

2014

Evaluating Sport Development Outcomes: The Case of a Medium Sized International Sport Event

Marijke Taks
University of Windsor

Christine Green
University of Illinois

Laura Misener
Western University

Laurence Chalip
University of Illinois

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/kinpub>

 Part of the [Kinesiology Commons](#)

Citation of this paper:

Taks, Marijke; Green, Christine; Misener, Laura; and Chalip, Laurence, "Evaluating Sport Development Outcomes: The Case of a Medium Sized International Sport Event" (2014). *Kinesiology Publications*. 16.
<https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/kinpub/16>

Accepted manuscript for ESMQ:

**Evaluating Sport Development Outcomes: The Case of a Medium Sized
International Sport Event**

By Marijke Taks, B.Christine Green, Laura Misener, Laurence Chalip

Marijke Taks (Ph.D.), Professor of Sport Management (Corresponding author)
Department of Kinesiology, Faculty of Human Kinetics, University of Windsor
401 Sunset Avenue, Windsor Ontario
Canada N9B 3P4
Phone: + 1 (519) 253-3000 (ext. 2467)
Cell: + 1 (519) 890 2670
Fax: + 1 (519) 973-7056
E-mail: mtaks@uwindsor.ca

Christine Green (PhD), Professor
Department of Recreation, Sport and Tourism, University of Illinois
104 Huff Hall, MC-584
1206 S. Fourth St.
Champaign, IL 61820
Phone: + 1 (217) 244-2773
Cell: + 1 (512) 619 1661
Fax: + 1 (217) 244-1935
Email: cgreen@illinois.edu

Laura Misener (PhD), Assistant Professor
School of Kinesiology, Western University
1151 Richmond Rd, London, ON
Canada N6A 3B9
Phone: + 1 (519) 661 2111 ext. 86000
Cell: + 1 (519) 868 9250
E-mail: lmisene@uwo.ca

Laurence Chalip (PhD), Professor, Department Head
Department of Recreation, Sport and Tourism, University of Illinois
104 Huff Hall, MC-584
1206 S. Fourth St.
Champaign, IL 61820
Phone: + 1 (217) 333 4410
Cell: + 1 (512) 619 1616
Fax: + 1 (217) 244-1935
Email: lchalip@illinois.edu

Abstract:

1 Research question

This study evaluates sport development outcomes of a medium sized, one-off, international sport event, while also exploring any strategies and tactics that were implemented with the intention to increase participation or other sport development outcomes. The event under investigation is the 2005 Pan American Junior Athletics Championships.

2 Research methods

Retrospective perceptions of sport development outcomes were explored using event documents, 21 semi-structured interviews with key stakeholders, and media coverage of the event.

3 Findings

The coaching clinic and the new facility were the only two intended tactics expected to intentionally trigger increases in sport participation and development. The sport facility seemed to have been successful, the coaching clinic was not. All other perceived outcomes, both positive and negative were unintended, and their underlying processes are unclear. Partnerships and relationships were established, but were not activated to serve sport development. It was assumed that “awareness”, the new facility, and positive media coverage would automatically attract new participants. There is some evidence to support the “demonstration effect” for those already involved in the sport, but not for new sport participation. A number of missed opportunities to build sport participation were retrospectively identified. Participation effects in the absence of leveraging are likely to be negligible.

4 Practical implications

Formulation and implementation of strategies and tactics, and measurements need to be put into place from the outset of an event. This will enable the efficacy of strategies and tactics to be benchmarked and assessed. Future research should focus on the underlying processes, rather than just the impacts and outcomes.

Keywords: event leverage, , legacy, partnerships and relationships, sport participation, strategies and tactics

The impact of sport events has received much attention from researchers and policy makers alike. The impacts claimed are varied, with the most commonly claimed types of impact being economic, touristic, physical, socio-cultural, psychological, and political impacts (e.g., Brown & Massey, 2001; Ritchie 1984). Although economic and tourism impacts studies have dominated the discourse, social impacts are of increasing interest to researchers, policy makers, and event organizers. Social impacts are often used, in part, to legitimate investment in an event, particularly government investment (Jago, Chalip, Brown, Mules, & Ali, 2003). As the need for increased physical activity has become a more significant part of policy agendas, there has been a parallel increase in the legitimization of sport events for their ability to stimulate sport participation. This is a commonly held belief, yet there is little empirical support for this claim. Further, the limited research examining the potential for sport events to stimulate sport participation has largely focused on the impact of, ‘mega’ or ‘hallmark’ sport events (Bauman, Ford, & Armstrong, 2001; Hindson, Gidlow, & Peebles, 1994; Sportscotland, 2004; Weed, Coren, & Fiore, 2009). Hallmark events are the largest of events, garner significant media attention, and draw interest well beyond the local hosting area. They also cost significantly more to attract and to manage. Perhaps because of their scope, hallmark events are a scarce commodity; one that most communities cannot possibly aspire to host. The size and scope of a mega-event may facilitate awareness of the sports contested, but most of its impact on potential participants is either mediated or disconnected from local participation opportunities and providers.

Smaller, non-hallmark events have been under-researched when it comes to sustainable legacies in general and their impact on sport participation in particular. However, small-to-medium sized sport events would seem to have more potential to affect people in the local

community, including the potential to inspire participation. These events occur more frequently than mega-events, are accessible to a wider variety of host cities and towns, and require tight local partnerships and human resources to stage (Taks, 2013). While mega-events like the Olympic Games attract a workforce that often moves from event to event, city to city, smaller events rely more heavily on the resources of the local community. This can strain the human resources in the host community, but it can also motivate and train the local workforce (including volunteers) to enhance the skills required to both run the event and develop the sporting infrastructure in the community. In short, these types of events have the potential to build social capital that remains in the host community (e.g., Misener, 2013). When compared to mega-events, small and medium sized sport events may be a more relevant means to create durable benefits for host communities, including stimulating community sports.

The purpose of this paper is to examine the potential of small and medium sized sport events to impact sport participation and sport development in host communities. The focus of this work is on one-off, discontinuous events, because they generate a typical temporary, out of the ordinary shock in the local community, giving local sport organizations that ‘special opportunity’ to capitalize upon. Specifically, this study examined the case of a medium sized international one-off sport event, which took place in a medium sized North American city.

Sport Development

Sport development is about facilitating opportunities for people to get involved in sport and physical activity. More specifically, sport development refers to the policies, processes, and practice of facilitating opportunities for involvement in sport, from mass participation to elite performance (Hylton & Bramham, 2008; Green B.C., 2005). Increasingly sport development is being embraced as part of a broader philosophy of sustainable development which focuses on

improving quality of life, tackling social exclusion, increasing access, preserving the environment, and expanding the pursuit of excellence (e.g., Girginov & Hills, 2008). Further the concept of developing and increasing opportunities for sport participation has been connected to concerns over increasing levels of physical inactivity and related health concerns (Green M., 2006). As the philosophies underlying sport development have expanded to include a focus on physical activity, health, and quality of life, governments and sport organizations alike have embraced the potential of sport events to stimulate sport development. Yet rarely do these organizations distinguish among the types of sport events that might stimulate sport development or the channels by which sport development could occur. In fact, there has been significantly more attention paid to high profile elite sport competitions that stimulate spectatorship, than to participation-based events that cater to a broader range of athletic endeavor.

Hylton and Bramham (2008) refer to sport development as policies and systems that build bridges between elite sport performance and sport as mass participation. The goal is to increase the number of participants at all levels of participation. While most research on sport development emphasizes increasing the potential number of elite athletes flowing through the sport system, our focus is primarily in increasing participation at the entry level.

Traditionally, the analogy of a pyramid has been used to depict the relationship between mass participation and elite sport. Green's (2005) Pyramid Model of Sport Development suggested that there are three levels of sport development: (a) mass participation which seeks to develop opportunities for everyone to participate in sport (recruitment); (b) competitive sport which deals with peoples chances to achieve their potential in sport, from taking part for fun and health to competition (retention); and, (c) high performance sport in which athletes are identified and developed for their performance potential (advancement). Thus, according to this model of

sport development the three levels of sports development are: participation, performance, and excellence, with the three critical strategic foci being recruitment, retention, and transition (Hylton & Braham, 2008; Hylton, Braham, Jackson, & Nesti, 2001). Mega-events showcase those athletes at the very top of the pyramid. For most recreational athletes, and almost certainly for non-athletes, the performances of mega-event participants would seem out-of-reach thus disconnected from their everyday experience.

Small-to-medium sized events, on the other hand, could be seen as more accessible to local athletes. Although the media reach does not compare with that of mega-events, non-mega events may offer a more intimate experience for event attendees and more opportunities for athletes to interact with the local community. As such, these sport events may have the greatest potential to leverage for participation (Green B.C. 2005; Hylton & Braham, 2008). This is particularly true when the event is driven by the local community rather than a multi-national organization such as the International Olympic Committee (IOC) or Fédération Internationale Football Association (FIFA).

Sport Development Outcomes of Sport Events

The idea that sport events may trigger sport participation has been referred to as the “demonstration effect” (Weed, Coren, & Fiore, 2009; Weed et al., 2012) or “trickle-down effect” (Hindson et al., 1994), which suggests that by focusing attention on the successes of elite level athletes, mega-sport or hallmark events will inspire others to become more active and get involved in sport thus resulting in increased sport and physical activity levels of the general population. Evidence supporting this effect is largely anecdotal (Coalter, 2004), and is mainly focused on mega sporting events (Bauman et al., 2001; Bloyce & Lovett, 2012; Hindson et al., 1994; Sportscotland, 2004). For example, the summer Olympic Games are unique in their ability

to attract unprecedented interest from people around the world, but also from people within the host country and community. The Games have shown the capacity to generate interest even among individuals with no previous interest in sport or the Olympics. Thus the Olympic Games can be considered a powerful tool to create awareness of sport, in general, and perhaps some of the sports contested.

Toohey (2008), however, found the most substantial sport-related impact to be an increase in passive involvement such as live attendance and television viewing. Other events have shown similar results. For example, Li and Luk (2011) measured local residents' perceptions of the impact of hosting the 4th East Asian games on their own sport and leisure activity. Although they felt that hosting the games improved perceptions of the city as an active destination, the event had no impact on their own participation. In fact, Lines (2007) found that mediated sport events could even challenge teens' sport participation.

Weed and colleagues (2009) conducted a systematic review of evidence about the impacts of - mainly large-scale - sport events as well as major sport teams. The review returned the 54 studies from around the world since 1990 and concluded that strategies that use the "Demonstration Effect" can have three outcomes: (a) those people who already do a little sport can be inspired to do a little more; (b) those people who have played sport before can be inspired to play again; and (c) some people might give up one sport to try another. Thus, large-scale events seemingly have the capacity to enhance sport participation, but the effects are limited at best and are more likely to retain existing participants than to recruit new participants into sport. There seems to be some evidence of sport development outcomes of sport events (i.e., stimulating those who are already involved), but little evidence that events stimulate new sport participation (i.e., non-participants taking up sports).

Still, claims that sport events foster sport participation are found in sport policies and bid documents of all types of events. For instance, the Canadian sport policy for hosting international events explicitly states that communities should be bidding and hosting the Canada Games and targeted international sport events: “To strengthen sport excellence and sport development impacts” (Sport Canada, 2011). The London Olympic Games will most probably be remembered as the flagship for bringing the “sport participation” legacy explicitly to the forefront (Weed et al., 2009). Never before has there been a Games that put such a strong emphasis on leaving a legacy of sport participation and development (e.g., Girginov & Hills, 2008). This emphasis has had far reaching impacts on public policy agendas. Yet even the London Games have framed the participation agenda in elite sport terms. The disconnect between planning and outcomes is evident: “the promotion of general physical activity and the wider social, community and economic wellbeing agenda has been marginalized in favour of a concentration on sports for sports sake and sporting excellence” (Brooks & Wiggan, 2009, p. 417.), all with the intention of delivering a successful Olympic and Paralympic Games that create “a sustainable legacy and get more children and young people taking part in high quality PE and sport” (p. 406). The Sydney Games also claimed that the event provided an excellent opportunity to market sport participation to the Australian public (Toohey, 2008). The actual impact of the Olympic Games on sport participation is mixed at best (Feng & Hong, 2013; Toohey, 2010). This is not surprising, since these events have rarely incorporated initiatives specifically designed to increase participation in sport. Rather, the mere fact of the event was supposed to deliver an increase in participation. The Vancouver Winter Olympics launched a ‘LegaciesNow’ initiative to ensure sport development for British Columbia (Vanwynsberghe, Derom, & Mauer, 2012). It

is too soon to evaluate the success of this initiative, but it is encouraging that there continues to be an active programme in the post-Olympic period.

It may be that mega-events such as the Olympic Games are too large, too mediated, or too distant from the local population to effectively enhance sport participation rates. Koenig and Leopkey (2009) analysed the sport development legacy of six non-Olympic Canadian sport events and reported some attempts to support sport in the hosting communities. Sport equipment and related items were donated to local schools and sport organisations after the event; financial surpluses from hosting events (if any) were donated locally to sport and related organizations; and partnerships between businesses and local sport organizations were created to enhance the sport experience for people in the host communities. While these tactics might stimulate sport participation in the local communities, there has been no empirical evidence demonstrating that they are either necessary or sufficient to affect the rate or frequency of sport participation.

Large-scale events often leave behind new or upgraded facilities after the event. Like equipment, facilities would be expected to enhance sport development efforts in the local community. However, these high end facilities often carry extravagant maintenance costs and seldom meet the sport participation needs of the local residents (e.g., Horne, 2007). In contrast, smaller scale events seldom require upgraded or newly built facilities. When they are built or upgraded it is often with the explicit intention to meet the needs of local residents, thereby assuring long-term use by the community that is central for sustainable sport participation (Gibson, Kaplanidou, & Kang, 2012; Taks, Kesenne, Chalip, Green, & Martyn, 2011).

Strategies and Tactics to Leverage Events for Sport Development

Evidence of the sport development impact of events has been inconclusive at best. Given the complexity of sport events, and the broad range of event types and potential sport

development impacts, it is not surprising that results conflict. Adding to the confusion is the lack of specific strategies and tactics designed to explicitly spur sport participation (i.e., strategies to leverage the event for participation). The previous literature review revealed some scattered tactics, such as the construction facilities, and availability of (new) equipment (i.e., a tactic embedded in physical resources), financial surpluses being reinvested into sports (i.e., an outcome and a tactic embedded in financial resources), and enhanced experience of people already involved in sport (outcome and a tactic embedded in human resources). However, there is no evidence of a strategy (i.e., setting goals and objectives; identifying, planning and implementing a variety of tactics; and evaluating outcomes) specifically developed to enhance sport participation and development. These types of desired outcomes (often termed “legacies”) rarely derive from mere hosting of an event, but are enabled by the strategic initiatives undertaken to obtain those outcomes (Chalip, 2004, 2006). Thus, leverage is distinct from legacy because it focuses on the strategies and tactics undertaken pursuant to one or more objectives (Smith, 2013).

The strategies and tactics necessary to obtain a desired outcome need to be formulated and implemented in a manner that is specific to the context and objective, just as is the case with strategic planning and implementation in general (Neves, 2013; Bryson, 2011). Although there are guidelines for economic (Chalip, 2004; O’Brien, 2007) and social outcomes (Chalip, 2006; Kellett, Hede, & Chalip, 2008), the necessary strategies and tactics to promote participation are not yet well understood. Nevertheless, one important difference between strategic planning as it is typically practiced to enhance the performance of public and private organizations versus strategic planning for event leverage, is that the latter may rely much more intensively on partnerships and relationships among stakeholder organizations (Chalip & Leyns, 2002; Misener

& Mason, 2009). This certainly seems to be the case when sport participation is a target outcome (Koenig & Leopkey, 2009).

The purpose of the current study was to evaluate the sport participation outcomes of a medium sized one-off sport event, while examining any strategies and tactics that were implemented with the intention to increase participation or other sport development outcomes. The role of partnerships among stakeholder organisations is also queried, since the relationships that evolve from those partnerships may become meaningful for strategic planning for event leverage. Specifically, this study investigated the outcomes for sport participation and potential strategies to foster sport participation that were associated with the 2005 Pan American Junior Athletics Championships.

Method

Context

The Pan-American Junior Athletic Championships are hosted bi-annually under the auspices of the International Association of Athletics Federations (IAAF) and the Pan-American Athletics Commission (PAC). The 2005 event was hosted in Windsor (Ontario), a medium sized Canadian city, from July 28-31. Thirty five countries participated in the event. It attracted 443 athletes, 144 coaches, and over 600 volunteers. A variety of local community groups and stakeholders were involved in the staging of the event: the local organizing committee, the local track and field club, corporate partners, volunteers, and the media. It attracted a high level of local media attention, and drew 16,000 spectators to the stadium over the course of the 4-day event, most of the spectators being local residents (Snelgrove, Taks, Chalip, & Green, 2008; Taks, et al. 2011). The competitors and participants were almost exclusively non-locals.

Data Collection

Three types of data were collected: event documents, stakeholder interviews, and media coverage of the event. The bid document, planning documents, the post-event report of the local organizing committee (LOC; LOC, 2004, 2005), as well as documents from the local track and field club were analysed first and used to becoming familiar with the event, identify appropriate stakeholders to interview, and refine the interview protocols. Furthermore, these documents were analysed for evidence of intentional and unintentional attempts to leverage the event for sport development outcomes.

Semi-structured interviews. A semi-structured interview guide was developed, consisting of five general themes related to sport participation and development: (a) awareness of sport participation initiatives at the time of the event; (b) expectations of the event stimulating sport participation and development; (c) perceptions of sport development outcomes obtained from the event; (d) relationships garnered through the event process; and, (e) reflections on lessons learned and potential tactics and strategies to foster sport participation in the local community for future events. While these themes were similar for all stakeholder groups, the identification question and some of the probes were stakeholder specific.

Interviewees for the study were purposefully selected to include a variety of key stakeholders of the event. In total 21 participants were targeted and agreed to participate: four members of the Local Organizing Committee (LOC), two members of the local track and field club (CLUB), four members with dual representation (LOC/CLUB), two track and field coaches (COACH), two facility managers (FAC), and seven current track and field athletes (ATHL; six on the junior level, and one on the senior national team). These stakeholders were chosen via

document analysis and referral from other stakeholders (cf. Creswell, 2012) because they were ideally placed to have insider knowledge and expertise about the strategies and tactics that were implemented in concert with the event.

The face-to-face interviews lasted between 25 minutes and one hour, and were conducted between October 2011 and May 2012, six years after the event. This time frame was deemed long enough to reveal sustainable sport participation outcomes (if any). In total 14 hours of interviews were audio-recorded and transcribed verbatim for a total of 269 pages (single spaced). NVivo software (QDR NVivo 9; NVivo, 2008) was used to assist with the process of axial and open coding.

Media-analysis. In addition to the interviews, a media analysis was conducted of event-related stories in the lead-up to the event, during the event, and in the post-event period. The focus of the study was the impact of the event on the local community, therefore, the media analysis was limited to stories in the local newspaper, the Windsor Star, and was conducted via ProQuest. In total 74 newspaper articles were identified with publication dates ranging from January 3, 2002 to July 8, 2008. All were coded using themes closely related to those identified via the stakeholder interviews (also using NVivo software). Forty-one themes were extracted from 74 newspaper articles. For the purpose of this study, we focused on the thirteen themes that were related to sport participation and development, including the stadium legacy. The analysis included an examination of the evolution of themes over time (before, during and after the event). There were 37 articles published before (January 3, 2002 - July 27, 2005), 24 during (July 28, 2005 - August 2, 2005), and 13 after the event (August 3, 2005 - July 8, 2008). The themes were compared with those extracted from the document analysis and stakeholder interviews.

Results

Four thematic categories were identified: (1) expectations for sport development, (2) perceived evidence, (3) the role of sporting infrastructure, and (4) the importance of partnerships and relationships. Constraints and opportunities for sport development were also identified. The thematic categories are reviewed, followed by constraints on sport development; then potential strategies and tactics for sport development are discussed.

Expectations for Sport Development

As is the case for many bid documents, sport participation and development were part of the agenda for the 2005 Pan American Junior Athletic Championships [1]¹. The bid (LOC, 2004) alluded to the new and upgraded facilities, increase in opportunities for sport development, development of programs for athletes, coaches, and officials throughout the region, opportunities for local athletes to showcase their talents and thus inspire future generations, as well as the potential of the event to include athletes and spectators with disabilities. However, the final report (LOC, 2005) did not mention any sport participation initiatives, did not explain the implementation or execution of the legacy plan proposals, and failed to identify any individuals as responsible for carrying out the legacy plans to meet the original objectives.

The majority of the non-athlete interviewees expressed expectations that the event would stimulate sport participation and development [2]. In particular, the newly constructed stadium was used to support this belief. Expectations for sport development focused primarily on track and field athletes already involved in the sport [3]. Six interviewees expected that just by the mere fact of creating awareness, the event would stimulate sport participation [4].

¹ This, and all following numbers between squared brackets refer to the quotes presented in Appendix A which support the findings.

It should be noted, however, that half of the non-athlete interviewees acknowledged that the primary purpose of hosting the event was: (a) to build a new stadium; and (b) to host a high quality event. In their view, sport participation and development was certainly not a primary objective. A member of the LOC, who was also a CLUB member, as well as two athletes, indicated that they had no expectations that the event would stimulate sport participation and development. Thus, expectations about sport participation and development varied in this regard.

Perceived Evidence

Because of the absence of benchmarks, evidence of sport development impacts was limited to stakeholders' perceptions. These perceptions were characterized as either intended or unintended. These were further categorized as either positive or negative outcomes. Since sport participation and development were not perceived as primary objectives, it is not surprising that most of the perceived outcomes were unintended. An overview of the perceived unintended outcomes is summarized in Table 1.

[Insert table 1 about here]

Unintended Positive Outcomes. The bulk of interviewees focused on unintended positive outcomes. Twelve of the 14 non-athlete participants and five of the seven athlete participants mentioned multiple unintended positive outcomes contributing to both sport participation and development.

The event drew an unforeseen number of spectators, including a large contingent of people from different cultural backgrounds [5]. The education system was certainly identified as a key beneficiary of the perceived outcomes of the events. For example, both grade school and high school extra-curricular track and field programs were perceived to have grown as a result of hosting the event [6].

The increased performance of track and field athletes was also illustrated by pointing towards the rise of more high calibre athletes [7].

Six non-athlete interviewees emphasized the increased profile of track and field for the university, and the possibility of attracting higher calibre student-athletes to the University. The interviewees recognised that it was the combined effect of the event and the new facility, including the state of the art equipment that created the opportunities for high calibre athletes.

The overall perception was that the event enhanced the personal development and skill level, not only of local athletes, but also of coaches and officials. More local coaches have since become accredited (LOC member 2)[8].

Another club member revealed that being observed and mentored through the event allowed him to advance to higher levels of coaching certification (CLUB member 2). Interviewees noted that there are also more and higher qualified officials than ever before (LOC/CLUB member 4)[9]. Indeed, officials gained experience in officiating an international event. In international competitions, coaches are not allowed to talk; everything is done with flags and hand gestures to overcome the language barrier (CLUB member 1). The increased experience also helped to build up officials' confidence levels (CLUB member 1).

The city already had a well-developed track and field community. One head coach in particular had been instrumental in crafting the city as a "track town" [10].

This head coach was also part of bringing this event to the city, which in turn was perceived to enhance opportunities for the track and field community.

There was some national and international coverage of the event, but more importantly, tremendous coverage by the local media, including radio, television, and especially the local

newspaper. The amount of positive coverage was an unexpected and unintended outcome, clearly prompting community awareness for the event [11].

Interviewees assumed that this incredible media attention automatically created awareness that would result directly in increases in participation and development.

Unintended Negative Outcomes

Stakeholders revealed a series of unintended negative outcomes. A coaching clinic was organized as one of the few intentional sport development strategies. Despite the intended positive outcome, the clinic organized the day prior to the event was not well attended [12]. Thus one of the only intentional strategies to leverage the event failed. Many interviewees identified the missed opportunity to tap into the immigrant market, especially since a local child represented each participating country during the opening ceremonies [13].

The University spent \$9.5 billion on the stadium development in 2005 (Taks et al., 2011). An additional \$1 million was spent in the summer of 2010 on the installation of the field turf surface. All of this development was funded solely by the University of Windsor and its students, without grants or tax-payers' dollars. It is fair to assume that the rental rates of the stadium increased after the event, affecting user fees. This was also perceived to be a negative, albeit unintended, outcome [14].

Actual data illustrate that the outdoor season fee for seniors in the local track and field club increased by 27% from 2005 to 2007 (i.e., from \$255 to \$325 respectively), and up to 39% in 2013 (i.e., \$355; M. Havey, personal communication, February 4, 2013).

Some interviewees were unsure whether the event had actually increased participation in the local club after the fact. The actual club membership of the Windsor Legion track and field club, represented in figure 1, shows club membership data from 2000 – 2010. Clearly, the

numbers went up right after the event from 187 in 2005 to 230 in 2006. However, a big drop is seen in 2007, to 134 members (W. Lee, personal communication, May 27, 2011). This is obviously an unexpected negative outcome. The drop in membership may be a distal effect of the positive sport development outcomes of the event. The event elevated the status of the sport and, consequently, the club's head coach, which enhanced the club's attractiveness to aspiring athletes. The coach had been responsible for the equipment and the competition site during the event, thereby becoming fully immersed in the IAAF rules and gaining a tremendous amount of experience. This increase in human capital (cf. Gratton & Taylor, 2000; Weed, 2011) paid-off for him personally, as he was offered a higher level coaching position at a university, but that was a loss for the local club. Losing their head coach undermined the personal relationship that athletes felt with their club. Thus, the enhancement of the coach's prestige had an immediate positive benefit for club membership, but the subsequent effect on his career hurt club membership.

[Insert figure 1 about here]

The Role of Sporting Infrastructure

As indicated earlier, the stadium was an expected and intended legacy of hosting the event. Clearly, the initiative of hosting the games was to build a new stadium (e.g., LOC member 1; LOC/CLUB member 2; CLUB member 1; LOC/CLUB member 4)[15], but it was also a vehicle to get new, top of the line equipment through a provincial government grant (e.g., LOC/CLUB member 2; LOC/CLUB member 3).

The stadium met the IAAF standards at the time; and was variously described by stakeholders as "top notch" (LOC/CLUB member 4), "world class" (LOC member 4), as well as "the fastest track in Canada" (LOC/CLUB member 1). It should be noted however, that since that time, artificial turf has been put into the centre of the field to serve the football and soccer

programs at the University. Although this benefits the greater sport community in the city, it prohibits organizing future international sanctioned track and field meets. The IAAF only allows throwing events in the centre of the 400m track on a natural grass as a surface; now, the throwing area is up on the hill (e.g., COACH 2; CLUB member 2). Regardless, to this day, it is the only facility of its kind in the region (LOC member 4). The old facility was described as “terrible” (COACH 2) and “a mess” (LOC member 1).

The local newspaper also emphasized the legacy of the stadium. Prior to the event, articles discussed the financial details of the stadium, and speculated on who would be covering the costs for the stadium. The media also discussed the University of Windsor’s students’ referendum to pay additional fees to support a new recreational facility, and highlighted the lack of funding from the different levels of government. The media also emphasised the magnificence of the stadium, suggesting that it was going to be one of the best facilities in Canada. The newspaper articles supported the belief that a new facility and equipment would encourage parents and children to become educated about track and field in the hopes that they would try the sport for the first time.

The stakeholders identified many different groups and organizations in the local community that have benefited from the new stadium (see Table 2). The location of the new stadium enhanced the accessibility for multiple groups in the community [16]. For instance, stakeholders indicated that the location of the new stadium allowed for better access for youth from lower socio-economic backgrounds compared to the old facility (approximately 10 km outside the city) (e.g., LOC/CLUB member 2; CLUB member 2) [17]. The new facility successfully ensured greater inclusivity and accessibility for people with disabilities [18, 19]. But

most importantly, benefited the track and field athletes who bragged about the state of the art facility [20, 21].

Two interviewees mentioned that one of the current elite athletes would not have stayed in the city if it were not for the facility (LOC/CLUB member 2; COACH 2); this athlete indeed confirmed this [22] . The local newspaper also stressed how a world-class track with an Olympic Mondo[®] surface would motivate track and field athletes to train at the new stadium (e.g., Puzic, 2006, May 27).

[Insert table 2 about here]

The facility has also contributed to the development of local school track and field programs [23].

Due to the new facility, its easy accessibility, and the availability of additional equipment, the local track and field club was able to mount the official Athletics Canada Run, Jump and Throw program[®], a national grassroots sport participation initiative and attract new participants [24]. In addition, the club benefited from the high attraction level of the facility, especially the fast track [25]. While all track and field disciplines benefited, pole vault in particular benefited [26]. Similarly, it was perceived that the stadium has also helped in recruiting higher calibre athletes for the University track and field program (e.g., LOC/CLUB member 1) [27]. One athlete reflected that it is probably more because of the facility and the strong track program that student athletes want to come to this University now, rather than because of the event itself (athlete 5).

Prior to the event, the Mayor of Windsor already identified the opportunity the new facility would create to host future events [28]. This expectation has proved true, since a wide variety of events have been hosted in the stadium since 2005 (i.e., Canadian Senior Track and Field Championships in 2007; Olympic Trials in 2008). These high calibre track and field events

are believed to continue to inspire local kids (e.g., LOC/CLUB member 1; athlete 1). Numerous other events were mentioned such as county, regional and provincial track and field events including school events, “all-comers” high school meets, and parasport events. In addition, twilight meets and Saturday meets have become part of the regular meet schedule in the summer (e.g., LOC/CLUB member 1; LOC member 1; LOC/CLUB member 2; COACH 2).

Most interviewees conveyed the importance of the stadium construction in the development of local track and field programs and athletes, as well as its contribution to the development of other sports such as American football and soccer (e.g., LOC member 1; LOC member 2; LOC member 3; Athlete 7; LOC member 4) [29, 30]. Thus, while the facility reinforced the ‘track town’ that the city already was to some extent, it also supported the development of other sports in the community.

Importance of Partnerships and Relationships

Figure 2 shows all stakeholder groups involved in the creation and/or the staging of the event. It is evident that an event like this offers opportunities to create and sustain partnerships and relationships, both personal and organizational, which may become instrumental to foster sport development outcomes. The event can create new partnerships or reinforce (or damage) existing ones. Numerous stakeholders described relationship issues connected to the event and hosting process. LOC/CLUB member 3 emphasized the following: “getting the whole community together was the key”. The groups participating in the organization of the event were faculty and staff members of the university; athletes, coaches and staff from the University athletics department (ARS); athletes, coaches and board members of the local track and field club; as well as people from the broader community, including elementary and high school teachers and athletes, as well as other volunteers, friends, and family. Collaboration among

people from these different groups was obviously most intense during the event. Working together for 12 to 15 hours a day over the course of four days allows for relationships to be transformed into friendships (LOC/CLUB member 3).

[Insert figure 2 about here]

Several stakeholders mentioned the community enabled by the event [31].

The event fostered camaraderie among members of the organizing committee (e.g., LOC/CLUB member 3), and created spontaneous opportunities to meet new people (e.g., athlete 3). However, it was also noticed that those relationships with non-local athletes and coaches do not necessarily last (e.g., LOC/CLUB member 2). The relationship between the university track and field program (ARS) and the officials coming from the local community, was boosted through the event (LOC member 1).

The collaboration between the University and the local track and field club was instrumental in hosting the event, and their relationship was quite strong. However, this relationship has weakened in the years after the event. This was mentioned on several occasions, but the real reason remains unclear [32, 33].

The enhanced relationship with sport governing bodies such as Athletics Ontario and Athletics Canada was mentioned several times, which has been instrumental to the continued success of the local club and the hosting of future events such as the 2007 and 2008 national championships [34]. Enhanced relationships with sponsors were only mentioned a couple of times (e.g., athlete 5; LOC/CLUB member 3; LOC/CLUB member 4) [35].

Strangely enough, nobody mentioned the media as a direct partner, although there was, in fact, an agreement with the local newspaper for free advertising (LOC member 1). As indicated earlier, the local media provided tremendous positive coverage, generating free publicity [36].

Another interviewee acknowledged that the event strengthened his relationship with the media [37]. It was also believed that this incredible media attention was an ‘automatic’ strategy to increase participation, which will be discussed in the next section.

Constraints on Fostering Sport Development

It is clear that except for the coaching clinic and the new stadium, no initiatives were taken to actively leverage the event for sport participation and development. The overall perception of the stakeholders interviewed was that the focus on delivering a high quality sport event required all their time and resources and therefore completely overwhelmed any potential sport development initiatives [38, 39]. While the issue of focus was consistently identified as the most powerful constraint, capacity came also up as a possible constraint, specifically the inability of the local club to handle more participants [40].

Still others acknowledged the missed opportunities, or the lack of awareness to foster sport participation and development but clearly admitted the potential value post-hoc [41].

Potential Strategies and Tactics to Increase Sport Participation and Development

Once stakeholders began to consider the missed opportunities, they were able to identify a number of potential strategies and tactics that might have successfully leveraged the event. Eight potential leveraging tactics were identified, although there was no clear pattern to the responses. Stakeholders suggested: (a) involving schools, before during and after the event (e.g., cultivating interest through educating teachers; having athletes visit schools; give away free tickets); (b) including track and field activities/exhibition events for kids during the event (e.g., grade school rally during opening ceremonies), and providing opportunities for corporate sponsors to become part of those activities; (c) organizing meet and greet opportunities with athlete and coaches; (d) creating opportunities for local clubs to be present (e.g., have a stand,

hand out information brochures); (e) building up the momentum, and grasping the excitement of the moment; (f) creating awareness and exposure through media (e.g., human success stories in the paper); (g) organizing transportation to the event from further away communities; and (h) having a “champion” in the sporting community.

When asked who should be responsible for carrying out these strategies and tactics, one person pointed towards the local track and field club (athlete 1), another one mentioned a separate committee in the LOC (LOC member 3), for example, creating a separate sport development committee within the LOC with a sport development officer. This committee would set goals, plan and coordinate appropriate actions (e.g., identify who, where to get new participants: age groups, ethnic groups). However, the LOC is temporary and ceases to exist after the event, therefore, the majority of the interviewees suggested an outside organization, such as a local sports council, which should consist of all stakeholders in the community (e.g. LOC member 2&3; LOC/CLUB member 3&4; FAC manager 1). Although a number of ideas were suggested, the fact remains that the community was stretched thin putting on the event. It is not clear who or how a committee or council could be created that would not cannibalize the workforce focused on implementing the event. Still, stakeholders were enthusiastic for the idea of leveraging the event for participation.

Except for the new facility and the coaching conference, no intentional strategies and actions had taken place prior to, during, or after the event. Interviewees assumed that the event and particularly the construction of the new stadium and increased awareness through the media would automatically foster sport participation and development. This assumption is based on the so-called “demonstration” or “trickle down” effect [42, 43].

Discussion

While almost all interviewees acknowledged that leveraging sport development, particularly participation, is important when hosting these types of events, it was clear that the primary objective of hosting the event was to build a stadium, and to stage a quality event. Therefore, stimulating sport participation and development was not a significant consideration prior to or during the hosting of the event. It was assumed that the legacy effect of the facility would automatically spark participation and that local media attention had created the necessary awareness for the sport of track and field that would result in increased interest and participation. Therefore, no specific actions were taken to actually stimulate sport participation and development in the local community (cf. Weed et al., 2009). It is important to note that the stakeholders in the event were highly involved in the sport of track and field. Consequently, it may be difficult for them to consider that others would not automatically be attracted to participate in the sport. In fact, aficionados generally lack an understanding of others' views of the object of their affection (Higgins & Shanklin, 1992). Thus, it is not surprising that the priorities were placed on event implementation rather than leveraging the event for participation. This worldview, coupled with the overwhelming learning curve in putting on a one-off event of this stature for the first time would militate against an effective leveraging effort. It may be that annual or bi-annual hosting of such an event would facilitate leverage by creating and retaining a base level of event knowledge and social capital (e.g., Ziakas & Costa, 2011). This could then free up the capacity to leverage the event.

In contrast to large sport events, it is more the exception than the rule for small and medium sized events to upgrade existing, or construct new sport facilities (e.g., Gibson et al., 2012; Taks et al., 2011). However, it does happen occasionally, as was the case for the 2005 Pan American Junior Athletic Championships. Sport facilities for large-scale events are usually high-

end facilities that are not designed with the average community sport participant in mind (Horne, 2007). In contrast, facilities upgraded or built for small and/or medium sized sport events are usually built to meet the needs of local residents (Gibson et al., 2012). This was clearly illustrated in this case. The new facility provided more and better access for the community and, with the addition of the infield turf, even helped to develop other sports such as soccer and American football. The ability to construct a facility to meet the needs of a large portion of the community is important to facilitate long-term use by the community, which is central for sustainable sport development in the community (Sotiriadou, Shilbury, & Quick, 2008).

Consistent with research on the demonstration effect (McCartney, Hanlon, & Bond, 2013; Weed, 2009), the Pan American Junior Track and Field Championships did show a sport development impact, albeit unintentional. That impact seemed to be limited to current track and field athletes, enhancing the opportunities and skills of those already involved in the sport. These athletes were inspired to train harder and aspire to a higher level. The existing track and field athletes benefitted tremendously from the new and improved stadium and equipment, the more experienced coaches, and the better trained officials. The perceptions of higher calibre athletes at the school, club and university levels support this claim. Yet, there was little evidence of the event attracting new participants, although the awareness generated by the media attention was assumed to be sufficient to generate new participation in the sport.

Creating “awareness” was the magic word for attracting new participants into track and field. It was assumed that the uniqueness of the event (i.e., a one-time international sporting event), its brand new facility and the tremendous positive media coverage, would automatically create a buzz and attract new participants. Unfortunately, the findings provide no evidence to support this assumption. Active strategies and tactics need to be developed in order to make this

happen. While the facility has created the potential opportunity for schools to use the venue, the event itself did not foster or create direct pathways through educational or sporting experience opportunities. The answer may lie in the “Festival effect,” part of the critical pathway by which events can potentially increase sport participation (McCartney, Hanlon, & Bond, 2013). A number of stakeholders mentioned missed opportunities for leverage, particularly opportunities that took advantage of the event festivities (e.g., opening ceremonies, event excitement). The festival effect is likely to be limited to the consideration of participation by non-participants. That is, the excitement of the event may create short-term interest in the sport. Thus, a planned intervention at this stage is needed to capture that interest and convert it to trial. The suggestions for leverage hinted at by the stakeholders are a start, but future work is needed to test potential conversion methods.

Clearly, a central feature from the interviewees in all areas was the ability of the event to bring people together from a variety of different sectors to increase opportunities for community connectedness (Chalip, 2006; Misener & Mason, 2006). The athletes in this study demonstrated that the event afforded them with the opportunity to meet other athletes, coaches, and officials in the same sport which likely had an impact on their choices to continue to higher levels of participation (i.e., bonding social capital). Similarly, LOC and CLUB members suggested that the event had increased their connectivity to the local community and were able to leverage these connections when volunteers for events were needed (e.g., Downward & Ralston, 2006), or when access to event-related resources was a priority (i.e., bridging social capital). However, the relationships evolving from those partnerships were not activated to serve future sport development purposes, with the exception perhaps of the connections created between the local club and the provincial and national governing bodies (i.e., linking social capital). This

partnership has increased the city's ability to secure other track and field events, stimulating more sport development opportunities in the city and an illustration of a sustainable outcome.

While the results of this study demonstrate the importance of the local media, there was no relationship formed with the media outlets to frame the message about opportunities for sport participation and development. This is in line with Girginov and Hills (2008), who emphasized the importance of partnerships between large-scale events (e.g., the Olympic Games) and the media to engage the public. Thus actively pursuing relationships with the media, and assisting in framing the messages to increase sport participation and development, could be implemented as a future strategy.

Partnerships in the context of large-scale events are the key to fostering and creating sustainable outcomes. However, in the context of events, these partnerships can be complex and often fleeting as a local organizing committee ceases to exist after the event. Thus, while the emphasis on partnerships is certainly understandable, if there is to be a strategy to stimulate sport participation through the event process, these partnerships and relationships need to be nurtured and accountability needs to be a central feature of any attempts to foster participation (Bloyce & Lovett, 2012).

Conclusion

One-off events are not the touchstone opportunity to stimulate sport participation and development in local communities. We cannot expect that events have an effect in-and-of themselves. Even in an event portfolio (Ziakas & Costa, 2011), the events should not be seen as 'interventions', but more as a tool in and overall (social) marketing strategy. Events are most effective, not as an intervention, but as an opportunity to enable other interventions and/or as strategic tools in a broader overall campaign. This means that sport participation and

development goals must be developed and agreed upon by significant group(s) in the local community, be it sport, non-sport or event related groups.

This study identified changes in sport participation and development perceived by key stakeholders in the local sport, mainly track and field community, to result from the hosting of a one-off event. The coaching clinic and the new facility were the only two intended tactics expected to intentionally trigger increases in sport participation and development. The sport facility seemed to have been successful in this regard while the coaching clinic was not. The reason for the low attendance of the coaching clinic remains unclear. All other perceived outcomes, both positive and negative were unintended, and their underlying processes are unclear. Most outcomes were perceived to have occurred because of the facility legacy; no other intentional strategies were revealed that led to sport participation and development. There is some evidence to support the “trickle down” or the “demonstration effect” in that the event created opportunities for sport development, but not for new sport participation. The facility was instrumental to the overall success and likely any additional sport development opportunities. Several missed opportunities to tap into the non-active sport market were acknowledged after the fact, when interviewees were specifically asked to reflect on this. Thus, creating awareness and developing strategies and tactics for stimulating sport participation before the event, implementing these strategies and tactics during and after the event, seem to be essential to creating successful sport participation outcomes. Thus future research should focus on the underlying processes, rather than just the impacts and outcomes (Chalip, 2004; Weed, 2011). This study relied on the retrospective perceptions of key stakeholders. Future event evaluations will benefit from application of more intensive processes of program evaluation (Fitzpatrick, Sanders, & Worthen, 2011) such that monitoring and evaluation during the event tracks the

formulation and implementation of strategies and tactics, and measurements are put into place from the outset that enable the efficacy of strategies and tactics to be benchmarked and assessed.

References

- Bauman, A., Ford, I., & Armstrong, T.(2001). *Active Australia: Trends in population levels of reported physical activity in Australia, 1997, 1999 and 2000*. Canberra: Australian Sports Commission.
- Bloyce, D., & Lovett, E. (2012): Planning for the London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic legacy: A figurational analysis. *International Journal of Sport Policy and Politics*, 4(3), 361-377.
- Brooks, S., & Wiggan, J. (2009). Reflecting the public value of sport: A game with two halves. *Public Management Review*, 11(4), 401-420. Doi 10.1080/14719030902989490
- Brown, A., & Massey, J. (2001). *Literature review: The impact of major sporting events*. London (UK): UK Sport.
- Bryson, J. M. (2011). *Strategic planning for public and nonprofit organizations: A guide to strengthening and sustaining organizational achievement*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Chalip, L. (2004). Beyond impact: A general model for sport event leverage. In B.W. Ritchie & D. Adair (Eds.), *Sport Tourism: Interrelationships, Impacts and Issues* (pp. 226–252). Clevedon (UK): Channel View Publications.
- Chalip, L. (2006). Towards social leverage of sport events. *Journal of Sport Tourism*, 11(2), 109-127
- Chalip, L., & Leyns, A. (2002). Local business leveraging of a sport event: managing an event for economic benefit. *Journal of Sport Management*, 16, 132-158.
- Coalter, F. (2004). Stuck in the blocks? A sustainable sporting legacy. In: A. Vigor, M. Mean, and C. Tims (Eds.). *After the Gold Rush: A sustainable Olympics for London* (pp. 93-108). London (UK): Institute for Public Policy Research/DEMOS.

- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Downward, P., & Ralston, R., (2006). The sports development potential of sports event volunteering: Insights from the XVII Manchester Commonwealth Games. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 6(4), 333-351.
- Feng, J., & Hong, F. (2013). The legacy: Did the Beijing Olympic Games have a long-term impact on grassroots sport participation in Chinese townships? *International Journal of the History of Sport*, 30, 407-421,
- Fitzpatrick, J. L., Sanders, J. R., & Worthen, B. R. (2011). *Program evaluation: Alternative approaches and practical guidelines* (4th ed). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.
- Gibson, H. J., Kaplanidou, K., & Kang, S. J. (2012). Small-scale event sport tourism: A case study in sustainable tourism. *Sport Management Review*, 15(2), 160-170.
doi:10.1016/j.smr.2011.08.013
- Girginov, V., & Hills, L. (2008). A sustainable sports legacy: Creating a link between the London Olympics and sports participation. *The International Journal of the History of Sport*, 25(14), 2091-2116.
- Gratton, C., & Taylor, P. (2000). *Economics of sport and recreation*. London (U.K.): Spon.
- Green, B.C. (2005). Building sport programs to optimize athlete recruitment, retention, and transition: Toward a normative theory of sport development. *Journal of Sport Management*, 19, 233-253.
- Green, M. (2006). From 'sport for all' to not about 'sport' at all?: Interrogating sport policy interventions in the United Kingdom. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 6(3), 217-238.

- Higgins, S. H., & Shanklin, W. L. (1992). Seeking mass market acceptance for high-technology consumer products. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 9, 5-14.
- Hindson, A., Gidlow, B., & Peebles, C. (1994). The “trickle-down” effect of top-level sport: myth or reality? A case-study of the Olympics. *Australian Journal of Leisure and Recreation*, 4(1), 16-31.
- Horne, J. (2007). The four ‘Knowns’ of sports Mega-Events. *Leisure Studies*, 26(1), 81-96.
doi:10.1080/02614360500504628
- Hylton, K., & Bramham, P. (Eds.) (2008). *Sport development: Policy, processes and practice* (2nd ed.). Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
- Hylton, K., Braham, P., Jackson, D. & Nesti, M. (2001). *Sports Development: Policy, Process and Practice*. London (UK): Taylor & Francis.
- Jago, L., Chalip, L., Brown, G., Mules, T., & Ali, S. (2003). Building events into destination branding: Insights from experts. *Event Management*, 8, 3-14.
- Kellett, P., Hede, A.-M., & Chalip, L. (2008). Social policy for sport events: Leveraging (relationships with) teams from other nations for community benefit. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 8(4), 101-121.
- Koenig, S., & Leopkey, B. (2009). *Canadian sporting events: an analysis of legacy and sports development*. Proceedings of the Administrative Sciences Association of Canada 2009 Conference. Niagara Falls: ON.
- Li, Y., & Luk, Y.M. (2011). Impacts of the 4th East Asian Games on residents’ participation in leisure sports and physical activities – The case of Macau, China. *Acta geographica Slovenica*, 51, 377-390.

- Lines, G. (2007). The impact of media sport events on the active participation of young people and some implications for PE pedagogy. *Sport, Education & Society*, 12, 349-366.
- LOC (2004). *Business Plan: 2005 Pan American Junior Athletic Championships*. Windsor (CA): 2005 Pan American Junior Athletic Championships Local Organizing Committee. Unpublished.
- LOC (2005). *Final report: 2005 Pan American Junior Athletic Championships*. Windsor (CA): 2005 Pan American Junior Athletic Championships Local Organizing Committee. Unpublished.
- McCartney, G., Hanlon, P., & Bond, L. (2013). How will the 2014 Commonwealth Games impact on Glasgow's health, and how will we know? *Evaluation*, 19(1), 24-39.
- Misener, L. (2013). Evenst and social capital. In R. Finkel, D. McGillivray, D., G. McPherson, & P. Robinson (Eds.). *Research themes for events* (pp. 18-30). Boston (MA): CABI
- Misener, L., & Mason, D. S. (2006). Creating community networks: Can sporting events offer meaningful sources of social capital? *Managing Leisure*, 11(1), 39-56.
doi:10.1080/13606710500445676
- Misener, L., & Mason, D. S. (2009). Fostering community development through sporting events strategies: An examination of Urban Regime perceptions. *Journal of Sport Management*, 23(6), 770-794.
- Neves, M. F. (2013). *Demand driven strategic planning*. New York: Routledge.
- NVivo. (2008). *NVivo8 Fundamentals: Starting to work with your material*. S. l.: QSR International Pty Ltd.
- O'Brien, D. (2007). Point of leverage: Maximizing host community benefit from a regional surfing festival. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 7, 141-165.

- Parker, J. (2005, August 2). Canadians prove prowess on track: Eighteen- medal performance best since 1984. The Windsor Star Online. Retrieved from <http://proquest.umi.com.ezproxy.uwindsor.ca>.
- Puzic, S . (2006, May 27). Pan Am Games 'a winner. The Windsor Star Online. Retrieved from <http://proquest.umi.com.ezproxy.uwindsor.ca>.
- Ritchie, B.J.R. (1984). Assessing the impact of hallmark events: Conceptual and research issues. *Journal of Travel Research*, 23(1), 2-11. doi:10.1177/004728758402300101
- Smith, A. (2013). Leveraging sport mega-events: new model or convenient justification? *Journal of Policy Research in Tourism, Leisure and Events*, 1-16. doi: 10.1080/19407963.2013.823976
- Snelgrove, R., Taks. M., Chalip. L, & .Green, B.C. (2008). How visitors and locals at a sport event differ in motives and identity. *Journal of Sport & Tourism*, 13(3), 165-180.
- Sotiriadou, K., Shilbury, D., & Quick, S. (2008). The attraction, retention/transition, and nurturing process of sport development: Some Australian evidence. *Journal of Sport Management*, 22(3), 247-272.
- Sportscotland (2004). *Curling success and its impact on participation* (Research Report No. 92). Edinburgh (UK): Sportscotland.
- Sport Canada, (2011). *Contribution guidelines: Hosting program international single sport event component* (Effective: July 2011). Ottawa (Ca): Candian Heritage/Sport Canada. Retrieved from <http://www.pch.gc.ca/eng/1351870132519>.
- Taks, M. (2013). Social sustainability of non-mega sport events in a global world. *European Journal for Sport and Society*, 10(2), 121-141

- Taks, M., Kesenne, S., Chalip, L., Green, B.C., & Martyn, S. (2011). Economic impact study versus cost-benefit analysis: an empirical example of a medium sized international sporting event. *International Journal of Sport Finances*, 6(3), 187-203.
- Toohey, K. (2008). The Sydney Olympics: Striving for legacies – Overcoming short-term disappointments and long-term deficiencies. *The International Journal of the History of Sport* 25 (14), 1953-1971.
- Toohey, K. (2010). Post-Sydney 2000 Australia: A potential clash of aspirations between recreational and elite sport. *International Journal of the History of Sport*, 27, 2766-2779.
- VanWynsberghe, R., Derom, I., & Mauer, E. (2012). Social leveraging of the 2010 Olympic Games: ‘Sustainability’ in a City of Vancouver initiative. *Journal of Policy Research in Tourism, Leisure & Events* iFirst, 1-21, DOI: 10.1080/19407963.2012.662618
- Weed, M., Coren, E., & Fiore, J. (2009). *A systematic review of the evidence base for developing a physical activity and health legacy from the London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games*. Canterbury (UK): SPEAR/Canterbury Christ Church University.
- Weed, M. (2011). Editorial: The Human Impact of Major Sport Events. *Journal of Sport & Tourism*, 16(1), 1 – 4.
- Weed, M., Coren, E., Fiaore, 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.
- Ziakas, V., & Costa, C. A. (2011). Event portfolio and multi-purpose development: Establishing the conceptual grounds. *Sport Management Review*, 14(4), 409-423.
doi:10.1016/j.smr.2010.09.003

Acknowledgement

This research is funded by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada through the Sport Canada Research initiative. We would like to thank the funding agencies.

Figure 1:

Membership of the Local Track and Field club (Source: (W. Lee, personal communication May 27, 2011))





Figure 2

Partnerships and Relationships Resulting from the Event



Note. Fac. = faculty; athl. = athletes; ARS = Athletic and Recreation Services; LOC = Local Organizing Committee; volunt. = volunteers.

—————> = direct input for creating/staging the event

- - - - - = indirect relationship between stakeholder groups

<- - - -> = indirect relationship between event and media

Table 1

Overview of Perceived Unintended Outcomes of the 2005 Pan American Junior Athletic Championships

Positive

1. Increased interest in the community for track and field
2. Increased levels of track and field participation in local schools, club and camps
3. Higher caliber athletes
4. More and better developed local track and field coaches
5. More and better developed local track and field officials
6. Strengthened feeling of the track and field community
7. Level of positive media attention

Negative

1. Low attendance at coaching clinic
 2. Lost opportunity to tap into immigrant market
 3. Increased rental cost, affecting user fees
 4. Club membership increased initially, then dropped
-

Table 2

Overview of the Primary Beneficiaries of the New Stadium

Beneficiaries	Contributing Stadium Features
Specific Segments	
Kids from low socio-economic back grounds	Central location of the stadium
Disabled people	Accessibility of the stadium
Track and field athletes	High quality of the stadium and equipment
Organizations	
Track and field school programs	Accessibility and availability
Local track and field club	Central location, accessibility, high quality
University track and field program	High quality of stadium and equipment
Sport Events (all levels)	High quality, accessibility and availability
Other Sports in the Community	Multi-usage of the facility

Appendix A: Illustrations of the Finding of Sport Participation Development (SPD) by Themes, Sub-Themes and Quotes

Table A1: Expectations for SPD

Event stimulates SPD (General)	[1] The 2005 Pan-American Junior Athletics Championship will be a driving force behind helping the Windsor Community to foster and promote athletics on a regional, national and international level ... (LOC, 2004, R6)
	[2] I was pretty convinced that we would get a lot of kids between the ages of ... maybe 10 and 12 or 13, being exposed to these events, and perhaps becoming enthusiastic about it (LOC/CLUB member 3)
Event stimulates SPD for those already involved	[3] ... what I expected was basically what I believed happened ... we already had active interested participants, and their interest ... peaked further by being exposed to higher level athletes and seeing them, how they prepare for competition (FAC manager 2)
Awareness	[4] ...having such a big event, in this city, raises people's awareness about it, and the parents usually think well, maybe the younger kids are [going to] enjoy this, so they put them into a sport. I think it really helps kids get a broader ... sport perspective I guess (Athlete 7)

Table A2: Perceived Evidence of SPD

Unintended positive	
1. Increased interest in the community for track and field	[5] the number of national flags that were being flown in the stands, ... a lot of those people were local and I was stunned, ... (CLUB member 1)
2. Increased levels of track and field participation in local schools, club and camps	[6] I know that there are around 1200 people in WECSSA [Windsor Essex County School Sport Association] athletics, and they've gone to a three day meet, and I don't know pre-2005 if they had that many people, I would guess that they had about 850 people, and that's from within the community and that's with a decreasing population, so there are more kids participating in track and field. (LOC member 2)
3. Higher caliber athletes	[7] It definitely improved my standings in sports, I was at Legion [local track and field club] practice once, maybe twice a week, and after watching the event and after watching how many people showed up and how many people cheered for these people running who are doing something they love, ... I was probably out there every day for the next three years, so it

	definitely allowed me to train harder, dedicated myself a little bit more, and it really got me higher, I wasn't just a mediocre athlete anymore, I found myself a little bit higher in the age group. (Athlete 7)
4. More and better developed local track and field coaches	[8] I [as a coach] gained a lot of knowledge from being in the position I was...The biggest thing for me was my understanding and [getting a] grasp of knowledge of all the track and field rules again because I was in charge of all the competition sites. So, I think my knowledge of the running of a track and field event allowed us to do better at meets. Better meets, more participation, ... if we run a better meet we get more people here who want to compete ... (LOC/CLUB member 2)
5. More and better developed local track and field officials	[9] ... I think primarily [of] the volunteer officials from the area that are so committed to track and field and so engaged in track and field; what a wonderful opportunity for them to do things at a higher level; so, that's building capacity for [the] future because, again they are more qualified now to do other things ... (LOC member 4)
6. Strengthened feeling of the track and field community	[10] ...what he [the head coach] was able to do over the course of the last 25 years is to coordinate, increase, facilitate communication between the various parties and provide a pretty high profile, example of how a really good track and field program should be run, ... an inspiration to the other people that are involved in this sport outside of the university community. (LOC/CLUB member 3)
7. Level of positive media attention	[11] They [the local newspaper] gave us unbelievable coverage, ... front page not just the sports page, ... everything was just like it was a home run, ..., there wasn't anything negative at all, ... (LOC member 1)
Unintended negative	
1. Low attendance at coaching clinic	[12] ... the coaching conference to be honest wasn't super well attended. The numbers were low. (LOC/CLUB member 1)
2. Lost opportunity to tap into immigrant market	[13] I didn't realize that South America and Central America were so well represented here [in the community], and that was a shock to me, it really was. But none of those people have come back you know, so I suppose if you want to say did we increase participation we failed because we had those people [immigrants] and we didn't involve them enough ... to get those children to participate in our sport ... so we didn't realize maybe that we had that opportunity ... everybody commented on it, ... we probably failed there because I don't think anybody anticipated that was going to happen. (CLUB member 1)

3. Increased rental cost, affecting user fees	[14] I think there's been issues with ... the costs of the stadium rental for other groups to come out and use to use the track. I mean, the Windsor Legion [Track and Field Club] still gets to use it and they have a good agreement, and the high schools are using it for their competitions but I know there's an issue that, if the rates keep going up ... it might get unaffordable (LOC/CLUB member 1).
4. Club membership increased initially, then dropped	[see Figure 1]

Table A3: Illustrating the Role of Sporting Infrastructure for SPD

General	
Legacy	[15] ... it was always our intent that the legacy was going to be the stadium and it would be the type of stadium that would not only advance track, but any outdoor sport and cultural events too" (LOC member 3)
Multiple beneficiaries due to increased accessibility	[16] [it] was access to facilities, that's the biggest thing for all of us track athletes, or even football athletes, having a facility that we can train on year round, that was world-class,...before, if we wanted access to it [the previous facility], we had to drive 30 minutes outside the city (Athlete 3);
Beneficiaries: Specific Segments	
Kids from low socio-economic back ground	[17] ... once we moved back here we got some of those kids [the lower socio-economic group] back ... because they didn't have transportation [to reach the old facility] ... (LOC/CLUB member 2)
Disabled people	[18] it's been called one of the most accessible facilities in the world from a track stadium perspective (COACH 1). [19] The para-athletes ... especially the wheelchair racers, they really like the track (LOC/CLUB member 2).
Track and Field athletes	[20] training on one of the best facilities in Canada is pretty amazing" (Athlete 6) [21] high calibre athletes kind of strive for just being here, on the field training sort of gives you that competitive edge to train a little bit harder (Athlete 7) [22] there's no reason to leave [be]cause I [elite athlete] have everything [here]" (athlete 3)

Beneficiaries: Organisations	
Track and Field schools programs	[23] During the high school season because the facility is here, we've been able to open it up one day a week so that high school kids can just walk in and train either with their coaches or with the university coaches and get coaching ... that's something we weren't able to do before. (LOC/CLUB member 2)
Local Track and Field Club	[24] ... because we had a new facility that we were able to utilize, we had equipment that was a legacy of the of the event that we were able to able to use, and ... being in a centralized location like this, it was easier for people to come (LOC/CLUB member 3).
	[25] Kids want to train in this complex, they want to be here,...they know what's happened at that stadium in the past,...they also know that it's a fast track, so they want to run on a fast track (LOC/CLUB member 4)
	[26] Our pole vault program has gone through the roof, ... we are one of the best pole vault programs in the province (LOC/CLUB member 2)
University Track and Field program	[27] ...[student-]athletes from other places want to come here because of what we have (LOC/CLUB member 3)
Other Beneficiaries	
Sport events (all levels)	[28] These types of events have now given us the credibility in the market-place to be able to compete with others, ... we now have organizers looking to cities like Windsor and approaching us more (The Mayor as cited by Puzic, 2006, May 27)
Other sports in the community	[29] It was built with football [in mind] as well as [other sports] ... and it would not only support the university programs but it would [also] support the community based programs from the county and the city (LOC member 3).
	[30] Aside from the university's track and field team, the school's football, soccer and rugby squads also stand to benefit (Parker, 2005, August 2).

Table A4: Importance of Partnerships for SPD

Community	[31] We asked for those type of volunteers from within Windsor and Essex county and we did get them, and by getting them, ..., we used a lot of contacts of our own, the officials that lived in Windsor, we asked all our friends to see if they could do that,... and they were just friends of friends, or friends of mine, said they could come out and help (LOC/CLUB member 4).
-----------	---

University and local club	[32] ... unfortunately now it's not a strong relationship let's say between Windsor Legion Track club and the University, but I think that at the time it was very strong (LOC/CLUB member 1). [33] [the event] probably bruised a few [relationships], but I don't know whether it strengthened any, but there were from time to time some contentious issues that we argued about and I don't know whether they strengthened the relationship or not (CLUB member 1).
Sport governing bodies	[34] ... our relationship with the national sport governing body definitely increased. I think we put ourselves on the map, ... I think that's the reason why ... we were awarded the 2007 and 2008 national championships (LOC/CLUB member 2).
Sponsors	[35] Those relationships [with sponsors] are there now, anytime we host another event it's a phone call, we already know those people, hey we're having another meet, sure you know, here's a few hundred bucks or put our sign up or what you have. I mean those are very, very important relationships. (LOC/CLUB member 4)
Media	[36] ... the free publicity, ... if you have your local media covering, ... you can take that to the bank (LOC member 1) [37] I learned how to deal with the media through this because I was dealing with the media on a constant basis as a coach and also as a technical manager, and I think that that's important because the media really carries a lot of weight out there (LOC member 2).

Table A5: Examples of Constraints of fostering SPD

Primary focus is hosting	[38] ... why did we not focus more on sport development? Honestly we were, we had our hands full ... getting the facility built first of all, and then planning to operate an event ... of that magnitude (LOC member 4). [39] ... time and resources were drained ... (LOC.CLUB member 1)
Capacity constraints	[40] [In] our club we have 150 members this year and that's as many as we can handle, ... [the] St. Denis Centre is packed, especially indoors, we're at the point where we can't really take many more without adding night practices, which then adds costs and all that kind of things, ..., I'd love to see bigger participation but we're, like we're maxed out, there's only so many coaches... (CLUB member 1)
Lack of awareness	[41] It's stupid that I haven't thought of it [stimulating sport participation] in the past, but with all those potential parents [in the stands] whose kids are going be in school, we should have had something then, if only the track club had handed out brochures, this is how you could contact us and things like that, we never did that, never even thought of it. (CLUB member 1)

Table A6: Reasons for Lack of Strategies and Tactics to Foster SPD

Increased awareness	[42] I think just watching it [the event] is, I really do think that's enough [to stimulate sport participation] (athlete 2)
Media attention	[43] The media impact was phenomenal, so that would increase the participation as well. Having coverage on the front page of the paper for five days of the week straight has a great impact on the participation of young people, and the fact that parents would hopefully enroll them in programs track and field related. (LOC member 2)