading to the formation of the OPLG because of the huge leveraging opportunity it presented to address gaps in parasport delivery in Ontario. The Games provided a clear timeline in which there would be heightened awareness and attention levels on parasport, allowing for the development and execution of a strategic plan that could take advantage of the Games. Interviewees also recognized that the Games provided a window of opportunity in which extra funding may be available for parasport organizations and initiatives, with the OPLG acting as a means to more easily acquire those funds. An anonymous member of the OPLG yielded this response when asked about incentives to join the OPLG: “The opportunity to capitalize on the Games from a financial legacy perspective is/was also very enticing” (Misener & Carlisi, 2015, p. 30).

System alignment was the most discussed incentive for collaboration by the interviewees and was the most crucial objective for the OPLG based on document analysis. System alignment discussions and documentation focused on creating critical pathways for “sport development including athlete participation, coaching, and organizational management” (Misener & Carlisi, 2015, p. 35). Emma expressed the importance of system alignment at the national level: “We want to see lots of people participating in sport at the grassroots level and be able to have aligned pathways moving all the way up through the system, and provinces are a key partner in that”. Having an aligned system ensures that programming covers all areas of the LTAD and No Accidental Champions models, thus improving parasport delivery from the First Involvement and Awareness stages through to high-performance stages (Canadian Sport for Life, 2013). System alignment also prevents duplicating programs and services that use resources that can be allocated to serve other functions and interests (Misener & Carlisi, 2015).

Another reason for system alignment given by the interviewees centered on having a united voice that would be representative of the different parasport interests in Ontario. This is particularly significant from a funding perspective; the various Ministries in Ontario that provide grants have been reluctant to put resources into the parasport system because of the perceived lack of alignment with the LTAD model (OPLG, Personal communication, June 23, 2016). There are a number of parasport organizations that have overlapping responsibilities and very broad mandates, which creates confusion as to where grants would be most effectively distributed. Having a singular, united voice would serve to “put people on the same page with leaders” (Linda) and provide funders with a collective voice representing parasport in Ontario, rather than several separate, self-interested voices that may not be aligned. Linkages and partnerships between different organizations in the (para) sport system are also included as

policy objectives in the Canadian Sport Policy, making it important for the OPLG to demonstrate that collaboration has occurred (Canadian Heritage, 2012).

The need to build organizational capacity within parasport was a constant point of discussion at OPLG meetings and mentioned frequently by interviewees as a significant incentive to collaborate. James, a CEO of a National sport governing body, noted, “the primary reason for this group to get together was to bring new resources from the external stakeholders into this genre of sport”. The quote further highlights the general shortage of resources dedicated to parasport, the reliance on external grants as a source of financial resources, and the desire to increase resource capacity. Interviewees felt that the OPLG was unsuccessful in acquiring external resources to build capacity for parasport organizations, citing only an equipment grant that was divvied up amongst the partners and host municipalities. The interviewees did acknowledge that they were able to build organizational capacity in other ways, mainly through knowledge gained from other organizations and an expanded network leading to new partnerships and joint projects.

The Collaborative Dynamics of the OPLG

While the form and direction of the OPLG was shaped by the opportunities and constraints of the system context, the further development of the OPLG was determined through collaborative dynamics. The progression towards collaborative dynamics is in accordance with the group development model proposed by Tuckman (1965), where the OPLG has moved from the forming stage to the storming and norming phases. The storming phase is defined by intragroup conflict that needs to be managed and resolved in order to move to the norming phase that sees the group come together as a cohesive unit. The elements that comprise collaborative dynamics within the integrative framework act as the mechanism for managing and resolving

intragroup conflict among the partners. These elements should not be viewed as a linear, systematic process, but rather as a set of iterative actions that change and adjust constantly (Emerson et al., 2012). As such, I have chosen to address the most prominent themes that emerged which relate to the collaborative dynamic elements as a whole, rather than addressing each element directly. The four themes I will be focusing on are (1) participant fit, (2) communication and networking, (3) shared motivation, and (4) a lack of formal controls.

Participant Fit

When asked if the sporting community and the community the OPLG serves are represented within the group, the majority of interviewees believed that the OPLG was well represented. However, almost all interviewees identified groups that were either not represented or should have had more representatives in the group. The most predominant group mentioned were individual PPGBs (both integrated and non-integrated), which is sensible as the OPLG is a provincially focused collaborative, thereby directly impacting provincially based sport/parasport organizations. In addition, the individual expertise of their particular sport would help identify opportunities and barriers specific to their sport development pathway. The importance of individual sport expertise is more pronounced in parasport given the number of differences and accommodations that need to be considered for athletes, coaches, facilities, equipment, and technical officials. Other representatives whom the interviewees identified as not/under-represented were athletes, coaches who work directly with athletes (not just coach trainers/administrators), MSOs, parks and recreation organizations, education boards, and health sector workers. Interviewees felt that these individuals/organizations would bring value to the OPLG and should be considered to contribute to discussions going forward.

Although interviewees were open to the idea of adding different individuals and organizations to the table, most felt comfortable that the right people were at the table and that “the general representation of having the provincial, community, national, high-performance, and grassroots was good” (Emma). Many interviewees thought that adding more partners would be extremely difficult to do and would have a negative impact. William expressed the difficulty of managing a larger group and how that could negatively impact outcomes:

Yes, we would love more people involved, 100%. But, when you have 30 or 40 people around the table it becomes a lot more difficult to facilitate and a lot less controlled and less directed to achieving specific outcomes.

William also discussed the difficulties associated with expanding the group to organizations whose primary interests are not sport, reinforcing the idea that further expansion would have negative consequences on the OPLG:

I think we would like to expand to the health, education sectors. The trouble is, as soon as you start to include those groups the message starts to get a bit convoluted because of the different mandates and priority areas, and sport is not number one on their agenda.

The idea of having the “right” set of partners at the table is a critical part of collaboration (Ansell & Gash, 2008; Emerson et al., 2009) as inclusion and diversity are instrumental for garnering the perspectives and expertise needed to raise awareness for and address issues within parasport in Ontario. However, two significant concerns emerged that make expanding the membership of the OPLG more difficult. Firstly, the OPLG lacks the human capacity needed to incorporate and manage new partners. As mentioned by Emma and other interviewees, coordinating meeting times between the partners is already a difficult task. Moreover, there is no one explicitly assigned to do that task; administration has thus far been accomplished through

additional effort of the core partners, particularly those at the NPGB. Without additional human capacity, successfully managing and building relationships with new partners is less likely to occur (Misener & Doherty, 2013). Secondly, each new participant brings their own set of priorities, interests and associated problems that require solutions that may or may not align with the priorities of the OPLG. These new dynamics can cause less effective courses of actions, reduced cooperation, and conflict between participants which need to be properly managed (Korfmacher, 2000; Tuckman, 1965). Further, more participants mean resources are spread across a greater range of issues, which is problematic for a collaborative that already suffers from a lack of capacity and has not demonstrated an ability to generate capacity from within.

Communication and Networking

The central working objectives of the OPLG are “the alignment, co-ordination and leverage[ing] of the partners, as well as building off, supporting and improving each other’s’ skills and resources” (Misener & Carlisi, 2015, p. 27). In order to accomplish these central working objectives, an increased level of communication between the different partner organizations needed to occur under a funding structure where collaboration has not been a normative practice, but rather a constant competition for scarce, uncertain resources. As a forum for open communication where there previously was none for parasport organizations in Ontario, OPLG members have benefitted through improved communication networks, new partnerships and joint projects, and the opportunity to learn about other organizations and their best practices.

The OPLG partners began discovering the shared interests, concerns, and motivations through a series of face-to-face meetings – generally every four months – and conference calls beginning from the time of the Ontario Parasport Summit. One of the first discoveries made by Barbara was that the partners “realized how little each of us knew about what the other was

doing”, and as a consequence spent the first six to eight months “getting to know one another at a more involved and detailed level”. Updates on what each of the partners are doing, what they are working on and what they value as priorities going forward were incorporated at the beginning of each meeting in order to create awareness and build rapport, helping build trust and commitment between partners. It is a practice clearly valued by the partners interviewed, encapsulated by this quote from Emma: “Before people were not even really talking and now everyone is able to get together around the table and talk things through and update each other and that is a huge step towards that alignment piece”.

The in-depth discovery of other stakeholders in the parasport system led to a number of desired results for collaborative partnerships discussed by Babiak (2009). There was an improved communication network for the partners, giving them access to a larger, more diverse audience. An improved network also gave core partners easier access to data and the ability to engage new resources. “Non-core” partners, such as the host municipalities, could solicit the expertise and resources of the OPLG to implement their own parasport initiatives or engage in joint projects as part of the greater legacy plan. The engagement of all stakeholders was viewed as a necessary step to achieve system alignment by interviewees from the NPGB who expressed the importance of putting the different organizations on the LTAD pathway “on the same page with leaders” (Linda).

Acquiring and maintaining the attention of external organizations was acknowledged as one of the more difficult challenges faced by the group. The lack of participation and awareness from some event stakeholders hindered the ability of the OPLG to access organizations at all points critical to the parasport development pathway. At the local level, there is a lack of

communication happening between parasport stakeholders at the provincial/national levels and local sport/parasport clubs. John described the challenge as such:

Our biggest challenge is making all those connections. While we have some strong people in that group who have connections within their municipalities, I really do not think that we [NPGB] know where the local athletics club is. The information we hold on opportunities for bringing in people for participation in sport with disabilities is very limited.

The ability to connect para-athletes to sport participation opportunities is critical for recruiting para-athletes into the parasport athlete development pathway, demonstrated by the addition of the First Involvement and Awareness stages to the parasport LTAD model (Canadian Sport for Life, 2013). The inability for National and Provincial parasport governing bodies to connect with local clubs so they can direct athletes towards participation opportunities is a barrier that undermines the critical early stages of the para-adapted LTAD. Furthermore, not having these connections means that local clubs are unaware and unable to access the network and expertise of the OPLG that could have significant benefits for their organizational capacity (Babiak, 2009).

The OPLG also experienced difficulty networking with government representatives. Interviewees cited the shifting of priorities towards hosting the Games successfully as a potential barrier to quality communication with governments. While understood to some degree, interviewees felt that the OPLG was not being leveraged enough based on the specialized expertise of the group. This notion was reinforced by the relative lack of funding the OPLG was able to acquire in the lead up to the games. Interviewees discussed the importance of getting and maintaining the attention of government going forward, citing it as an urgent priority now that the Games have concluded and no longer require an overwhelming amount of attention.

It is well established that successful leveraging initiatives require a quality coordinated effort between event stakeholders and local communities (Harrison-Hill & Chalip, 2005; Misener, 2015; Smith; 2009). The inability to build quality relationships with all relevant event stakeholders impacted the ability of the OPLG to coordinate the participants needed to attain the necessary capacity for joint action to successfully leverage the Games. For example, many communities have Accessible Sport Councils that have intimate knowledge of their municipality and are responsible for disseminating information locally (Misener, 2015). These councils have links that could be resourceful in the strategic planning process of the OPLG, but the councils have not been active participants thus far. Consequently, these councils are not invested in any leveraging outcomes and did not make a significant (if any) contribution, nor will they benefit from the increased capacity.

The lack of human capacity for the OPLG and local sport clubs were also a significant barrier preventing the engagement and development of relationships with more stakeholders. According to Misener and Doherty (2013), human resources are of critical importance to non-profit community sport organizations in managing interorganizational relationships. Without personal connections or skilled personnel whose role it is to engage with others, it is difficult to engage in and/or manage new partnerships (Frisby et al., 2004; Misener & Doherty, 2013). Human capacity is necessary to properly engage and manage new partnerships as quality relationships cannot be built through principled engagement (Babiak & Thibault, 2008; Emerson et al., 2012; Frisby et al., 2004). The lack of quality relationships between local clubs and the OPLG have thus far prevented the communication needed to achieve system alignment that would co-ordinate and improve capacity within the parasport system through resource sharing

and improved program and service quality, among other benefits (Misener & Carlisi, 2015; Misener & Doherty, 2013).

Interviewees discussed how their involvement with the OPLG directly led to improved relationships with others, resulting in new collaborative projects. Michael, a Program Director at a MSO, discussed the impact networking within the OPLG had on his organization:

Many of our programs, a lot of things we try have stemmed from relationships that were either initiated or further developed during the time with the group. A lot of things have stemmed because of the relationships built or further fostered within those meetings.

Interviewees also noted that being part of the OPLG helped expand organizational capacity through the expertise at the table that could be taken away and applied to their own organizations. This served the dual purpose of strengthening their own organization as well as the parasport athlete development pathway. Interviewees discussed this benefit as one that was not realized for non-core organizations, particularly the host municipalities engaged in legacy initiatives. Communication was intermittent outside of meetings and has mostly been discontinued post-Games, leaving less opportunity for the host municipalities (and other non-core partners) to gain knowledge in the way that the core partners did.

The relationship building that occurred as the OPLG developed helped build the shared motivation needed to commit to working collaboratively and move the group from the ‘storming’ stage towards ‘norming’ (Tuckman, 1965). While similar motivations initially brought the group together, it took time to build the relationships needed to create commitment through the shared motivation process. William reflected on this, noting: “as the meetings progressed we actually saw that interest working together actually evolve into working together on a few different projects”. This provides evidence supporting the third proposition posited by Emerson et al.

(2012) that suggests “repeated, quality interactions through principled engagement will help foster trust, mutual understanding, internal legitimacy, and shared commitment, thereby generating and sustaining shared motivation” (p. 14).

Related to shared expertise was the perceived lack of data and associated difficulty in data collection and dissemination. Their need for collecting data is paramount to evaluating the efforts of the OPLG in accomplishing their collective objectives. Without such data, it is impossible to evaluate whether the OPLG made a positive impact on parasport in Ontario. This hinders the OPLG’s ability to evaluate effectiveness, determine gaps, and justify additional funding going forward. William noted the impact of the perceived lack of quality data was “frustrating from our perspective in that we did not have the quality baseline data so we could really celebrate success, so you know what pre-Games participation rates are between this age demographic.” The lack of data consolidation within the parasport community has resulted in organizations having to “dig up stats that [they] should just have at [their] fingertips” (Mary), making even relatively simple tasks a challenge (e.g., identifying the number of coaches in a given parasport). The interviewees also expressed uncertainty about what data is available, what information should be collected, how it is being collected, from whom, and by whom. William believed that “any data, any baseline numbers or quantitative or qualitative stuff that we can have from this project, that is going to be the biggest value on paper that we can have” and may be the “biggest one moving forward”.

Shared Motivation

In order to generate shared motivation, the OPLG needed to get commitments from the different partners by navigating intragroup conflicts and resistances (Tuckman, 1965). Within the context of the integrative framework, this is accomplished through the process of generating

trust, mutual understanding, and internal legitimacy (Emerson et al., 2012). By generating a shared sense of commitment and motivation, the OPLG partners could go beyond the organizational and sectoral “boundaries that previously separated them and commit to a shared path” (Emerson et al., 2012, p. 14).

Interviewees demonstrated a sense of shared motivation based on positive support for other core partners, a shared sense of priorities and values, and the desire to remain involved and see the OPLG and its agenda pushed forward. In reflecting on her involvement with the group, Mary discusses the partners’ sense of shared motivation:

I think it is nice that it is not just me saying that we should be doing this, the rest of the community is saying the same thing. It is not just my agenda. We all have our own passion, but this is important to many so it always helps.

This quote demonstrates the shared motivation that the OPLG has been able to create through mutual understanding – the ability to understand the collective needs, barriers, and interests of the parasport system as a whole while acknowledging the individual interests of others (Emerson et al., 2012) – which has led to the further commitment of the partners to the shared path that was not previously there prior to the OPLG forming.

Commitment. There was a clear separation between interviewees affiliated with the NPGB and the rest of the partners when discussing how they demonstrated their commitment to the OPLG. Those affiliated with the NPGB cited their resource contributions (financial, human, and technical) and voluntary time and effort spent on the administration and management of the group while the other interviewees cited attending meetings, efforts to build relationships, and providing expertise as their contributions. These findings are not surprising given that: (1) the initial funding provided by the provincial government to execute a greater legacy plan was given

to the NPGB prior to the existence of the OPLG; and (2) the well noted lack of resources in the parasport system precludes the other partners from contributing much beyond their presence, effort, and expertise at meetings.

Apart from these differences, there was a strong desire among the partners to strengthen the parasport development system through system alignment and resource acquisition. However, interviewees frequently noted individual and organizational commitments separate from the OPLG as a barrier preventing a greater commitment of resources. In a system where capacity is already stretched, it was difficult for people to justify their time and resources, even when the goals of the OPLG align with their own. The partners need to clearly understand the value of the OPLG to their organization to make a greater commitment (Misener & Misener, in press).

William spoke of how it is necessary for his organization to justify involvement in the OPLG with a return on investment:

When we are dedicating staff time – especially for projects like this – if there is not an immediate return on investment in participation or recruitment for the programs and services that we provide, it is very hard for us to justify that to the Board. We know that there is a long-term benefit, but we are held accountable by the Board to make them money.

Trust. Lack of trust, or even an inadequate level of trust according to Vangen and Huxham (2003), did not emerge as a major theme. However, past conflicts between partners was an issue that may have impeded the building of trusting relationships. It is difficult to pinpoint any direct impact that this past conflict may have had on the OPLG, Mary noted that it likely influenced the group at some point:

Maybe there was a little bit of turf stuff between [various PPGBs]. I do not know if we felt that at the meetings but certainly that has been a feeling for a while. So it probably impacted some of it. So I think that has been a challenge and still is a challenge.

Apart from past conflicts, there was a lack of emerging evidence to suggest that trust between partners remains an issue. Evidence demonstrating the sense of shared commitment that the group has achieved suggests that the group has been able to navigate around any possible historical conflicts to create trust between each other through repeated, quality interactions of principled engagement (Emerson et al., 2012; Tuckman, 1965). It should be noted here that my status as a member of the research team affiliated with the OPLG partners, interviewees may not have been forthcoming in sharing possible information regarding any lingering lack of trust towards other partners. Vangen and Huxham (2003) also suggest that practitioners tend not to elaborate on any lack of trust in collaborative situations.

The ability of the core partners to establish shared motivation by building trust and commitment helped sustain communication and kept the core partners meeting up to this point in time. This signifies the “commitment to the process” that Ansell and Gash (2008, p. 17) consider critical for successful collaboration. The sustained motivation and engagement also aligns with the notion of the “virtuous cycle” described in the fourth proposition proposed by Emerson et al. (2012) that states: “Once generated, shared motivation will enhance and help sustain principled engagement and vice versa” (p. 14).

Lack of Formal Controls

The OPLG used both formal and informal processes to manage partner interactions within the group context. As a relatively new collaborative, the OPLG relied on informal social processes to manage relationships in the absence of formal processes. As Babiak and Thibault

(2008) suggest, this is more common for new collaborations that also operate in uncertain or changing environments. During the formation process of the OPLG, there was little in the way of strategy or objectives beyond a desire to leverage the Toronto 2015 Parapan American Games to improve parasport in Ontario, nor were there prior parasport event leveraging collaborations formulated to adapt any sort of ‘blueprint’ (Misener & Carlisi, 2015). In the absence of formal processes that take time to develop, informal processes were necessary to ensure that collaborative actions could be taken in a timely fashion.

Objectives and strategies. The formally stated overarching goal of the OPLG – to “leverage the momentum of the 2015 Pan Am/Parapan Am Games to create enhanced opportunities, exposure and awareness for Parasport in Ontario, leading to greater grassroots participation in sport by persons with a disability” (Misener & Carlisi, 2015, p. 26) – was acknowledged by all interviewees. Less clear among the interviewees were the objectives and strategic directions that needed to be taken to reach that overarching goal. Mary noted the lack of clear objectives: “in terms of a legacy for our organization or a specific call to action, I do not think we did that for each of the organizations involved”. There was also a sense of urgency among interviewees to set new goals with measurable outcomes and deliverables so that they can frame priorities, tactics, and strategies that align with the new *Game ON* sport plan (Ontario Ministry of Tourism, Culture, and Sport [MTCS], 2016). *Game ON* was created as a “legacy” of the Toronto 2015 Pan Am/Parapan Am Games and “is intended to guide and articulate the province’s goals as they relate to sport” (MTCS, 2016, p. 1). By aligning their objectives to those of the *Game ON* sport plan, interviewees believed that would increase the likelihood of future funding from the government sources.

The interviewees revealed that there was not a clear strategy for achieving goals; instead there was a reliance on external partners to frame success, specifically concerning the legacy initiatives of the host municipalities. The strategy with municipalities was to support them in implementing their own sustainable legacy initiatives based on their own ideas rather than providing them with specific directives. As John noted:

We gave [the municipalities] a blank canvas on how to approach [legacy initiatives] when really all they wanted was information from us. We needed to come with resources, with information on how to address barriers of participation and other pieces that would really have supported them.

Another contributing factor to the confusion surrounding objectives and direction was the lack of definition concerning the successful completion of objectives. This stems in part from the groups' inability to identify and collect data that would help measure and evaluate the effectiveness of their tactics and strategies (See Communication and Networking). Kevin noted the difficulty in finding success without definition:

We talked about these ideas of working together and respecting each other and using the games as a legacy. But nobody defined what that [success] is. So it is hard to find success within that, although we get together and have good discussion and we hear about what everybody is doing, it did not go beyond that.

Failing to define success for OPLG led to failure in reinforcing stated objectives laid out in their documentation (e.g., participation, awareness, coaching, and etcetera) which gave rise to the confusion of group strategies and an uncertainty as to whether they were accomplishing what they set out to.

The need for clear goals that are measurable is critical for any organization to build a strategy for achieving and evaluating success for those goals (Chelladurai, 2014; Misener, 2015). With clear goals, an organization is better able to determine if they have made progress using specific criteria as feedback (Covell & Walker, 2013). For the OPLG, having explicitly stated goals would allow the partners to define a shared strategic direction for achieving those goals. This is referred to as a shared theory of action in the integrative framework and helps determine the likelihood and effectiveness of any collaborative actions taken by a collaborative group (Emerson et al., 2012).

Monitoring and reporting. The interviewees noted a lack of formal guidelines around monitoring and reporting systems. Without a formalized procedure in place that explicitly assigns monitoring and reporting responsibilities to an individual or organization, there was no accountability for acting on any of the items discussed during meetings. It was clear that the interviewees considered the activities of the OPLG to be “mostly talk and not enough action”, having great discussions during meetings but not following through on action items. Without an explicitly stated facilitator “who can keep giving the reminders and tapping people on the shoulder and keep it rolling” (Patricia), there is no formal monitoring or reporting mechanism to keep the partners on track outside of meeting updates. The responsibilities of monitoring and reporting have been informally assumed by the NPGB, although there are no formal procedures or policies set out for how these activities are undertaken.

These findings are similar to those of Babiak and Thibault (2008) who found a lack of formal reporting and monitoring mechanisms in a Canadian sport development-based cross-sectoral partnership, thus impeding success. Babiak and Thibault (2008) found that partners who invested more resources also developed more control mechanisms for monitoring and reporting.

In the case of the OPLG, the NPGB invested the most and has done the monitoring and reporting of activity, although using very loose mechanisms to ensure control and accountability (e.g., sporadic emails, updates at meetings). Based on the findings, it appears that the current informal monitoring and reporting mechanisms may have contributed to the lack of follow through on action items.

Decision-making. The decision-making process used by the OPLG is based on collaborative discussions that adhere to the criteria for a good consensus-building process (e.g., Innes & Booher, 1999, p. 419). Setting the discussion agenda for meetings is a collaborative effort where partners are given the opportunity to bring forward issues relevant to them in the context of the group. The OPLG then engages participants in a full discussion exploring the issues and interests at hand. That the OPLG had collaborative discussions and used a consensus-based approach to come to agreements on issues was widely acknowledged and believed to be an effective process by the interviewees. However, many interviewees expressed difficulty identifying when the OPLG made substantive determinations (e.g., reaching agreement on an action item) even though they identified decision-making as “consensus-based”. There were no formal decision-making or conflict resolution mechanisms identified during data collection. In the absence of formally structured mechanisms, Linda suggested “that [NPGB] makes decisions on behalf of that group because of the lack of structure”. Given their positioning in the parasport community, the resources they have invested, and the expertise and leadership within that organization, it is not surprising that the NPGB drives the decision-making for the OPLG. Furthermore, the NPGB was also in control of funding for the greater legacy plan – and by extension, the OPLG – making them accountable for the actions taken of the OPLG.

Although OPLG decisions were made informally by the NPSB, the collaborative process used to build consensus was fairer and more efficacious according to collaborative theory (Emerson et al., 2012, Innes & Booher, 1999). However, while it is too early to determine if the consensus-building approach led to effective decision-making, the findings suggest that a consensus-building approach did not necessarily lead to the actions needed for implementation. Without a formalized process for making decisions, the OPLG did not explicitly identify when agreements on decisions were made. Correspondingly, the actions needed to implement those decisions were unclear as well. The absence of a shared, explicitly outlined theory of action (as well as the inability for the OPLG to generate the needed capacity) from the OPLG contributed to the minimal amount of identifiable actions taken.

Summary. The findings presented here focused on the formative and collaborative dynamics of the OPLG using the Integrative Framework for Collaborative Governance as a conceptual model (Emerson et al., 2012). The Toronto 2015 Pan/Parapan Am Games was the catalyst that provided the impetus to form the group, creating the opportunity for parasport organizations to leverage an event to bring in new resources and improve capacity within the parasport system. Through a series of quality collaborative interactions, the partners were able to build trust and create a sense of shared motivation leading to some beneficial collaborative projects taking place. However, the lack of existing resources combined with the inability of the OPLG to generate more from within or acquire more from external sources impeded their ability to collaborate effectively, which impacted their ability to implement and evaluate collective actions. The way in which the OPLG reframes its collective objectives and strategies will be imperative as it moves beyond leveraging the Games to try to improve the prospects of parasport in Ontario.

Chapter 5: Implications and Conclusions

Implications

Based on the findings of this research, there are theoretical implications concerning the integrative framework used in this case study. While many of the framework components and the propositions outlining how they interact with each other were confirmed, there was little attention given to the influence of participants on the various components. There are also practical implications that reinforce the importance of getting the right participants to contribute and ensuring that explicitly stated, formalized structural mechanisms are developed to direct how OPLG participants function collaboratively. These implications are discussed in detail below.

Theoretical Implications

My study provided further evidence confirming previous findings on collaborative governance outlined by Emerson et al. (2012). The findings confirmed the importance of the system context in generating new opportunities, in this case the Parapan American Games, which can be strategically leveraged by collaborative working groups. The hosting of such events provide the impetus and platform to build leveraging strategies, reinforcing evidence from sport-event leveraging scholars (e.g., Misener, 2015; Misener et al., 2015; Smith, 2014). The findings also support the significant role of leadership and consequential incentives in driving the formation of collaborative governance regimes. The OPLG has also developed in a way consistent with group development models (e.g., Tuckman, 1965). As noted throughout the findings, many of the propositions proposed by Emerson et al. (2012) are supported throughout, reinforcing the collaborative governance theories that helped build the integrative framework.

One area for researchers using the framework to consider going forward is the significance of participant fit and its impact on the different components. While Emerson et al.

(2012) acknowledged the significant role of participants, both the conceptual framework and propositions do not take participant selection and potential impact (or non-impact in absence) into consideration. Previous research has shown that getting the “right” people to the table is critical for maximizing the impact of a collaborative governance regime (Ansell & Gash, 2008). Other research has shown that the exclusion of certain groups can reinforce existing systematic power structures resulting in continued marginalization of others (Lindensmith, 2015). A holistic perspective of a collaborative group is incomplete without considering key questions about participants (e.g., how the participants came to be a part of the group, why they were (or were not) invited to collaborate, why a participant may choose to discontinue, etcetera).

Practical Implications

Consistent support and attention for legacy from key funders The findings clearly indicate that the Toronto 2015 Parapan American Games was the catalyst that started the chain reaction of events that led to the formation of the OPLG. While legacy was included as a priority for the Parapan Games, it is unclear as to whether legacy was a genuine priority or included as a means of justifying the event (Smith, 2014). There was initial funding allocated by the provincial government the NPGGB to pursue the objectives set out in the bid document, but that support was not consistent leading up to the Games. Despite the indication that there would be additional funds made available for legacy initiatives, little financial support came through; only \$100, 000 with restrictions on expenditure (equipment purchases only) and a two-week window for the partners to decide how to distribute it. Perhaps more important was the lack of communication that developed, which resulted in uncertainty and frustration among the partners and inhibited the strategic planning process.

A greater commitment from government funding bodies could have a significant impact on the OPLGs ability to have an impact on parasport. While more resources would help improve the OPLGs capacity to act, the consistent support and attention of key government representatives would be symbolic of their stated commitment to legacy and reduce some of the uncertainty that made planning difficult. The active participation of a government representative would also establish a link to a key entity at the top end of the parasport system, helping to create further system alignment. Furthermore, a government representative at meetings can contribute to the strategic planning process from the government's perspective, adding a necessary voice that could help the group make more informed decisions. Principled engagement between government and other parasport stakeholders will lead to the discovery of shared interests, similar to the discovery of shared interests between the core partners prior to the Games. If government and other parasport stakeholders can discover shared interests, resources are far more likely to be invested in order to implement collaborative solutions in pursuit of those shared interests.

The continued pursuit for system alignment. The increased communication between organizations that make up the core of the OPLG led to a number of positive outcomes, one of which was an improvement in the parasport system alignment through shared initiatives and new partnerships. While this improved coordination should result in better access to parasport programming for the partners involved, organizations that fall outside the "core" of the OPLG are excluded. As such, they do not receive the benefit of distributed resources, the opportunity to learn, or the chance to align themselves with other relevant organizations involved in parasport. This creates a disconnection between the OPLG and external organizations that reduces the

efficiency of the parasport development pathway and is a considerable barrier in achieving system alignment.

The OPLG should reconsider the way in which they are (or are not) engaging individuals and organizations that can benefit from or contribute to OPLG objectives. Many external groups will not have mandates that so closely align with that of the OPLG and are therefore less likely to develop similar levels of shared motivation and commitment to that of the core partners. As such, mutual interests should be identified in outside individuals or organizations that can positively impact the parasport development pathway. Based on those mutual interests, the level of involvement with the OPLG can be determined. The previous example of government funding bodies represents a non-core organization that should have a higher level of involvement. A less involved example might be organizations from the health care sector, specifically rehabilitative centres. Parasport provides alternative opportunities for persons with a disability to stay physically active after acquiring a disability. Building a collaborative working relationship can benefit all parties involved: the parasport system integrates a new participant into the parasport development pathway, the health care system reduces the burden on itself caused through physical inactivity, and the participant through improved physical well-being, among other benefits (cf. Misener, 2015).

These examples show that there can be a continuum of involvement for external groups, but it is important to give those outside organizations both the opportunity and incentive to be involved. In this way, organizations have an avenue to invest in the group, and by extension can contribute to and/or benefit from the parasport development in their own way, helping to realize the system alignment goal. Investing staff time and resources to building relationships could be a worthwhile effort that can increase the OPLG capacity for joint action.

Transitioning to formalized structures. The management and administration of the OPLG has been largely informal up to this point; the partners have relied on the NPGBs capacity to provide human and financial resources needed to manage the OPLG. Although the NPGB and other core partners made tremendous efforts, there was no explicit accountability for following through on action items through. This resulted in potential opportunities to implement new parasport programming going unrealized. Implementing formal structures, policies, and procedures will help to reduce the uncertainty expressed by interviewees surrounding roles, responsibilities, strategic direction, and group functions (e.g., decision-making) (Babiak & Thibault, 2008). Clearly identifying these previously uncertain components can bridge the gap between “good ideas” and “actions taken” by explicitly identifying a shared theory of action that in practice makes partners accountable for completing tasks that they have agreed to complete (Emerson et al., 2012). Having an explicitly stated shared theory of action in tandem with an improved ability to generate capacity for joint action makes it more likely that collaborative actions will be implemented.

Conclusion and Future Research

Through this study, I examined the formation and collaborative dynamics of the cross-sectoral partnership emerging as part of the leveraging strategy for the Toronto 2015 Parapan American Games. A number of key findings were made using the Integrative Framework for Collaborative Governance posited by Emerson et al. (2012). These findings highlight the importance of the Toronto 2015 Pan/Parapan American Games as a formative catalyst by providing parasport organizations with an opportunity to leverage the event to bring in new resources and improve capacity within the parasport system. Although benefits stemming from collaborative interactions were realized by the partners, the OPLG was constrained by a lack of

existing resources and an inability to generate more internally or externally. The reliance of the OPLG on government funding was a critical barrier in implementing collective action as funding priorities shifted towards successfully hosting the event, rather than achieving less urgent legacy objectives. Practical implications from the findings reinforce the importance of getting the right participants to collaborate while ensuring that explicitly stated, formalized structural mechanisms are created to direct how OPLG participants function collaboratively going forward.

Theoretically, researchers using the integrative framework should further consider the impact of participants and their inclusion or exclusion within the framework components.

My study contributes to emerging research aimed at better understanding the factors influencing the formation and development of cross-sectoral collaborations attempting to leverage sport events (Bell & Gallimore, 2015; Christie & Gibb, 2015; Misener, 2015). The findings also contributed to the investigation of formative antecedents suggested by Babiak and Thibault (2008) through an examination of the contextual system factors and drivers. Although the findings may have limitations on transferability to other cross-sectoral collaborations, this research still provides valuable insights for key leaders and collaborators operating within the Canadian sport system, particularly the parasport system and the OPLG itself. The OPLG continues to operate and redefine its strategic direction post-Games with aspirations of achieving system alignment and creating more parasport opportunities in Ontario. The findings here will be shared with the OPLG in an effort to improve upon the collaborative dynamics, management processes, and strategies employed to have a greater positive impact on parasport in Ontario.

Though the findings help contribute to the investigation of collaborative partnerships, there are a number of opportunities for future research. Firstly, future studies should attempt to extend interviews to those outside the core group of contributors in order to obtain the

perspective of those who may not have shared a similar level of shared motivation. These non-core individuals and organizations may have concerns or be dissatisfied in a way that cannot be understood or is misinterpreted by the core partners. Collecting interview data at different stages of a collaborative partnerships development would reveal more information about how relationships and management processes change over the course of time. Similarly, conducting a longitudinal study that focuses on formation through to the implementation of legacy tactics and then collects subsequent results in order to make an accurate determination of success or failure of the collaborative partnership would significantly further research in this area.

Investigating the post-Games iteration of the OPLG would provide insight into how a collaborative forming to leverage an event might continue to pursue legacy objectives post-Games. The findings revealed that there was limited opportunity for the OPLG to acquire the necessary funding to properly plan or implement legacy initiatives because resources were being allocated by the TO2015 organizing committee and government towards successfully hosting the Games. Now that the Games have concluded, there are opportunities for the OPLG to capture the attention of a provincial government that has prioritised parasport in the new *Game ON* sport plan (MTCS, 2016). Key individuals in the provincial government have also expressed their desire to be active participants in the discussion of aligning and improving the parasport system going forward (OPLG, Personal communication, June 23, 2016). It is possible that the OPLG is in better position post-Games to acquire resources from the provincial government than they were in the years prior to the Games. Documenting how the OPLG moves forward post-Games and continues to collaborate with key funding organizations can have substantial implications on how future sport events are leveraged by collaborations to achieve legacy objectives.

Other data collection methods can be employed to gain new insights on cross-sector partnerships. For example, a phenomenological approach would yield results into the lived experiences of different participants that may provide different perspectives on some of the findings presented here. There also remains a shortage of studies collecting data on the impacts and outcomes of collaborative groups that indicate either success or failure. This study was completed at a time where the impacts of OPLG efforts were unknown, but others extending this research should consider it. Furthermore, given the lack of data collected for measuring outcomes, it may not have been possible to measure impacts and adaptations over time.

References

- Agranoff, R., & McGuire, M. (2003). *Collaborative public management: New strategies for local governments*. Washington, D.C: Georgetown University Press.
- Ansell, C., & Gash, A. (2008). Collaborative governance in theory and practice. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 18(4), 543-571. doi:10.1093/jopart/mum032
- Axelrod, R. (1984). *The evolution of cooperation*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Babiak, K. (2003). *Examining partnerships in amateur sport: The case of a Canadian national sport centre*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of British Columbia, Vancouver. doi:10.14288/1.0077141
- Babiak, K. (2007). Determinants of interorganizational relationships: The case of a Canadian nonprofit sport organization. *Journal of Sport Management*, 21(3), 338-376.
doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1123/jsm.21.3.338
- Babiak, K. M. (2009). Criteria of effectiveness in multiple cross-sectoral interorganizational relationships. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 32(1), 1-12.
doi:10.1016/j.evalprogplan.2008.09.004
- Babiak, K. and Thibault, L. (2008). Managing inter-organisational relationships: the art of plate spinning. *International Journal of Sport Management and Marketing*, 3(3), 281–302.
doi:10.1504/IJSMM.2008.017193
- Babiak, K., & Thibault, L. (2009). Challenges in multiple cross-sector partnerships. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 38(1), 117-143. doi:10.1177/0899764008316054
- Barnes, M., Cousens, L., & MacLean, J. (2007). From silos to synergies: A network perspective of the Canadian sport system. *International Journal of Sport Management and Marketing*, 2(5-6), 555-571. doi:10.1504/IJSMM.2007.013967

- Bell, B., & Gallimore, K. (2015). Embracing the games? Leverage and legacy of London 2012 Olympics at the sub-regional level by means of strategic partnerships. *Leisure Studies*, 34, 1-22. doi:10.1080/02614367.2014.994553
- Bentley, A. (1949). *The process of government*. Evanston, IL: Principia Press.
- Bingham, L. B. (2008). Legal frameworks for collaboration in governance and public management. In L. B. Bingham and R. O'Leary (Eds.). *Big ideas in collaborative public management* (247–269). Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.
- Bloyce, D., Smith, A., Mead, R., & Morris, J. (2008). Playing the game (plan): a figurational analysis of organizational change in sport development in England. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 8(4), 359-378. doi:10.1080/16184740802461637
- Bryson, J. M., & Crosby, B. C. (2008). Failing into cross-sector collaboration successfully. In L. B. Bingham and R. O'Leary (Eds.). *Big ideas in collaborative public management* (55–78). Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.
- Canadian Heritage. (2012). *Canadian Sport Policy 2012*. Retrieved from http://sirc.ca/sites/default/files/content/docs/pdf/csp2012_en_lr.pdf
- Canadian Heritage. (2002). *The Canadian Sport Policy*. Retrieved from http://sirc.ca/sites/default/files/content/docs/pdf/2002-the_canadian_sport_policy.pdf
- Canadian Paralympic Committee. (2013). *2012-2013 Corporate Annual Report*. Retrieved from http://paralympic.ca/sites/default/files/uploads/cpc_2013ar_finalnov2013_english_lo-res.pdf
- Canadian Paralympic Committee. (2014a). Canadian Paralympic Committee EnAbling Change Project [PowerPoint slides]. Retrieved directly from CPC.

- Canadian Paralympic Committee. (2014b). EnAbling Change: Project Interim Report [PDF Document]. Retrieved directly from CPC.
- Canadian Sport for Life. (2013). *No Accidental Champions: LTAD for Athletes with a Disability (2nd Edition)*. Retrieved December 6, 2015 from <http://canadiansportforlife.ca/sites/default/files/flipbooks/noaccidental2/NoAccidentalChampions.html#/2/>
- Chalip, L. (2004). Beyond impact: A generalised model for host community event leverage. In B. Ritchie & S. Adair (Eds.), *Sports tourism: Interrelationships, impacts and issues* (pp. 226–252). Clevedon: Channel View.
- Chalip, L. (2006). Towards social leverage of sport events. *Journal of Sport & Tourism, 11*, 109–127. doi:10.1080/14775080601155126
- Chalip, L., & Leyns, A. (2002). Local business leveraging of a sport event: managing an event for economic benefit. *Journal of Sport Management, 16*(2), 132–58.
doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1123/jsm.16.2.132>
- Chelladurai, P. (2014). *Managing organizations for sport and physical activity: A systems perspective* (Fourth ed.). Scottsdale, AZ: Holcomb Hathaway.
- Christie, L., & Gibb, K. (2015). A collaborative approach to event-led regeneration: The governance of legacy from the 2014 commonwealth games. *Local Economy*.
- Coleman, J. S. (1988). Social capital in the creation of human capital. *American Journal of Sociology 94*, 95–120. doi:10.1086/228943
- Conley, A., & Moote, M. A. (2003). Evaluating collaborative natural resource management. *Society & Natural Resources, 16*(5), 371–386. doi:10.1080/08941920309181

- Cornforth, C. (2003). *The governance of public and non-profit organisations: What do boards do?* London, United Kingdom: Routledge.
- Cousens, L., Barnes, M., & MacLean, J. (2012). Strategies to increase sport participation in Canada: The role of a coordinated network. *International Journal of Sport Management and Marketing*, 12(3-4), 198-216. doi:10.1504/IJSMM.2012.052667
- Covell, D., & Walker, S. (2013). *Managing sport organizations: responsibility for performance*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Crosby, B. C., Bryson, J. M., & Stone, M. M. (2006). The design and implementation of cross-sector collaborations: Propositions from the literature. *Public Administration Review*, 66(1), 44-55. doi:10.1111/j.1540-6210.2006.00665.x
- Daly, M. (2003). Governance and social policy. *Journal of Social Policy*, 32(1), 113-128. doi:10.1017/S0047279402006840
- Daniels, S. E., & Walker, G. B. (2001). *Working through environmental conflict: The collaborative learning approach*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Darcy, S., & Cashman, R. (2008). Legacy. In R. Cashman & S. Darcy (Eds.), *Benchmark games: The Sydney 2000 Paralympic games* (pp. 218–231). Petersham: Walla Walla Press in conjunction with the Australian Centre for Olympic Studies.
- DePauw, K. P., & Gavron, S. J. (2005). *Disability and sport* (8th ed.). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Dickson, T. J., Benson, A. M., & Blackman, D. A. (2011). Developing a framework for evaluating Olympic and Paralympic legacies. *Journal of Sport & Tourism*, 16, 285–302. doi:10.1080/14775085.2011.635014

- Emerson, K., Nabatchi, T., & Balogh, S. (2012). An integrative framework for collaborative governance. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 22(1), 1-29.
doi:10.1093/jopart/mur011
- Emerson, K., Orr, P. J., Keyes, D. L., & McKnight, K. M. (2009). Environmental conflict resolution: Evaluating performance outcomes and contributing factors. *Conflict Resolution Quarterly*, 27(1), 27-64. doi:10.1002/crq.247
- Ferkins, L., Shilbury, D., & McDonald, G. (2009). Board involvement in strategy: Advancing the governance of sport organizations. *Journal of Sport Management*, 23(3), 245-277.
doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1123/jsm.23.3.245
- Fisher, R., Ury, W., & Patton, B. (2012). *Getting to yes: Negotiating an agreement without giving in* (Rev. ed.). London: Random House Business Books.
- Frisby, W., Thibault, L., & Kikulis, L. (2004). The organizational dynamics of under-managed partnerships in leisure service departments. *Leisure Studies*, 23(2), 109-126.
doi:10.1080/0261436042000224482
- Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2005). Paradigmatic controversies, contradictions, and emerging confluences. In N. K. Denzin & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 191-215). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Gumulka, G., Barr, C., Lasby, D., & Brownlee, B. (2005). *Understanding the capacity of sports and recreation organizations*. Retrieved from:
http://sectorsource.ca/sites/default/files/resources/files/understanding_capacity_of_sports_rec_report.pdf
- Harrison-Hill, T., & Chalip, L. (2005). Marketing sport tourism: Creating synergy between sport and destination. *Sport in Society*, 8(2), 302-320. doi:10.1080/17430430500102150

- Hoye, R., & Cuskelly, G. (2007). *Sport governance*. Amsterdam; London: Elsevier.
- Hoye, R., & Doherty, A. (2011). Nonprofit sport board performance: A review and directions for future research. *Journal of Sport Management*, 25(3), 272-285.
doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1123/jsm.25.3.272>
- Innes, J. E., & Booher, D. E. (1999). Consensus building and complex adaptive systems: A framework for evaluating collaborative planning. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 65(4), 412-423. doi:10.1080/01944369908976071
- International Olympic Committee (2012). *Technical manual on Olympic Games impact*.
Lausanne: International Olympic Committee.
- Korfmacher, K. S. (2000). What's the point of partnering? A case study of ecosystem management in the darby creek watershed. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 44(4), 548-564. doi:10.1177/00027640021956378
- Lindensmith, K. (2015). *Power and legacies: an examination of the Toronto 2015 Parapan American Games* (Unpublished masters dissertation). University of Western Ontario, London, ON.
- Lindsey, I. (2009). Collaboration in local sport services in England: Issues emerging from case studies of two local authority areas. *International Journal of Sport Policy*, 1(1), 71-88.
doi:10.1080/19406940802681210
- Lindsey, I. (2011). Partnership working and sports development. In M. Green & B. Green (Eds.), *Routledge handbook of sports development* (pp. 517-529).
- MacQuarrie, C. (2010). Holistic Designs. In Albert J. Mills, G. Durepos, & E. Wiebe (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Case Study Research*. (pp. 442-444). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781412957397.n164>

- McDonald, I. (2005). Theorising partnerships: Governance, communicative action and sport policy. *Journal of Social Policy*, 34(4), 579-600. doi:10.1017/S0047279405009165
- McGuire, M. (2006). Collaborative public management: Assessing what we know and how we know it. *Public Administration Review*, 66(1), 33-43. doi:10.1111/j.1540-6210.2006.00664.x
- Mills, D. (1998). *Sport in Canada: Everybody's Business*, Ottawa, ON: Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage.
- Milward, H. B., & Provan, K. G. (2000). *How networks are governed*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Minnaert, L. (2012). An Olympic legacy for all? The non-infrastructural outcomes of the Olympic Games for socially excluded groups (Atlanta 1996-Beijing 2008). *Tourism Management*, 33(2), 361-370. doi:10.1016/j.tourman.2011.04.005
- Misener, K., & Doherty, A. (2013). Understanding capacity through the processes and outcomes of interorganizational relationships in nonprofit community sport organizations. *Sport Management Review*, 16(2), 135-147. doi:10.1016/j.smr.2012.07.003
- Misener, L. (2015). Leveraging parasport events for community participation: Development of a theoretical framework. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 15(1), 132-153. doi:10.1080/16184742.2014.997773
- Misener, L., & Carlisi, R. (2015). *Enabling change: accessibility directorate of Ontario report*. Unpublished manuscript, Department of Kinesiology, University of Western Ontario, London, Canada.

- Misener, L., & Darcy, S. (2014). Managing disability sport: From athletes with disabilities to inclusive organisational perspectives. *Sport Management Review, 17*, 1-7.
doi:10.1016/j.smr.2013.12.003
- Misener, L., Darcy, S., Legg, D., & Gilbert, K. (2013). Beyond Olympic legacy: Understanding Paralympic legacy through a thematic analysis. *Journal of Sport Management, 27*(4), 329-341. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1123/jsm.27.4.329
- Misener, L., McGillivray, D., McPherson, G., & Legg, D. (2015). Leveraging parasport events for sustainable community participation: The Glasgow 2014 commonwealth games. *Annals of Leisure Research*. doi:10.1080/11745398.2015.1045913
- Misener, K., & Misener, L. (in press). Examining the integration of sport and health promotion: Partnership or paradox? *Journal of Sport Management*.
- Newman, J. (2001), *Modernising Governance: New Labour, Policy and Society*, London, United Kingdom: Sage.
- O'Brien, D., & Chalip, L. (2007). Executive training exercise in sport event leverage. *International Journal of Culture, Tourism and Hospitality Research, 1*(4), 296-304.
doi:10.1108/17506180710824181
- Ontario Ministry of Tourism, Culture, and Sport. (2016) *Game ON – the Ontario government's sport plan: A legacy of the pan am/parapan am games*. Retrieved from <http://www.mtc.gov.on.ca/en/publications/Game-ON-The-Ontario-Governments-Sport-Plan.pdf>
- Ostrom, E. (1990). *Governing the commons: The evolution of institutions for collective action*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

- Ostrom, E. (2007). A diagnostic approach for going beyond panaceas. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 104(39), 15181-15187.
doi:10.1073/pnas.0702288104
- Oxford University Press. (2016). Governance: Learners Dictionary. Retrieved January 10, 2016 from <http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/us/definition/learner/governance>
- Preuss, H. (2007). The conceptualisation and measurement of mega sport event legacies. *Journal of Sport & Tourism*, 12(3-4), 207-228. doi:10.1080/14775080701736957
- Rhodes, R. A. W. (2000). The governance narrative: Key findings and lessons from the ESRC's whitehall programme. *Public Administration*, 78(2), 345-363. doi:10.1111/1467-9299.00209
- Robertson, P.J. & Choi, T. (2012). Deliberation, consensus, and stakeholder satisfaction: A simulation of collaborative governance. *Public Management Review*, 14, 83–103.
doi:10.1080/14719037.2011.589619
- Rummery, K. (2002), 'Towards a theory of welfare partnerships', in C. Glendinning, M. Powell and K. Rummery (eds.), *Partnerships, New Labour and the Governance of Welfare*, Bristol: Policy Press, pp. 229–45.
- Sabatier, P. A., Focht, W., Lubell, M., Trachtenberg, Z., Vedlitz, A., & Matlock, M. (2005). *Swimming upstream: Collaborative approaches to watershed management*. Cambridge, MA: MIT press.
- Saint-Onge, H., & Armstrong, C. (2004). *The conductive organization: Building beyond sustainability*. New York, NY: Elsevier/Butterworth Heinemann.

- Selin, S., & Chavez, D. (1995). Developing a collaborative model for environmental planning and management. *Environmental Management*, 19(2), 189-195.
doi:10.1007/BF02471990
- Shilbury, D. (2001). Examining board member roles, functions and influence: A study of Victorian Sporting Organisations. *International Journal of Sport Management*, 2, 253–281. doi:http://hdl.handle.net/10536/DRO/DU:30001115
- Shilbury, D., Ferkins, L., & Smythe, L. (2013). Sport governance encounters: Insights from lived experiences. *Sport Management Review*, 16(3), 349-363. doi:10.1016/j.smr.2012.12.001
- Shilbury, D., Ferkins, L. (2015). Exploring the utility of collaborative governance in a national sport organization. *Journal of Sport Management*, 29(4), 380-397.
doi:10.1123/JSM.2014-0139
- Shilbury, D., O’Boyle, I., & Ferkins, L. (2015). *Collaborative Governance: Mapping Future Sport Governance Research*. Paper presented at the North American Society for Sport Management Conference, Ottawa, ON.
- Sirianni, C. (2009). *Investing in democracy: Engaging citizens in collaborative governance*. Washington, D.C: Brookings Institution Press.
- Smith, A. (2009). Theorising the relationship between major sport events and social sustainability. *Journal of Sport & Tourism*, 14(2–3), 109-120.
doi:10.1080/14775080902965033
- Smith, A. (2012). *Events and urban regeneration*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Smith, A. (2014). Leveraging sport mega-events: New model or convenient justification? *Journal of Policy Research in Tourism, Leisure and Events*, 6(1), 15-30.
doi:10.1080/19407963.2013.823976

- Sport Canada. (2006). *Policy on Sport for Persons with a Disability*. Retrieved December 6, 2015 from <http://canada.pch.gc.ca/eng/1414513635858/1414513676681>
- Strauss, A. L., & Corbin, J. M. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques*. Newbury Park, Calif: Sage Publications.
- Thibault, L., & Babiak, K. (2005). Organizational changes in Canada's sport system: Toward an athlete-centred approach? *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 5(2), 105-132.
doi:10.1080/16184740500188623
- Thibault, L., & Harvey, J. (1997). Fostering interorganizational linkages in the Canadian sport delivery system. *Journal of sport management*, 11, 45-68.
doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1123/jsm.11.1.45>
- Thomson, A. M., & Perry, J. L. (2006). Collaboration processes: Inside the black box. *Public Administration Review*, 66(1), 20-32. doi:10.1111/j.1540-6210.2006.00663.x
- TO2015 Bid committee. (2009). *Toronto 2015 – Your Moment Is Here*. Retrieved from http://images.toronto2015.org/system/asset_pdfs/906/original/bid-book.pdf
- Tuckman, B. (1965). Developmental sequence in small groups. *Psychological Bulletin*, 63(6), 384–99. doi:10.1037/h0022100
- Vangen, S., & Huxham, C. (2003). Nurturing collaborative relations: Building trust in interorganizational collaboration. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 39(1), 5-31. doi:10.1177/0021886303039001001
- Vigor, A. (2004). Creating an Olympic legacy: Careful planning is needed for a London Olympics to meet our myriad aspirations. *New Economy*, 11(1), 35-39.
doi:10.1111/j.1468-0041.2004.00333.x

- Weed, M., Coren, E., Fiore, J., Wellard, I., Mansfield, L., Chatziefstathiou, D., & Dowse, S. (2012). Developing a physical activity legacy from the London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games: A policy-led systematic review. *Perspectives in Public Health, 132*(2), 75–80. doi:10.1177/1757913911435758
- Weed, M., & Dowse, S. (2009). A missed opportunity waiting to happen? The social legacy potential of the London 2012 Paralympic Games. *Journal of Policy Research in Tourism, Leisure and Events, 1*, 170–174. doi:10.1080/19407960902992241
- Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case study research: Design and methods* (4th ed.). Los Angeles: Sage Publications.

Appendices

Appendix A

Summary of Propositions from Emerson et al. (2012)

Proposition One: One or more of the drivers of leadership, consequential incentives, interdependence, or uncertainty are necessary for a CGR to begin. The more drivers present and recognized by participants, the more likely a CGR will be initiated.

Proposition Two: Principled engagement is generated and sustained by the interactive processes of discovery, definition, deliberation, and determination. The effectiveness of principled engagement is determined, in part, by the quality of these interactive processes.

Proposition Three: Repeated, quality interactions through principled engagement will help foster trust, mutual understanding, internal legitimacy, and shared commitment, thereby generating and sustaining shared motivation.

Proposition Four: Once generated, shared motivation will enhance and help sustain principled engagement and vice versa in a “virtuous cycle”.

Proposition Five: Principled engagement and shared motivation will stimulate the development of institutional arrangements, leadership, knowledge, and resources, thereby generating and sustaining capacity for joint action.

Proposition Six: The necessary levels for the four elements of capacity for joint action are determined by the CGR’s purpose, shared theory of action, and targeted outcomes.

Proposition Seven: The quality and extent of collaborative dynamics depends on the productive and self-reinforcing interactions among principled engagement, shared motivation, and the capacity for joint action.

Proposition Eight: Collaborative actions are more likely to be implemented if (1) a shared theory of action is identified explicitly among the collaboration partners and (2) the collaborative dynamics function to generate the needed capacity for joint action.

Proposition Nine: The impacts resulting from collaborative action are likely to be closer to the targeted outcomes with fewer unintended negative consequences when they are specified and derived from a shared theory of action during collaborative dynamics.

Proposition Ten: CGRs will be more sustainable over time when they adapt to the nature and level of impacts resulting from their joint actions.

Appendix B

Western University Non-Medical Research Ethics Board Notice of Approval



Research Ethics

Western University Non-Medical Research Ethics Board NMREB Delegated Initial Approval Notice

Principal Investigator: Dr. Laura Misener
Department & Institution: Health Sciences\Kinesiology, Western University

NMREB File Number: 107330
Study Title: Examining the governance related adaptations of the Ontario Parasport Legacy Group.
Sponsor:

NMREB Initial Approval Date: December 11, 2015
NMREB Expiry Date: December 11, 2016

Documents Approved and/or Received for Information:

Document Name	Comments	Version Date
Instruments	Interview Questions	2015/11/19
Recruitment Items	Email Recruitment Letter	2015/11/19
Letter of Information & Consent		2015/11/19
Western University Protocol		2015/12/07

The Western University Non-Medical Research Ethics Board (NMREB) has reviewed and approved the above named study, as of the NMREB Initial Approval Date noted above.

NMREB approval for this study remains valid until the NMREB Expiry Date noted above, conditional to timely submission and acceptance of NMREB Continuing Ethics Review.

The Western University NMREB operates in compliance with the Tri-Council Policy Statement Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans (TCPS2), the Ontario Personal Health Information Protection Act (PHIPA, 2004), and the applicable laws and regulations of Ontario.

Members of the NMREB who are named as Investigators in research studies do not participate in discussions related to, nor vote on such studies when they are presented to the REB.

The NMREB is registered with the U.S. Department of Health & Human Services under the IRB registration number IRB 00000941.

This is an official document. Please retain the original in your files

Appendix C

Interview Questions

Icebreaker Questions:

What is your involvement with the Ontario Parasport Legacy Group?

Framework Component: General System Context/Drivers

1. Describe how the Ontario Parasport Legacy Group was initiated?
2. How has involvement in the Ontario Parasport Legacy Group influenced your organizations relationship with others in the group?
3. Who do you believe should be taking on a leadership role for the Ontario Parasport Legacy Group? Why?
4. What challenges have you and your organization faced as a part of the Ontario Parasport Legacy Group?
5. What challenges has the Ontario Parasport Legacy Group faced as a group?
6. What motivated you and your organization to become involved with the Ontario Parasport Legacy Group? Have those initial motivators been addressed by the Ontario Parasport Legacy Group in some manner?
7. In your opinion, is the sporting community and community the Ontario Parasport Legacy Group serves represented in the group?

Framework Component: Collaborative Dynamics – Principled Engagement

8. How are your organizations' vision, mission, and values reflected in those of the OPLG?
9. What processes does the Ontario Parasport Legacy Group use to make decisions? Is there anything you believe should be changed about the way they make decisions?
10. Outside of meetings, how are you engaged with the Ontario Parasport Legacy Group and/or its members?

Framework Component: Collaborative Dynamics – Shared Motivation

11. What barriers, if any, do you think have impeded the ability to create mutual trust between members of the Ontario Parasport Legacy Group? Between other members of the Ontario parasport system?
12. How has your organization demonstrated their commitment to the Ontario Parasport Legacy Group?

Framework Component: Collaborative Dynamics – Capacity for Joint Action

13. Can you speak to the success of the Ontario Parasport Legacy Group? How has this been achieved?
14. What would you envision for the future of the Ontario Parasport Legacy Group?

Wrapping-Up:

Would you like to receive a copy of the transcribed interview for review?

Curriculum Vitae

EDUCATION

Masters of Arts, Sport Management and Leadership **2014-Present**
Western University, London, Ontario (Expected completion 2016)

Post-Graduate Certificate, Sport Business Management **2012-2013**
Durham College, Oshawa, Ontario

Honours Bachelor of Arts, Legal Studies and Business **2006-2010**
University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Ontario

WORK EXPERIENCE

Research Assistant **2015**
Western University, London, Ontario

Teaching Assistant **2014-2016**
Western University, London, Ontario

PUBLICATIONS AND RESEARCH CONTRIBUTIONS

Refereed contributions

Carlisi, R. & Misener, L. (2016). *Pursuing Parasport Alignment: Forming a Strategic Cross-Sector Partnership to Leverage the Toronto 2015 Parapan American Games*. Presented at the North American Society for Sport Management Conference in Orlando, FL

Misener, L., **Carlisi, R.**, Wasser, K., Bailey, R., Kay, M., & Hubley, M. (2016). *Catalysing Parasport Development through Events: Challenges and Lessons from the Local initiatives*. Presented at the North American Society for Sport Management Conference in Orlando, FL

Wasser, K., & **Carlisi, R.** (2015). *Sport for whose development? A critical examination of a city's event leveraging strategy for community development*. Presented at the North American Society for Sport Management Conference in Ottawa, ON

EXTRACURRICULAR AND VOLUNTEER ACTIVITIES

- Over 5 years of coaching experience in basketball, hockey, and special needs sport
- VP Finance, Kinesiology Graduate Student Association, April 2015-Present
- PSAC 610 Departmental Steward, Kinesiology, November 2014-Present
- Right To Play, Western Club, Executive Committee Consultant, September 2014-April 2015