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Abstract

Existing research suggests that the stereotypical realm of taboo sport sponsorship, which has traditionally included tobacco and alcohol products, is evolving to incorporate soft drink, confectionary and fast food. Such products are viewed (by some event stakeholders and community members) as detrimental to public health initiatives and are seen as contributing to health issues including obesity, diabetes and heart disease. As a result, some organisations who associate themselves (via sponsorship) with community sport events are receiving criticism over the types of products they are promoting. These challenges are due, in part, to increasing public health concerns (especially within New Zealand) and amplified levels of corporate social responsibility in relation to sponsorship partnerships with companies that produce such products. Due to sport events often being linked to stereotypical values associated with fitness, healthy living and active lifestyles, this would suggest that there is a narrowing field of sponsors and associated funding which sport event managers can utilise.

A review of the literature pertaining to sport sponsorship and sport event sponsorship demonstrated the need for research which examines community sport event sponsorship and stakeholder relationships. Research gauging the impact a public health agenda can have on potential and existing community sport events sponsors is required. In order to do this, community sport event stakeholder relationships and sponsor-focused incompatibilities need to be examined and understood. Such research will aid in the management of successful stakeholder relationships and sustained provision of community sport events.

A qualitative research method focussed on four New Zealand based community sport events which were examined as case studies. Each event was selected based upon a series of pre-set classification criteria. These criteria identified each event involving sponsors who had recently fallen under question (such as confectionary, fast food or soft drink companies), lacked regulation and who were yet to be guided by legislation. In-depth, semi-structured interviews with event managers and associated event stakeholders and the collection of associated documents (for example, promotional materials, media articles and policy documents) took place between April 2010 and December 2012. Individual stakeholders were identified via a snowball sampling technique. Data was analysed via NVivo8 software and incorporated a three stage, open, axial and reflective coding method.

Analysis of the data collected identified a significant change in the nature of community sport event sponsorship due to the impacts of a public health agenda. Community sport event stakeholders are increasingly taking obesity, heart health, diabetes and other major public health issues into consideration when aligning with events and sponsors. The pressure of a public health agenda has resulted in community sport event stakeholders seeking to avoid alignment with unhealthy food and beverage brands and products. Incorporated within stakeholder alignment decision making processes are factors (such as corporate social responsibility, organisational values, and personal agendas) driving community event stakeholder power exertion and legitimacy. As a consequence, event owners are reducing their dependency on sponsors who clash with health objectives. Furthermore, community event stakeholders are predicting changes
in event sponsorship legislation and policy which will further limit funding opportunities available to community sport event managers.

The research findings have contributed to theoretical insight and the body of literature associated with the management of community sport events, the factors influencing stakeholder relationships and the changing nature of sponsorship. These findings also have direct implications for current and future event managers, particularly in relation to funding sources, sponsor alignments and event stakeholder management. Further research is proposed involving a longitudinal assessment of community sport events and a broader range of community sport event stakeholders.
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Chapter One
Introduction

Well over a decade ago Batty and Klap (1999, p.272) noted that ‘the number and range of sports events in New Zealand [had] grown phenomenally’ and that this ‘boom in events [had] also seen New Zealand companies increasingly utilising sports competitions and events as a means of creating awareness for the products or services they offer’. Community sport events today are just as popular, as are the sponsorship arrangements utilized by associated companies to increase sales, develop brand awareness and instil corporate image (Carter, Edwards, Signal & Hoek, 2011; Donaldson & Finch, 2013; Masterman, 2007; Pettigrew, Rosenberg, Fergusson, Houghton & Wood, 2012).

Many companies choose to associate themselves with events, via sponsorship, in order to increase awareness and sales of their products or services (brands) amongst the general public (Becker-Olsen & Hill, 2006; Cliff & Motion, 2005; Cornwell, Roy & Steinard, 2001; Gwinner & Eaton, 1999; McDonald, 1991; Pettigrew, Pescud, Rosenberg, Fergusson & Houghton, 2012; Pope, 1998; Waaeras, 2007). However, some companies which associate themselves with community sport events are being criticised for the types of products and/or services they are promoting. Ferkins and Garland (2006), Friedman (1970) and Masterman (2007) argued that while sponsorship may be considered a creative marketing tool, criticism of sponsorship alignments has led to stakeholders having to consider the implications of community sport events and stakeholder image association. McDonald (1991) and Sam, Batty and Dean (2005) also confirmed this, noting that as a form of promotion, sponsorship can affect the image people can have of a sponsor.
The stereotypical realm of taboo sponsorship, which traditionally includes tobacco and alcohol products, has evolved to a point where products, such as soft drinks, confectionary and fast food outlets are viewed by some event stakeholders and community members in a similar fashion (British American Tobacco New Zealand, 2013; Carrigan & Carrigan, 1997; Collins & Vamplew, 2002; Dominion Breweries, 2013; Fairburn, 1989; Kelly, Baur, Bauman, King, Chapman & Smith, 2012; Ludwig and Nestle, 2008; Meerabeau, Gillett, Kennedy, Adeoba, Byass & Tabi, 1991; Laugesen & Swinburn, 2000; Sam, Batty & Dean, 2005). Meenaghan (2013) also confirmed that sponsorship as an activity is undergoing fundamental change. Maher, Wilson, Signal and Thomson (2006) suggested that this is due, in part, to increasing public health concerns (especially within New Zealand) and amplified levels of corporate social responsibility in terms of sponsorship partnerships with companies that produce such products.

There are a number of consequences associated with the changing nature of sponsorship. Firstly, stakeholder relationships can fall under pressure as attempts are made to align sponsor values with those of other stakeholders, especially whilst striving to uphold the positive images of all those involved (Freeman, 1984; 2007). Stakeholder power struggles can often arise due to conflicts of interest between individuals or the company’s they represent (Byers, Henry and Slack, 2007). In a community sport event setting, such conflicts can relate to stakeholder alignments or logistical decisions. Secondly, a trend towards ethical investment appears to be taking place (Paramino-Salcines, Babiak & Walters, 2013). Carrigan and Carrigan (1997, p.62) predicted this, noting that ‘there could be merit in sport taking a more moral stance in the sponsors it accepts’. For example, event managers are shying away from sponsor’s products linked to health concerns. Community sport events have come to depend on sponsorship as a predominant source of funding.
Limitations on such funding could significantly impact the sustainability of community sport events (Boyle & Haynes, 2000; Davis, 2006; Garland & Ferkins, 2006; Jackson et al., 2001). A further implication of the changing nature of sponsorship relates to the concerns that have been raised in regard to legislation, policy development and potential restrictions on the types of sponsors and sponsors products with which community sport events can align (Kolah, 2006; Pettigrew et al., 2013; World Health Organisation 2007). For example, the Public Health Bill 177-2 (2007), accepted by New Zealand Parliament, incorporates a series of voluntary and compulsory guidelines which broadly reference the need for a code of practice for sponsors and the products they market.

The changing nature of sponsorship along with the factors influencing and consequences following these changes provide a platform for discussion within this thesis. Background information on the selection of this topic is provided below which leads into a discussion regarding the contributions of this research and identification of the research questions.

1.1 Research Topic Selection and Background

In mid-February 2006, while coordinating the many duties assigned to my role as Event Manager for the annual New Zealand Christchurch Star City to Surf (See event overview in Chapter Five), I received an email from the Canterbury District Health Board (CDHB). The CDHB had, for a number of years, entered the largest corporate team in the event, which subsequently provided over NZD $8000 in gross revenue. This dollar figure equated to approximately 10 per cent of the total revenue expected to be produced from the event. The email suggested that the CDHB was intending to boycott the event, based on opposition to the event’s major sponsor, Powerade. Powerade is a sports drink containing electrolytes, carbohydrates and water, manufactured by Coca Cola.
In 2006 The City to Surf’s major sponsor was Powerade, as it had been for the previous four years. The email received from the CDHB opposed Powerade’s inclusion as the major sponsor of the City to Surf, on the basis of the product’s high sugar content. An ultimatum was given by the CDHB, requesting an immediate change in sponsorship or threatening the withdrawal of the CDHB team from the 2006 event which was, at the time, only six weeks away. As event manager, I questioned the legitimacy of the request and made the decision to forward the email to the editor of The Christchurch Star (the event owner), without foreseeing the media furore that would follow.

The conflict immediately became public knowledge as the leading news story on all major television news programmes and on the front page(s) of the country’s major newspapers the following morning. The topic was also discussed extensively on talk-back radio. Headlines, such as: ‘Canterbury District Health Board takes stand on sugary health drinks’ (Health First, 2006); ‘Health Board Snub for Charity Fun Run’ (The Star, 2006); ‘Surf Run looses CDHB support over Powerade Sponsorship’ (The Press, 2006) circulated in the media. The issue remained in the news for the following six weeks, up until the day of the event itself. During this time a number of other New Zealand sport events also sponsored by Powerade were brought to the public’s attention. These included: the Special K Women’s Duathlon Series, the Shoe Clinic Harbour Capital Half Marathon and the Taupo Powerade Day-Night Thriller. Similar media-generated headlines and associated articles in other areas of community sport in New Zealand also came under the media spotlight at this time. These included, “Sports clubs defend ‘unhealthy’ sponsorship” (2006), “Diabetes expert faults Coca-Cola funding expo” (2006), “Sports thrive on fast-food funding” (2006), “NZ sports teams sponsored by alcohol firms ‘drink more’” (2008).
Ultimately, the 2006 Christchurch Star City to Surf did not change its sponsor and the event received a record number of participants, despite the withdrawal of the CDHB team, possibly because of the coverage of the controversy by the media. Furthermore, Powerade representatives were happy with the additional promotion the product received due to the heightened media attention. The following year, in 2007, meetings took place between The Christchurch Star, the CDHB and Coca-Cola. As a result, the event has since been sponsored by Pump, a bottled water product and subsidiary of Coca-Cola. This change spurred the headline (“Sponsor change brings back CDHB”, 2007).

The events which took place leading up to the 2006 City to Surf sparked my interest in establishing a better understanding of community sport event stakeholder alignments, the reasoning behind stakeholder conflicts and the potential residual effects of such conflicts. Interest in these specific areas guided the development of research questions for this thesis and established the unique contributions the research conducted would offer. These research questions and contributions are outlined below.

1.2 Research Significance, Questions and Contributions

Sport events offer increasing opportunity and interest for inquiry from both an academic and industry standpoint. Recent developments regarding the changing nature of sponsorship have been influenced largely by a public health agenda. Such developments have had numerous implications for community sport event management, however this area has remained largely unexplored in academic literature.

The literature review process (see Chapters Two and Three) indicated that there was only a very limited amount of published research available which has mapped the changing
nature of sport sponsorship and more specifically, sport event sponsorship in New Zealand. An assessment of the literature also highlighted the need for additional research to focus upon the influences determining community sport event stakeholder actions. Subsequent primary enquiry amongst sport focussed academics also confirmed the need for additional research on community sport event stakeholders and stakeholder relationships.

This thesis seeks to develop an understanding of event stakeholder relationships, especially sponsor-focussed incompatibilities relating to community sport events. To do so I examine the impact a public health agenda can have on community sport events, stakeholder relationships and sustainable sponsorships. Based on these considerations, the following research questions were developed:

1) How does a public health agenda influence stakeholder power; corporate social responsibility; and legitimacy within a community sport event setting?
   a) How and why is stakeholder power and legitimacy exerted?
   b) What is the relationship between corporate social responsibility and stakeholder decisions involving community sport events?

2) In turn, what effect do stakeholder power, corporate social responsibility and legitimacy have on community sport event sponsorship and management?

This thesis contributes to the understanding of community sport event focussed literature, theory and industry practice. Firstly, the research conducted aids in understanding the influences behind the changing nature of community sport event sponsorship in New
Zealand. Secondly, the consequences of such influences are highlighted in specific relation to future community sport event stakeholder alignments.

1.3 Terminology

This document incorporates terminology specifically associated with the community sport event management and event sponsorship fields. In order to assist the reader and for the sake of uniformity, the following definitions of frequently used terms have been adopted.

*Community Sport Event*

A community sport event is an event staged for social, fun and entertainment value, with a primary target of local community audiences. ‘These events often produce a range of benefits, including engendering pride in the community, strengthening a feeling of belonging and creating a sense of place. They can also help expose people to new ideas and experiences, [and] encourage participation in sports activities’ (Allen, O’Toole, Harris & McDonnell, 2008, p. 14). Such events can develop to a point where they also attract large numbers of visitors to a community (Janiskee, 1996) and may operate on either a for profit or not for profit basis. This term is referred to throughout this thesis.

*Sponsorship*

Sponsorship is a two-way partnership between the sponsor and the sponsored - one which incorporates benefits for both parties in terms of financial support, provision of in-kind goods and services, and the opportunity for promotion and marketing (Meenaghan, 1983:1991; Simkins, 1980; Walliser, 2003). This term is explained in further detail in Chapter Two, Section 2.1 and is referred to throughout this thesis.
**Stakeholder (within a community sport event context)**

‘People and organisations with a legitimate interest in the outcomes of an event are known as stakeholders’ (Allen, et al., 2008, p. 129). They may organise, sponsor, supply, participate in, or be affected in some way, by the staging of an event. This term is explained in further detail in Chapter Three and is referred to throughout this thesis.

**Stakeholder Image Association**

Lee et al., (1997;2009) and Cunningham, Cornwell and Coote (2009) described image association as the strategic alignment of opportunities which can expand brand awareness, promote a certain image and aid in effective cause marketing approaches. Stakeholder image association, in a community sport event setting, therefore stems from stakeholders projecting specific brands or products as major sponsors (McDonald, 1991). Image association can be positive or negative. Sam et al., (2005, p.10) highlighted the potential for an ‘erosion of public goodwill’ due to stakeholder’s aligning with a questionable organisation or cause. Stakeholder image association is discussed in further detail in Chapter Two, Six and Seven.

**Corporate Social Responsibility**

References to corporate social responsibility include consideration of community wellbeing and the concept of goodwill (Kotler & Lee, 2004; Leonard & McAdam, 2003; Godfrey, Merrill & Hansen, 2009). More specifically, Breitbarth and Harris (2008, p.180) described the concept of corporate social responsibility as challenging ‘organizations to explicitly clarify their business ethics, acknowledge expectations of their stakeholders and integrate it to benefit society’. Corporate social responsibility is discussed in further detail in Chapter Two, Three, Six and Seven.
Event Management

‘The event management process may take place over many months or years . . . Event Management is made up of a number of management areas, including planning, leading, marketing, design, control and budgeting, risk management, logistics, staging and evaluation. Each of the areas continuously affect each other over the event project phases’ (Allen, et al., 2008, p.160). This concept is referred to throughout this thesis.

Stakeholder Power

Stakeholder power is referred to throughout this thesis in relation to the demands and actions of community sport event stakeholders and the consequences these demands and actions can have on other event stakeholders and the management of the overall event. Specific reference to stakeholder power is made in Chapter Two, Three, Six and Seven. ‘Power concerns the ways that social relationships shape capabilities, decisions, change; these social relations can do things and they can block things unfolding. Power is ultimately about the choices that we make, the actions we take, the evils we tolerate, the goods we define, the privileges we bestow . . . Power means finding the most effective leverage for particular relations’ (Clegg, Courpasson & Phillips, 2006, p.3).

Legitimacy

‘Traditional legitimation rests on the continuous cultivation of a belief in the sanctity of old tradition and habit. Lacking formally enacted rules, the system operates on the basis of a set of traditional norms which gives the ruler authority and his or her government the right to exercise domination over others’ (Waaeras, 2007, p.282). Within a community sport event context, legitimacy refers to a stakeholder’s legitimacy to act in a certain way
or make a specific demand. This term is specifically referred to in Chapter Two, Three, Six and Seven.

**Public Health Agenda**

A public health agenda is considered a vehicle in which to influence social choice and individual community members on health associated issues (Davis and Jones, 1996; Koplan & Brownell, 2010; Ludwig & Nestle, 2008; Maher, 2006). More specifically, these public health agenda issues include an increase in the consideration of obesity, heart disease, smoking and diabetes (Lurie, 2010). Kelly, Baur, Bauman, Smith, Saleh, King & Chapman (2011) specifically noted that ‘children’s exposure to the marketing of unhealthy food and beverages, including sport sponsorship, has been identified as a potential contributor to the obesity-promoting environment’ (p.72). A public health agenda is specifically referred to in Chapter Two, Six and Seven.

**1.4 Thesis Structure**

This thesis is organised into eight chapters. This chapter has provided a background to the research issue and outlined the context of the research.

Chapter Two reviews the literature on sponsorship, sport sponsorship and sport event sponsorship. Gaps within this literature are identified, demonstrating the need for research which examines community sport event sponsorship and stakeholder relationships.

Chapter Three outlines the theoretical framework adopted for use in association with this thesis. The theoretical framework ultimately selected as a lens through which to analyse the processes associated with community sport event sponsorship was Freeman’s
‘Stakeholder Theory’ (1984). This theory predominantly associates itself with organisational structure and can be utilised to acknowledge the influential nature of event stakeholders. It focuses on the impacts stakeholders can have on an organisation and ‘how relationships with stakeholder groups can be managed’ (Butterfield, Reed & Lemak, 2004, p.164). As an extension of Freeman’s (1984) stakeholder theory, Rowley’s (1997) density and centrality concepts were specifically utilized in order to explain event stakeholder relationship networks (Savage, Bunn, Gray, Xiao, Wang, Wilson & Williams, 2010).

Chapter Four outlines the research methodology. The research conducted for this project utilized qualitative research and a case study approach. Four New Zealand based community sport events were reviewed as case studies, each of which were selected based upon a series of pre-set classification criteria. In-depth, semi-structured interviews with event managers and associated event stakeholders took place between April 2010 and January 2011. Individual stakeholders were identified via a snowball sampling technique. An analysis of the interview transcripts, printed documents and reflective journal notes collated for this project took place via the application of an open, axial and reflective coding process. This incorporated the use of qualitative data analysis software NVivo8 in addition to a manual coding procedure, from which a set of key themes were identified.

Chapter Five provides descriptive results that relate to the four community sport events adopted as case studies for the purpose of this thesis. An in depth description of each event stakeholder, including where possible, a record of their involvement with each event, is provided. Stakeholder relationship maps, providing a holistic overview of stakeholder roles and relationships, have been created for each case study.
Chapters Six and Seven introduce the research findings and subsequent discussion which incorporates information drawn from the literature review and selected theoretical framework presented in Chapters Two and Three.

The final chapter, Chapter Eight, presents the conclusions and specifies the contributions that this thesis has made to the development of this field of study. Areas for future research are defined, followed by a concluding statement.

1.5 Delimitations

This research project incorporates four case studies of New Zealand based community sport events. Two of these events are based in Christchurch (South Island) and two are based in Auckland (North Island). As a result this thesis does not explore community sport events based across the whole of New Zealand, nor does it assess any community sport events outside of the country.

This study focuses on a set of identified stakeholders from each community sport event who were willing to participate in the research. It does not incorporate every stakeholder associated with each case study. Identified respondents considered themselves as associated event stakeholders at the time the research was conducted. These respondents and their corresponding organisations may or may not remain stakeholders of the event selected as case studies.
1.6 Conclusion

This research seeks to clarify and assess the changing nature of community sport event stakeholder relationships and the increasing levels of conflict surrounding particular community sport event sponsors. Such research will aid in the expansion of community sport event literature in addition to developing a conceptual framework which addresses industry-based community sport event stakeholder management and sponsorship issues.

This introductory chapter has outlined the background, theoretical context, research questions and relevance of the research. It has also outlined the structure of the thesis and its delimitations. The following chapter (Chapter Two) presents a review of the related literature and research surrounding the commercialisation of sport events and community sport events over recent decades. Chapter Two also provides an overview of the factors currently influencing community sport event management. These include the need to consider corporate social responsibility, the impact of a public health agenda and the way in which stakeholders exert power within a community sport event setting.
Chapter Two

Literature Review

Over recent years sports events, and more specifically community sport events, have been subjected to an increasing number of external pressures (Boyle & Haynes, 2000; Carrigan & Carrigan, 1997; Collins & Vamplew, 2000; Cunningham et al., 1993; Donaldson & Finch, 2013; Edwards & Inkson, 2006; Irwin et al., 2002; Hindson, 2006; Jackson, 2005; Kelly et al., 2012; Kelly, King, Bauman, Baur, Macniven, Chapman & Smith, 2013; Kohe, 2011; Kolah, 1999; Masterman, 2007; McDaniel, Kinney & Chalip, 2001; Monye, 2000; Paramino-Salcines et al., 2013; Trenberth & Collins, 1999). Such influences have resulted in significant impacts on the development and sustainability of community sport events.

This chapter provides a review of the literature and research surrounding the commercialisation of sport, sport events and community sport events over recent decades. Following this historical overview, this chapter highlights factors influencing community event management which include: the development of corporate social responsibility; the influence of a public health agenda; stakeholder power exertion; and the role of the media. Lastly, this chapter outlines some of the major consequences of influential issues for events, such as sponsorship selection and the development of government policies. This chapter aids in framing the focus of this thesis, highlighting an existing gap in relevant literature and justifying the usefulness of the research conducted. Figure 2.1 below provides a synopsis of this chapter in order to further clarify the structure of the literature review. Figure 2.1 also highlights how each section of this chapter provides background and context to the research questions which form the basis of this research study.
Figure 2.1: Literature Review Overview

Section 2.1: The Commercialisation of Sport and Events
A chronological overview of the commercialisation of sport and sport events (including the rise of sponsorship).

Section 2.2: Factors Influencing Sport and Events
- Increasing Brand Awareness
- Image Association
- Cause Marketing
- Corporate Social Responsibility
- Morally Correct Sponsorship and a Public Health Agenda
- Sponsorship and the Media
- The Exertion of Power and Legitimacy

Section 2.3: Consequences of a Strategic Approach to Sponsorship
- Sponsorship and Event Policies and Legislation

[Background to RQ1, RQ1a, RQ1b and RQ2]
2.1 The Commercialisation of Sport and Events

Many characteristics of modern sport and events and their sponsorship are traceable back to civilizations from the Greek and Roman eras (Kissoudi, 2005; Masterman, 2007; Meenaghan, 1991; Stedman, Goldblatt & Neirotti, 2001). An Agōnothetēs (the Greek term for a sponsor of a contest or competitive programme) would often be a magistrate or wealthy citizen and would usually be responsible for some or all of an event’s costs (Golden, 2004). Such sponsorship may also have provided additional benefits to the athletes being sponsored, including exemption of taxes, provision of citizenship and offers of seats on local councils within the Greek communities, if sponsored by an official (Masterman, 2007). While Kissoudi (2005, p.618) suggested that sponsorship during this era was essential for the ‘cultural and economic development of Athens’, other Greek city states also sponsored athletes (Wooyeal & Bell, 2004).

Many sport events in Rome were supported by sponsors who were seeking to improve their social standing in society. A sponsor’s name would be repeated by announcers during an event in an attempt to highlight their support (Futrell, 2006). Shannon (1999) noted ‘winning public esteem’ as a major reason behind Roman wealthy citizens choosing to sponsor gladiatorial games.

A magnanimous sponsor not only provided exciting and colourful shows and fierce competition; he also took care of the human needs of his audience. This took the form of special comforts for the spectator: shade, snacks and door prizes (Futrell, 2006, p.110)

Alternatively, Collins and Vamplew (2002) supported the notion that the event sponsorship phenomenon which has evolved in recent times boasts its beginnings in
16th Century England, when public ale houses were noted as the main locations where sport events were staged and attracted large crowds. These organised events, such as ‘pub’ sports, were increasingly viewed as viable commercial opportunities. Prior to the 1900s, the alliance of sport and alcohol manufacturers (in addition to gambling associations) initially involved sports such as rugby, hunting, wrestling and boxing. The trend for sport events to align themselves with tobacco companies and breweries increased scope. Specific sports such as cricket, often took place on land adjacent to ale houses. Profits from attendance and food and beverages sold were used to cover local property tax rates (Collins & Vamplew, 2002). Boxing and wrestling events were especially associated with the consumption of alcohol. Gambling was also linked to these types of ‘pub’ sports, as event patrons rallied to support and profit from the fighters (Fairburn, 1989). Licensing agreements were established allowing beer to be sold at these and other events, such as horse racing (Collins & Vamplew, 2002).

The progressive shift from an amateur approach to sport event management in the 19th Century, to that of a more business-like approach during the early to mid 20th Century, resulted in the establishment of commercial opportunities with media networks, and the chance for sport managers to market their products (Hindson, 2006). Mandell (1984) suggested that in the late 1800s, the concurrent development of the railroads (permitting teams and spectators to travel) and cheap newspapers (advertising events), forged a relationship between sport, sport events, advertising and consumption. The commercialisation of popular sport activities led to sponsorship agreements being forged as early as 1896 in Britain. For example, ‘Nottingham Forest [football team] were sponsored by Bovril when they appeared in that year’s FA Cup final, while elsewhere in Europe the origins of the modern Tour de France cycle race date from a commercial
sponsorship deal which used the race to promote the newspaper L’Equipe’ (Boyle & Haynes, 2000, p.48). Two of the most popular spectator sports in Britain, football and cricket, also enjoyed varying degrees of contact with commercial sponsors at this time (Boyle & Haynes, 2000). As the British Empire expanded so too did their sports and their methods of organisation.

Hindson (2006) suggested that evidence supporting the commercialisation of New Zealand sport evolved from the unstructured games initially introduced by British immigrants in the 1800s. While there was little formal organisation and structure for sport in 19th Century New Zealand, by the turn of the 20th Century some sectors of sport had become commercialised in nature (Hindson, 2006). Rugby players, such as the All Blacks, were used to promote commercial products, such as tobacco companies and cigarette brands as early as 1905 (G. Ryan, Lincoln University, Personal Communication, May 15, 2009). This timing coincided with the first sanctioned New Zealand Rugby Union (NZRU) tour of Great Britain (Scherer, Falcous & Jackson, 2008). In the 20th Century a number of All Blacks employed as sales representatives by companies who were prepared to bend the rules and allow the All Blacks to keep playing rugby in an amateur era as they saw that an association with a top-rugby-player was good for business (Laidlaw, 1973). Such an example highlights the beginnings of the cause marketing phenomenon associated with sponsorship (see Section 2.2 for further detail), whereby organisations frequently aligned with positive causes in order to enhance their company image and promote goodwill (Masterman, 2007).

New Zealand sport faced increased financial pressure following World War One (Kohe, 2011). As a result sport managers went in search of alternative funding sources – which
were specifically referred to as sponsorship following World War Two. For example, in 1928 sponsor advertising was displayed for the first time at the Basin Reserve in Wellington under the instruction of Harry Amos, Chairman of the New Zealand Olympic Committee (NZOC) (Kohe, 2011). Loans and donations from brewers to sport clubs became common place in the 1930s ‘when economic recession hit the [sport] industry hard . . . For example, in 1930 Truman’s loaned £1000 at five percent to the Boyce Hill Golf Club and also gave them a discount on beer purchases at 7.5 per cent’ (Collins & Vamplew, p.54, 2002). Sport sponsorship, at this time, was considered a vehicle through which to increase customer trade for sponsoring companies.

Developments in sport sponsorship from the 1950s onwards have been referenced in more detail. Arguments made by many researchers suggest that more modern forms of sport event sponsorship have stemmed from and often intertwine with the general commercialization of sport (Boyle & Haynes, 2000; Collins & Vamplew, 2002; Close, Askew & Xin, 2007; Trenberth & Collins, 1999). Meenaghan (1991) considered such commercially driven sponsorship as having dramatically evolved from its simple form in Greece to its multi-faceted, global existence today.

Technology has played a significant role in this evolution of the modern sponsorship phenomenon. For example, the introduction of new media technologies in New Zealand significantly affected the way in which sport was advertised and the evolving role sponsorship took as an advertising tool (Jackson, 2005). The arrival of television coverage of sport in New Zealand in the 1950s ‘opened up new vistas of commercial opportunity, as well as exposure to wider local and global opportunities and trends’ (Hindson, 2006, p. 29). Editors of the 1954 New Zealand Rugby Almanac complained
that the advertising around the ground at Athletic Park in Wellington 'cheapened rugby' – suggesting that advertising at sports grounds was still a relatively new thing in the early 1950s (G. Ryan, Lincoln University, personal communication, May 15, 2009). Such arguments are based on moral objections to sports’ commercialisation and are discussed in further detail in Section 2.2: Factors Influencing Community Sport Event Management. Further developments in sophisticated technology and the growth of commercialisation and mass media not only expanded the entertainment potential of sport but added to its exploitation in a marketing and advertising sense (Kolah, 1999).

By the 1960s, the introduction of new technology provided new avenues of commercial opportunity and exposure to global trends (Trenberth & Collins, 1999). This resulted in the increased use of sponsorship in the years to come. Meenaghan (1991) postulated sponsorship becoming more prominent in the 1960s. Technological advancement resulted in the launching of satellites, including Telstar in 1962. Advances were also made in television, which transitioned from black and white to colour between 1953 and 1968 in the United States and 1967 and 1973 in Australia and New Zealand, respectively. Battles between television networks for enhanced picture quality also played a part (Boyle & Haynes, 2000; Nicholson, Stewart & Hess, 2007). The decade also witnessed the introduction of an increasing number of consumption industry regulations and restrictions. These are discussed in further detail in Section 2.3.

Despite these advances sport sponsorship did not fully develop into its modern form until the 1970s (Gratton & Taylor, 2000, p.163). During this time, commercial promotion opportunities were impacted by an electronic media ban on tobacco advertising in the United States in 1971. While there was a noted increase in magazine
and billboard advertising of tobacco products which stemmed from the ban, many company's began to explore the indirect advertising opportunities available via sponsorship. By 1976 sport sponsorship accounted for £16 million of the total revenue received by sport in Britain, and £46 million by 1980 (Kolah, 1999). Sponsorship also aided in counteracting the financial crisis professional sport had fallen into in Britain in the early 1970s as a result of falling attendances (Boyle & Haynes, 2000). Sport events linked with media in order to secure more sponsorship deals and revenue opportunities. However, as demand for media coverage grew, it also became increasingly difficult for many smaller sports to obtain sponsorship. Minor sports found themselves relying upon television coverage to attract sponsorship, ‘yet having to use sponsorship funds to pay the high cost of television coverage’ (Trenberth & Collins, 2006, p.12). Hindson (1999) argued that the involvement of mass media and the commercialisation of sport led to its exploitation. ‘Sports governing bodies, sponsors and television have become intertwined in an alliance that has transformed sport throughout the world’ (Boyle & Haynes, 2000, p. 47).

By the late 1980s commercialism highlighted the importance of winning for New Zealand sports teams and provided opportunities for athletes to become professionals within their fields, some earning large sums of money (Hindson, 2006; Kohe, 2011). Increasing levels of media exposure for sport resulted in increasing levels of sponsorship funding (Kohe, 2011). Investments, estimated at over NZD $93 million, were supporting the New Zealand sport sector by the early 1990s - with liquor advertising alone contributing approximately NZD $35 million (Jensen, Sullivan, Wilson & Russell, 1993). Fully commercialized sport sponsorship started to become a formal consideration in New Zealand around the same time as the sport of rugby became
overtly professional in 1995 with the advent of SKY sport channel. Jackson, et al., (2001, p.186) also supported this notion, suggesting that 1995 was a pivotal moment for Rugby and sponsorship as this was when ‘the value of rugby as a global commodity was recognised’ by potential sponsors.

Sports’ dependency on sponsorship support and funding continued to increase during the 1990s. For example, by the early 1990s, in Britain, commercial sponsorship was generating over £250 million in annual revenue for sport and sport events (Kolah, 1999). The alcoholic drinks industry was quick to utilize sponsorship as a promotional and marketing tool at this time (Meerabeau et al., 1991). France was the only country at this time to ‘prohibit alcohol sponsorship of cultural and sports events’ (Gee, 2013, p.914). Jackson, Batty and Scherer (2001, p.186) proposed that ‘without corporate sponsorship there would be little, if any, global satellite sport television’. However, the reverse could also be suggested in regards to larger scale events: without satellite sport television there would be little corporate sponsorship. Advertising and promotional expenditure in the United States, which included the utilization of sport event sponsorship, grew from one quarter of the industry’s marketing budget in 1975 to two thirds in 1998 (MacKenzie, Bartecchi & Schrier, 1994). Such growth was not limited to America. By 1999 sport sponsorship in Britain was estimated to be worth £350 million (Gratton & Taylor, 2000; Kolah, 1999). Importantly, sport sponsorship had become the nation’s ‘dominant form of sponsorship’ (Gratton & Taylor, 2000, p.163). Furthermore, sports and sport events became heavily reliant on commercial sponsorship (Boyle & Haynes, 2000; McDaniel, Kinney & Chalip, 2001). In an effort to describe the relationships which have come into existence between sport and sponsors, Irwin, Sutton and McCarthy (2002, p.210) noted that
to some, sponsorship is a term synonymous with event marketing, as events account for a significant proportion of all sponsorship activity. Within the realm of sport sponsorship, it is the event atmosphere that appears to be the most appealing and thus attractive to sponsors.

Since the year 2000, sport sponsorship investments have continued to rise. ‘Sponsorship spending by companies in North America increased from USD $10.2 billion in 2003 to USD $13.4 billion in 2006’ (Allen et al., 2008, p.346).

While investment in the sponsorship phenomenon increased, changes in the perception of sponsors also began to take place. Public knowledge and attitudes concerning sport, health and consumer products have changed in recent years (Edwards & Inkson, 2006) as ‘sport is not separate from the rest of society, but inextricably linked with wider social, economic, political and historical influences’ (Hindson, 2006, p.39). In recent years, one of the main characteristics of the sports industry to emerge is the ‘marketing of global brands [such as Nike or Coca Cola] through the association of the brand with events’ (Gratton & Taylor, 2000, p. 151). Sponsors are utilizing their alignment with sport events in order to market their brands to specific societal targets, for example, marketing food to children (Hawkes, 2007, p.44). This sponsorship extends to community sport events.

In 2012, sponsorship investments in community sport events, including triathlons and smaller 5km events totalled more than $102.1 million USD in North America alone. Four and five figure sponsorship funding agreements associated with grass root level events have become the norm according to the 2012 IEG Sponsorship Report. Similar growth in sports sponsorship investments has also been reported by the *Sports Business Insider*
(2012), which estimated that the global sponsorship sector grew by 4.9 per cent in 2012 to $51billion USD.

Sponsorship: A Modern Definition

There appears to be limited academic investment in a widely agreed definition of sponsorship in a broader sense, with many of those definitions which have been tendered lacking consistency (Meenaghan, 1983). Academics such as Walliser (2003) suggested that a generally accepted definition of sponsorship does not exist. Some definitions tend to be quite broad in nature. For example, Lee, Sandler and Shani (1997, p.160) describe sponsorship as ‘a variety of arrangements between companies which provide some kind of resource (money, people, equipment), and events or organizations which are the beneficiaries of the resources’. Gardner and Shuman (1987, p. 11) interpreted sponsorship as ‘an investment in causes or events which support an organisation’s corporate or marketing objectives’. Kolah (1999) offered a more detailed description, proposing that sponsorship involves an investment of cash or an in-kind activity, for which access to exploitable commercial potential is provided. Walliser (2003) extended these ideas of return by referring to the concept of ‘exchange’ between the sponsor and the sponsored. Other authors associate specific characteristics with the term sponsorship. For example, Simkins (1980) suggested sponsorship incorporates the sponsor making a contribution (in cash or in kind) to the event, the sponsored activity not being part of the main commercial operations of the company, and that there is an expectation of return in terms of publicity for the sponsor involved. One of the more frequently referenced sponsorship definitions is supplied by Meenaghan (1983, as cited in Carrigan & Carrigan, 1997; Lee et al., 1997; Walliser, 2003; Cornwell, Pruitt & Ness, 2001; Olkkonen, 2001; Speed & Thompson, 2000), who defined sponsorship as an
exchange of support (financial or in-kind) in relation to an activity for the purpose of achieving commercial objectives.

Despite the lack of a widely agreed upon definition of sponsorship, similarities emerge when a comparison of academic definitions take place. Terms such as exchange, exploitation, benefits, and marketing are frequently mentioned. In terms of sport sponsorship, Sam, et al., (2005, p.3) argued that ‘sport sponsorship has become considerably more sophisticated in recent years’ and suggest the process is more than a one-off transaction or ‘exchange’.

In accordance with Meenaghan, (1983;1991), Simkins (1980), Walliser (2003) and for the purposes of this research, the term ‘sponsorship’ refers to a two-way partnership between the sponsor and the sponsored, which is beneficial for both parties in terms of financial stimulation. The act involves the provision of in-kind goods and services by the sponsor, while offering the sponsor the opportunity for promotion and marketing of its organisation, products and services in return.

This section has provided a background to the rise and development of sponsorship and its association with sport and sport events in addition to establishing a definition of sponsorship for the purpose of this study. A review of literature follows, in regards to the specific factors which influence sponsorship for community sport events.
2.2 Factors Influencing Sport and Event Management

There are a number of factors which influence community sport event stakeholder decisions and consequently impact upon the management of such events. For example, potential and existing stakeholders approach community sport event alignment opportunities strategically, considering opportunities which can expand brand awareness, provide positive image association and aid in effective cause marketing approaches, in particularly corporate social responsibility (Lee et al., 1997, 2009; Cunningham, Cornwell & Coote, 2009; Donaldson & Finch, 2013; Paramino-Salcines et al., 2013; Pettigrew et al., 2012). Areas of compatibility are also carefully assessed in order to identify potential issues often associated with the alignment of organisational value and objectives (Speed & Thompson, 2000). Morally correct sponsorships and associated alignments are increasingly affecting community sport event stakeholder decisions and are further influenced by the media and public perception (Boyle & Haynes, 2000; Gratton & Taylor, 2000). Additionally, stakeholder hierarchy and questions surrounding legitimate uses of stakeholder power also play a major role in influencing community sport event management (Ferrand, Torrigiani & Povill, 2006; Scherer, Falcous & Jackson, 2008; Irwin et al., 2008).

The strategic use of sponsorship by stakeholders is a key consideration as sponsorship determines why and how stakeholders choose to align themselves with specific sport events. Cunningham, Cornwell and Coote (2009, p.65) argued that ‘the role of sponsorship within marketing strategies is expanding rapidly’. Lee et al., (1997, 2009) noted that research on sponsorship primarily derives from the sponsoring company’s perspective, and focuses on evaluating the effect sponsorship has on consumer intent
and attitudes towards products, services and brands. The research perspectives already utilized to assess sponsorship strategy aid in highlighting a potential gap in the sponsorship literature. The acknowledgements by Cunningham, Cornwell and Coote (2009) and Lee et al., (1997, 2009) also establish a review of sponsorship alignments and impacts, from an event management perspective, as a key point of difference for this thesis.

2.2.1 Increasing Brand Awareness

A large proportion of the research conducted within the sport sponsorship domain specifically focuses on brand awareness (Becker-Olsen & Hill, 2006; Cliff & Motion, 2005; Cornwell, Roy, Edward & Steinard, 2011; Gwinner & Eaton, 1999; McDonald, 1991; Paramino-Salcines et al., 2013; Pettigrew, Pescud, Rosenberg, Fergusson & Houghton, 2012; Pope, 1998). In order to increase awareness and sales of their products or services (brands) amongst the general public, many companies choose to associate themselves with sport events, via sponsorship. Close et al.’s (2007) discussion of brand awareness notes the monetary values associated with using sport sponsorship as a marketing tool. By and large, research conducted has found that sponsorship awareness leads to higher consumption values (Pope, 1998). Sponsorship can raise public awareness and opinion of the sponsoring company and its product/brand, which can entice consumers and make them more likely to make a purchase (Walliser, 2003). For example, in 1995 the India-New Zealand cricket series was sponsored by Wills Tobacco Company. Vaidya, Naik and Vaidya (1996) interviewed a selection of high school students in relation to the influence the event sponsorship advertising had on them. Most students acknowledged that they knew tobacco was addictive and caused multiple diseases and health risks. Of those students who participated in the survey, 5.2
per cent were still tempted to buy tobacco. 3.1 per cent bought and smoked Wills cigarettes. Those who had watched the cricket event and viewed the sponsorship advertising were found to have trialled these products more so than those who had not watched (Vaidya, et al., 1996). While students assumed that the cricket players smoked the cigarettes promoted, no players on the Indian team smoked (Vaidya et al. 1996).

Additionally, Humphries, Cornwell, Weeks and McAlister (2007), Pope (1998) and Rowley and Williams (2008) argued that sponsorship can alter consumption values relating to brands and product categories. Such consumption values are directly associated with the image of the event and its other stakeholders. Image association, as a factor which can influence community sport event management and sponsorship, is discussed in further detail below.

2.2.2 Image Association

The impacts certain marketing decisions can have on stakeholder products and their associated organisations also require further consideration, especially in relation to the marketing choices of community sport event managers and other event stakeholders. Lindgreen and Swaen (2010) described such consideration as the positioning of a corporate brand. The corporate brand of an event and the associated brand/s of each stakeholder are just as important as each other. Image association in a community sport event setting often stems from sponsors projecting specific brands or products. While larger dollar sums are committed by sponsors to large-scale events, a community focussed event can also be attractive to sponsors, especially if their aim is to boost corporate image and be seen to support the local community (Cunningham et al., 1993; Irwin et al., 2002; Monye, 2000; Paramino-Salcines et al., 2013; Pettigrew et al., 2012).
McDonald (1991, p.31) referred to sponsorship as a serious form of promotion, and ‘like any promotion, affects the image people have of the sponsor’. Boyle and Haynes (2000, p.62), noted that ‘as the sponsor becomes more important, the need to sanitize the televised image of the sport increases as does the desire to distance sports from anything which may be deemed political or controversial’. Sam et al., (2005, p.10) identified the possibility of an ‘erosion of public goodwill’ due to poor alignment with a sponsor and their associated image.

Research by Speed and Thompson (2000) aligned the concept of image association with consumer attitudes to sport events and general attitudes towards event sponsors. Their findings noted that sponsor-event fit, sincerity of the sponsor and attitudes towards the sponsor were key factors in generating a favourable response by consumers to the sponsorship. While the data collected for Speed and Thompson’s (2000) research was positioned from the perspective of consumers, the focus of this thesis leans more towards an examination of how event managers, sponsors and other event stakeholders develop and maintain their image(s), via their decisions and/or actions, within a community sport event setting. These areas are highlighted in Section 2.2.3: Cause Marketing and Section 2.2.4: Corporate Social Responsibility.

Walliser (2003) confirmed that there is only a limited number of studies in relation to sport sponsorship and ‘image’. Those that have been conducted tend to focus on temporary image associations and how stakeholders seek to improve image through aligning themselves with an appropriate cause. Sam et al., (2005, p.2) suggested that there have been ‘few approaches available to address the intricacies of securing, maintaining and evaluating sport sponsorship relations’. Such intricacies of community
sport event sponsorship incorporate an element of cause marketing. This concept is also associated with stakeholder image and is discussed in Section 2.2.3 below.

### 2.2.3 Cause Marketing

Conway (2011, p.2) defined cause marketing as ‘marketing communications utilizing a non-profit cause [or] sponsorship of a non-profit cause’. This definition is similar to that proposed by Irwin et al., (2002), Monye (2000) and Cunningham et al., (1993), who identified cause marketing as the reasoning behind an organization or company choosing to become a sponsor of a community event. Cause marketing has become a mainstream form of marketing’ which aids in improving corporate image and building brand awareness (Conway, 2011). For example, companies, such as McDonalds and General Motors, have demonstrated a belief that doing the right thing within their communities is integral to their business success (Irwin, 2002).

Sponsors incorporate concepts of image and utilize associated media attention when associated with cause marketing. For example, McDonald’s creation and support of the Ronald McDonald House Charities Program is compatible with its business mission of attracting families to its restaurants (Irwin, 2002, p.285)

Polonsky and Speed (2001, p.1362) considered sponsorship and cause marketing concepts to hold ‘considerable similarity [which] can potentially be combined into an integrated program’. This is because cause marketing is commercially driven. From a sponsorship perspective, sport can become a vehicle for promoting incompatible products (Craik, Bailey & Moran, 1995; David, Burhanudeen, & Abdullah, 2006). An event stakeholder can associate itself with a particular event specifically to develop good relations with the public (Waaeras, 2007). In a press article (Davis, 2006),
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McDonald’s communications manager, Joanna Redfern-Hardisty commented that sponsoring events, for McDonald’s, is a mutually beneficial situation for the parties involved. Sponsorship was considered part of McDonald’s marketing mix as it enabled the company to give back to the communities in which restaurants operate (Davis, 2006).

As a way to involve the community, cause marketing has been identified as being closely related to the concept of corporate social responsibility (Becker-Olsen, Cudmore & Hill, 2006; Hemmingway & Maclagan, 2004; Hollensen, 2010). Van den Brink, Odekerken-Schräder and Pauwels (2006) suggested that cause marketing is best situated under the corporate social responsibility umbrella itself due to shared objectives in terms of enhancing an organisation’s image within the community in which they are based. Section 2.2.4 defines and outlines corporate social responsibility as a factor which can influence community sport event management and sponsorship.

2.2.4 Corporate Social Responsibility

Many definitions of corporate social responsibility have been put forward by researchers in recent years. Breitbarth and Harris (2008, p.180) described corporate social responsibility as ‘broadly grounded in an understanding of business being part of society. Corporate social responsibility challenges organizations to explicitly clarify their business ethics, acknowledge expectations of their stakeholders and integrate it to benefit society’. Levenmore (2010) considered corporate social responsibility to be driven by the needs of the donor as opposed to the needs of the community. References to corporate social responsibility by Kotler and Lee (2004), Leonard and McAdam
(2003) and Godfrey, Merrill and Hansen (2009) included elements of community wellbeing and the concept of goodwill as key outcomes.

More specific definitions of corporate social responsibility have also been offered. For example, Kotler and Lee (2004, p.3) described corporate social responsibility as ‘a commitment to improve community well-being through discretionary business practices and contributions or corporate resources’. McWilliams, Seigel and Wright (2006, p.1) suggested that the practice involves ‘actions that appear to further some social good, beyond the interests of the firm and that which is required by law’. Russo and Perrini (2010) noted that corporate social responsibility is a voluntary contribution which betters society through financial support and development.

There are increasing references to organisations resorting to corporate social responsibility due to media pressure (Zyglidopoulos, Georidis, Caroll & Seigel, 2011). In many cases this pressure emphasises the use of corporate social responsibility as a defensive mechanism utilized to respond to social issues and counteract scandals (Carroll, 1991; Godfrey, Merrill & Hansen, 2009; Leonard & McAdam, 2003; Lindgreen & Swaen, 2010).

Within the sports industry, corporate social responsibility is primarily associated with sport via cash donations, in-kind donations, sponsorship of community events and employee volunteerism. (Sheth & Babiak, 2010, p.437). However, Breitbarth and Harris (2008, p.180) stated that corporate social responsibility ‘received little specific attention in the field of sports management and sports marketing’. Sheth and Babiak (2010, p. 433) noted that ‘while there is a growing body of corporate social
responsibility research in general, it has only recently received attention in the sport industry. However, sport can have a positive effect on many corporate social responsibility attributes including: ‘media distribution and communication power, youth appeal, positive health impacts/association, social interaction and sustainability awareness’ (Sheth & Babiak, 2010, p.433). With particular reference to event sponsorship and corporate social responsibility, Lacey, Close and Finney (2009, p.1223) suggested that ‘despite shifts towards community-based event marketing, questions remain about consumer perceptions and the role of event sponsor’s perceived corporate social responsibility as determinants’.

Russo and Perrini (2010) argued that corporate social responsibility discussions should incorporate a stakeholder view as both relate to the use of social capital. Similarly, Maon, Lindgreen and Swaen (2009, p.72) identified the broader corporate social responsibility concept as a component of stakeholder theory (see also Chapter Three), noting that corporate social responsibility is a stakeholder oriented concept that extends beyond the organisations boundaries and is driven by an ethical understanding of the organisation’s responsibility for the impact of its business activities, thus, seeking in return society’s acceptance of the organisation’s legitimacy.

Corporate social responsibility initiatives are considered to foster strong and enduring relationships with stakeholders (Bhattacharya, 2009). Zyglidopoulos, Georiadis, Caroll and Seigel (2011. p.5) highlighted how corporate social responsibility allows organisations to respond to a greater range of stakeholder demands. For example:

An oil company can only reduce its corporate social responsibility weaknesses by reducing its environmental
While approaches to strengthen corporate social responsibility may be completely unrelated to the main line of business, a study by Becker-Olsen, Cudmore and Hill (2004) revealed differences in consumers’ opinions of products depending on the products perceived compatibility with an organisation. The study highlighted the important notion that the less compatible a product, the less inclined a consumer was to purchase it. It is here that the strategic use of sponsorship can come into play (Walliser, 2003). In order to expand product awareness, sponsors will seek linkage to an event or activity which ‘intrudes on societal consciousness’ (Meenaghan & Shipley, 1999). Cunningham, et al.’s (2009) study on sponsor selection identified a number of sponsorship partnerships which firms were and were not willing to support. These decisions were based on factors describing the associated sponsored activity (e.g. health, sport, charity, business, religion). This segues to discussion on morally correct sponsorship and an associated public health agenda, both of which are expanded on below.

### 2.2.5 Morally Correct Sponsorship and a Public Health Agenda

Literature relating to morally correct sport sponsorship has primarily focused on the topic of sports associating themselves with ‘unhealthy’ sponsors, for example those promoting tobacco, alcohol and gambling (Cunningham, Cornwell & Coote, 2009; Lamont, Hing & Gainsbury, 2011; Maher et al., 2006; McDaniel & Mason, 1999; Meerabeau et al., 1991). For example, Gee (2013, p.914) highlighted that legislation restricting alcohol sponsorship in France in the 1990s was implemented ‘to protect
against risks and harm to public health’. Sam et al., (2005, p.3) noted that there has been ‘increasing scrutiny of sponsorship relationships in recent years relating to wider issues such as tobacco use, alcohol consumption and the exploitation of workers in Third-World countries . . . these issues are problematic to the sponsorship environment’ (Sam et al., 2005, p.3). Carrigan and Carrigan (1997) also raised the issue of sponsors who are experiencing incompatibility issues with sponsor products. Meanwhile, Collins and Vamplew (2002) suggested in their conclusions to an assessment of the Beijing Olympics that ‘social class stereotyping’ and opinions on ‘public health’ have led to a downturn in alcohol associated sponsorship. While such comments refer to a large scale sport event, smaller, community based events deal with similar issues (Maher et al., 2006). For example, Lamont et al., (2011) considered sport sponsorship by gambling organisations as promoting the gambling phenomena - an action which may exacerbate the public health issue of problem gambling.

While gambling organisations and alcohol and tobacco companies have traditionally faced criticism of their sport event sponsorships, sponsors such as fast-food chains and soft-drink companies, are also now facing similar criticism from sport event stakeholders, media and sections of the general public (Carter et al., 2011; Kelly et al., 2012; Pettigrew et al., 2012; Sam et al., 2005). A plethora of media articles have been published highlighting the need for further research, some of which were noted in Chapter One (on pages four and five). Limited literature exists on the increasing pool of products deemed incompatible for sport events and the sources of such criticism.

Such criticism and incompatibilities are increasingly attributed to the push of a public health agenda (Donaldson & Finch, 2013; Koplan & Brownell, 2010; Ludwig & Nestle,
While, Ludwig and Nestle (2008) noted an increase in the number of partnerships between ‘unhealthy’ sponsor products and sport. Lurie (2010) identified an increase in the consideration of obesity, heart disease, smoking and diabetes in association with sport. Sam et al., (2005, p.10) suggested there has been an increasing demand for ‘healthy’ sponsors, noting that sport ‘sponsorship by fast food franchises is becoming increasingly controversial’. Kelly et al., (2011) specifically noted that ‘children’s exposure to the marketing of unhealthy food and beverages, including sport sponsorship, has been identified as a potential contributor to the obesity-promoting environment’ (p.72).

Due to the rise in popularity of sponsorship as an advertising mechanism, there is an increasing number of ethical and moral considerations now associated with the sponsorship of sport events (Walliser, 2003). Davis and Jones (1996) identified the public health agenda as a vehicle with which to influence social choice and individual community members. Ryff and Singer (2000) confirmed that an individual’s social life can be linked to their level of health. For example, this could include an individual’s choice to participate in events and consume sponsors products. Research by Gwinner and Eaton (1999) concluded that not only are unhealthy food sponsor-associated products an issue in themselves and to those consuming them, but the controversy associated with sponsors perceived as unhealthy or incompatible can also have negative impacts on the event involved via the process of image association.

Koplan and Brownell (2010, p. 1487) suggested that ‘the food industry has sought credibility by teaming with respected partners’ and that creative marketing strategies which depict or associate with physical activity attempt to offset high calorie levels and
nutrient-poor foods. Carrigan and Carrigan (1997, p.62) predicted a trend towards ethical investment, noting that 'there could be merit in sport taking a more moral stance in the sponsors it accepts'. This sentiment was also supported by Ludwig and Nestle (2008, p.1808) who suggested that

To demonstrate concern about childhood obesity, food companies tout their efforts to promote sports . . . For example, PepsiCo will donate $11.6 million [USD] over the next five years to the YMCA to support, among other events, an annual community day to celebrate healthy living, encourage kids and families to get excited about physical fun and activity and engage kids in play to be healthy.

Stakeholder support of sport and sport events aids in the promotion and improvement of societal health (Levermore, 2010). Because of this, Walliser (2003) suggested that a more limited range of sponsors are accepted in association with sport events than with the arts or social causes. This is due, in-part, to the fact that arts and social cause-type events generally entice or target adult audiences (New Zealand Ministry for Culture & Heritage, 2010). Sport events however are usually linked to stereotypical values related to fitness, healthy living and active lifestyle (Hodgins, 1992). This would suggest that there is a narrower field of sponsors which sport event managers can utilise. Maher, et al., (2006) suggested that due to a large percentage of community sport event participants being families and children, efforts to reduce the promotion of products which could threaten the health of such groups and individuals need to be made.

Slack and Amis (2004) noted that there has been some debate in the literature related to the positive and negative impacts of socially responsible sponsorship in sport. As many community events rely on sponsorship funding, they may choose to remain
associated with fast-food, confectionary or soft-drink sponsors (Davis, 2006). There appears to be limited research conducted on the broadening nature of incompatible sport event sponsors and the stakeholders determining and coordinating such incompatibilities. While research is beginning to emerge on this topic (Carter, Signal, Edwards, Hoek & Maher, 2013; Kelly et al., 2012; Pettigew et al., 2012), collectively, such studies focus on nutrition and health science issues and are predominantly published within the health science domain as opposed to sport, event or management journals (BMC Public Health, Public Health Nutrition and Asia Pacific Journal of Clinical Nutrition).

The research conducted for this study extends beyond the identification of unhealthy sponsors and the effects of unhealthy sponsor products on the health of the community. More specifically, this thesis focuses on event management and event stakeholder perspectives and issues pertaining to an increasing range of mutually incompatible sponsors. For example, a lack of funding from such incompatible companies could have dire effects on the sport event industry, due to the fact that sport events have come to depend on sponsorship as a predominant source of funding (Boyle & Haynes, 2000; Davis, 2006; Donaldson & Finch, 2013; Garland & Ferkins, 2006; Jackson et al., 2001; Kelly et al., 2012). An 'issue raised by the large injections of sponsorship funding is the danger that it is sponsors . . . which are dictating which sports survive' (Carrigan & Carrigan, 1997, p.61). This issue is discussed in further detail in Section 2.3: The Consequences of a Strategic Approach to Sponsorship.
The sponsorship choices made by event managers are often portrayed as inappropriate by the media. The following section highlights the roles the media plays in community event sponsorship.

### 2.2.6 Sponsorship and the Media

Rowe (1996) supported the analogy that sport and the media go together like bacon and eggs, also emphasising that the sport-media nexus existed long before the introduction of television via art, print media, radio and film. More specifically, Gratton and Taylor (2000) highlighted the importance of media for sponsorship, with specific reference to the use of television: ‘All major sponsorship deals, for events . . . depend on the guarantee of widespread television coverage of the event. Events with the largest television audiences will attract the most sponsors and highest prices’ (p. 211). Hindson (2006, p. 32) argued that ‘instead of broadcasting events because people were interested in them, [the media] discovered that they could make people interested in events because they were on television’. This approach was highly profitable for the sponsors, including breweries and tobacco companies sponsoring sport events in the 1980s and 1990s as it resulted in increasing levels of exposure to their products (Jensen, et al., 1993; Wenner & Jackson, 2008).

In terms of other media channels, Oliver and Myers (1999) study analysed ‘How Events Enter the Public Sphere’ via newspaper coverage. Their research suggested that media coverage is more often than not based on what a media corporation considers as newsworthy. ‘There are standards of ‘newsworthiness’ that determine newsworthy events from non-newsworthy events, such as news value and news routines’ (Oliver & Myers, 1999, p. 45). Boyle and Haynes (2000, p.62), argued that ‘sports go in and out of
fashion’ partly driven by how the media choose to portray them. The influential nature of the media can shape public perception and frame public issues (Garison, 1988; Oliver & Myers, 1999). Maxwell, McCombs and Shaw (1972) and McCombs (2004) argue that media tools, including newspapers, television and magazines, can force certain issues in society and suggest what people should be thinking about. While this thesis directs attention to the impact a public health agenda is having on community sport events and their stakeholders, it is acknowledged that the media can portray (and thus drive) a public health agenda as a key societal issue.

Additional research relating to sports events and the media tends to focus upon the sponsored, with emphasis placed upon relationship marketing (Sam et al., 2005). Research involving sponsors who seek media coverage found that sponsors want to be seen to be giving back to their community (Walliser, 2003). Media coverage often amplified the positive impact of sponsor activities (Garisson, 1988). This links directly to the need for organisations to incorporate corporate social responsibility into their goals in order to be seen as ‘doing the right thing’. An additional consideration is the impact any media coverage of an event, such as television news story, talk back radio, newspaper article, can have on the development and maintenance of stakeholder image (Boyle & Haynes, 2000). An event stakeholder’s drive for maintaining a positive image can lead to power struggles and questions regarding legitimacy of actions. Power and legitimacy, as influential factors of community sport event management are discussed in further detail in the following section.
2.2.7 Power Exertion and Legitimacy

During the course of their association with an event, stakeholders strive to maintain their image and meet predetermined objectives. Issues surrounding the legitimacy of their demands and consequential power struggles can arise at this time. Research linking power and sport sponsorship has been conducted from varying perspectives. Farrelly, Quester and Burton (1997) reviewed sport sponsorship from a corporate marketing perspective. Their study assesses the hierarchical integration of sport sponsorship strategies and priorities within Australian and North American sponsoring companies. Scherer, Falcous and Jackson (2008) directly addressed the concept of power brokers within sport management, specifically highlighting the ‘entwinement of sport governing bodies, media conglomerates and other corporations’. Their research was directly focused on processes of commodification in sport, in particular the New Zealand Rugby Union, and on the globalization of New Zealand’s national rugby team, the All Blacks.

The power associated with sponsorship as an advertising tool, has also been examined. For example, Roy and Cornwell (2003) reviewed the impacts of sponsorship on consumer behaviour and perception. Wolfe, Meenaghan and O’Sullivan (2002) linked sport, sponsors and media relationships to power concepts using network theory. Sport, in this instance, was studied in a more general sense, while focussing on the geographic region of Ireland. Sponsors were reviewed in association with television rights, promotion and revenue from which elements of power associated with broadcasting were identified.
For the purpose of this research, a variety of power concepts and applications have been adopted. Power is something which is often linked to and exercised in class struggle (Clegg, 1981). Weber, Roth and Wittich (1978, p.53) described power as referring 'to an actor's “position to carry out his own will despite resistance”’. According to Byers, Henry and Slack (2007, p. 271) power exists when there are conflicts of interest between individuals or groups’ of event stakeholders. Similarly, power theorists, Hardy and Clegg (2004), noted that the type of power which exists within organisations can be linked back to class structure and social relations, specifically to the hierarchical structure of organisations. Additionally, they (2004, p. 344) mentioned that, from 'Weber's perspective, all organisational members, in principle, have some creativity, discretion, and agency to use power (although some more than others)'. This viewpoint parallels the differing levels of influence or bargaining power which stakeholders can hold over organisations (Mitchel et al., 1997; Rowley, 1997; Schneider, 2002). Wicks, Gilbert and Freeman (1994) acknowledged that a formal hierarchical structure can aid in defining the roles and duties of individuals or groups in a clearer manner. However in situations where stakeholders are involved, not only do hierarchies 'tend to exclude the voices of stakeholders outside of the organisation, it narrows and ranks the range of input from those inside the firm' (Wicks, Gilbert & Freeman, 1994, p.483). Greene (2009, p.221) suggested that 'all social systems have an organizational structure' which can be linked to a hierarchy via the distribution of power. Held and McGrew (2003) also supported this stance and the notion that higher-level organisations (in terms of size, defined role, governmental links, or even generally perceived status) hold more power than smaller entities within the community.
In a sport management context this classical approach to power bases itself on the assumption ‘that people were rational and would therefore obey an order purely on the basis that it had come from a person higher up the hierarchical ladder who had more authority’ (Auld & Cuskelly, 2006, p.122). Hierarchical power is heavily dependent on the concept of legitimacy (Freeman, 1984; Hardy & Clegg, 2004). Community sport event sponsors can assume power based on their official sponsorship level, i.e. bronze, silver, gold or platinum, or by their existing status held within the community in which they are based.

This is perhaps where questions regarding the different boundaries of power, control and authority arise. Weber, et al., (1978) described the concept of ‘control’ as presenting itself when organisations attempt to influence ‘production’. Clegg (1981) defined control as a labour process which is achieved through a determined set of rules, which may or may not be formally defined by members of the organisation. ‘Control can be seen as . . . an organisational system designed by managers but influenced by the desires and actions of organizational stakeholders’ (Byers et al., 2007, p.273). Formal authority in an organisation is often aligned with the inherent managerial right to give orders (Auld & Cuskelly, 2006), and for ‘these orders, or rational rules, to be obediently adhered to’ (Schneider, 2002, p.215). O’Sullivan (2000) treated authority as equivalent to power, noting that it incorporates facets of justification and knowledge. Concepts of authority are predominantly associated with hierarchical systems of power and control (Held & McGrew, 2003).

Ferrand, Torrigiani and Povill (2006), Irwin, et al., (2008) and Olkkonen, Tikkanen and Alajoutsijärvi (2000) all highlighted the complex alliances which exist between event
stakeholders and sponsors. Such circumstances are noted by Clegg (1981, p.551) as incorporating ‘different control rules [which evolve] at different times and at different stages of functional complexity’. Freeman (1984) highlights the need for an awareness of hierarchy as some stakeholders exercise more political power that other stakeholders. Within the event management realm this relates directly to the ‘territorial struggle [by stakeholders] for power and influence’ over event-based decisions (Freeman, 1984, p.157).

In conclusion, the literature suggests that the power struggles and complex alliances and relationships between event stakeholders are directly related to: the drive to maintain a positive image within society; adhering to an identified public health agenda; and ensuring positive promotion of brands and products. These aspects can have a resounding impact on the management of community sport events and are explained in further detail in the following section.

### 2.3 The Consequences of a Strategic Approach to Sponsorship

The pressures faced by community sport event managers and stakeholders and outlined in Section 2.2 can significantly impact upon a range of event management decisions in the development and introduction of legislation and policy surrounding event sponsorship (Boyle & Haynes, 2000; Davis & Jones, 1996; Hindson, 2006; Kelly et al., 2012; Kolah, 2006; Sparks, Dewhirst, Jette & Schweinbenz, 2005; Meenaghan, 2013; Tamburri, 1998). An additional consequence is the need for event managers and event stakeholders to question and carefully assess future sponsorship alignments (Garland &
Ferkins, 2006; Hindson, 2006). A brief summary of the literature that highlights event sponsorship policies and legislation is detailed below.

### 2.3.1 Sponsorship and Event Legislation and Policy

Legislation which references sponsorship, sponsors products and restrictions on sponsorship advertising appears, at present, to be mainly limited to gambling, tobacco products and alcoholic beverages (Sparks, Dewhirst, Jette & Schweinbenz, 2005). However, due to the increasing number of sponsor products encountering incompatibility issues (for example, with stakeholder values or overarching public health agenda initiatives), the question as to whether the legislation will broaden its boundaries is raised. Kolah (2006) made reference to such a possibility, particularly noting a push for sponsorship-associated legislation. Sparks et al., (2005) briefly mentioned how the pressure from health authorities has influenced and could further influence changes in sponsorship legislation. In an effort to justify the introduction of such legislature, Davis and Jones (1996, p.108) noted that ‘the commitment to developing healthy public policies is fundamentally about social and political change’.

On a global scale, it was during the 1960s that increasing regulations, restrictions and legislative influences were placed upon some consumption industry giants, such as tobacco manufacturers and brewing companies. Whilst the products these companies manufactured held strong links with sport and sport sponsorship, these limitations would modify future relations between the industry giants and sport. For example, when the banning of cigarette advertising on television took place in Britain in 1965, attempts to circumvent national advertising legislation were made by using sport as an accomplice and incorporating the display of sports event sponsors logos on television
(Boyle & Haynes, 2000; Carrigan & Carrigan, 1997). ‘The exploitation of sponsorship for commercial reasons . . . was catalysed by the tobacco industry and its need to find new advertising outlets when traditional media were denied it either by legislation or by voluntary codes’ (Meerabeau, et al., 1991, p.39). Initially tobacco companies such as Benson and Hedges, which sponsored cricket and snooker and John Player, which sponsored cricket and motor-racing, used sponsorship of televised sport as a means of evading the television ban on direct cigarette advertising. This approach originally proved successful, so much so that the range of corporations turning to sponsorship as a form of marketing steadily increased (Meenaghan, 1984; 2013). Cornwell (1997) highlighted the questionable connotations of this approach whereby corporations utilized sport event sponsorship as a ‘non-traditional communication program’, especially by tobacco firms which linked their products to the positive attributes of sport and sport events.

In the following decades legislation affecting sponsorship would be introduced by a growing number of countries. For example, by 1990, France began to restrict alcohol advertising in the media. Sponsorship however, described as a more subtle approach to advertising, still managed to avoid legislative restriction to a large degree (Meerabeau, et al., 1991). In 1997 the Canadian government passed the Tobacco Act which imposed severe restrictions on tobacco sponsorship of events from 1998. Despite the provision of a grace period to allow event organizers to find new sponsors, the new legislation saw a loss of more than CAD $60million a year for the event sponsorship industry in Canada (Tamburri, 1998).
Government policy has played a significant role in the development of sport sponsorship in New Zealand. For example, following a review of the Recreation and Sport Ministry in 1984, the Labour Government passed the Recreation and Sport Act in 1987. In the mid 1990s the Hillary Commission began to advise sport organizations on ways to secure alternate sources of funding, rather than relying solely on government grants (M. Sam, Otago University, personal communication, May 8, 2009). Such references had not appeared within sport related public policy prior to this, and were perhaps the first hint at links between sport organisations and the need to secure sponsorship. In 2002, Sport and Recreation New Zealand (SPARC) replaced the Hillary Commission as the coordinating entity for sport and recreation in New Zealand (Hindson, 2006). SPARC has since been renamed Sport New Zealand.

By 2008 multiple references to sponsorship and the development of ‘innovative partnerships between commerce and sport’ (Annual Report, SPARC, 2008) appear in SPARC documentation, emphasising the high level of dependency sport now has on sponsorship as a major revenue stream, and offering encouragement to consider sponsorship as a funding option, as opposed to relying only on government funding.

New Zealand’s major tobacco company, British American Tobacco New Zealand, has sponsored community, sport and cultural events in New Zealand for a number of decades (British American Tobacco New Zealand, 2013). In the 1980s, cigarette brand Rothmans put their name to many of the test cricket series played in New Zealand. In conflict with suggestions by government for sport to source external sponsorships, legislation was introduced which restricted the types of sponsorships which could be secured. The establishment of sponsorships from 1990 onwards banned any alignment with tobacco firms. The Smoke-Free Environments Act introduced in New Zealand in
1990 resulted in restrictions on the marketing of tobacco products, including the demise of print media and sponsorship and restrictions on workplace and public smoking (British American Tobacco New Zealand, 2013). Sport sponsorship would prove to be an exception in some cases however. The ‘Winfield Amendment’ permitted Rugby League to be sponsored by tobacco companies until December 1995 (Laugesen & Swinburn, 2000). Ferkins and Garland (2006) suggested that Cricket sponsorships enabled promotion of and improvement to the sport, which in turn encouraged attendance of games. The heavy dependency on sponsorship and the proposed removal of major tobacco sponsors, could return the sport to its once ‘perilous state’ (Ferkins and Garland, 2006, p. 227). The New Zealand Minister of Health was awarded the power to grant exemption to the tobacco sponsorship ban in 1990 (in association with the World Cup Cricket Amendment). A limited number of these exemptions were granted in the first four years, however no exemptions took place following 1996 (Laugesen & Swinburn, 2000).

By the year 2000, government legislation on restricting liquor sponsorship was introduced. Breweries were no longer able to assist with sponsorship requests involving any: motor or water sports; individual amateur teams; blood sports; and, to anyone or any group with members under the legal drinking age (Dominion Breweries, 2013).

To date legislation specifically related to fast food, confectionary and soft drink sponsorship has not been introduced by government. New Zealand Parliament came close to doing so in 2007 when they passed the Public Health Bill 177-2 in 2007. This piece of legislation incorporated a series of voluntary and compulsory guidelines which
broadly referenced the need for a code of practice for sponsors and the products they market. In 2007, the World Health Organisation (p.32) noted that there had ‘been numerous calls for government action on food marketing to children [potentially via events]’ and that an ‘increase in food advertising . . . implied a need for further regulatory controls’ within New Zealand. Pettigrew et al., (2013), also argued that government restrictions on community event sponsorship should be put in place. However the authors also highlighted the ‘lack of research to date on the public support and implications of restricting sponsorship of community events by food and beverage companies’ (p.613).

The issue of a public health agenda and healthy sponsorship has remained a popular topic within the media and current academic research. For example, Kelly et al., (2011, p.75) considered sport sponsorship ‘warrants discussion by public health policy makers, especially in an environment of increasing child overweight and obesity’. Recent New Zealand based news articles released include headlines such as “Sponsorship ban a slippery slope” (Manawatu Standard, 2012), “Call for soft drink ban in schools” (National, 2009). “Call to restrict junk food sales” (National, 2011), “Time to curb junk food marketing to kids” (The Dominion Post, 2012).

**Chapter Review**

In summary, the topic of sponsorship and the perspectives from which it can be analysed are wide and varied. This literature review has discussed sponsorship in association with its role in sport and community sport events. While discussed separately considerations of strategy, corporate social responsibility, the role of the media, the impact of a public health agenda and the influence of power all relate to
sponsorship and are by no means stand-alone concepts. The following chapter, Chapter Three, outlines and justifies the theoretical framework selected to assist in the analysis of such considerations within a community sport event context.
Chapter Three
Theoretical Framework

Literature associated with sport and event management highlights the issues of power, control and authority, legitimacy and image, in terms of event stakeholders (Walliser, 2003; Gratton & Taylor, 2000; Boyle & Haynes, 2000; Meenaghan & Shipley, 1999). There are a number of theoretical models and frameworks which provide varying interpretations and analysis of sport and event management issues and underlying agendas. The theoretical framework ultimately selected as a lens through which to analyse the selected community sport events, was ‘stakeholder theory’ (Freeman, 1984). This theory is predominantly associated with organisational structure and can be utilised to acknowledge the influential nature of event stakeholders. As an accompaniment to Freeman’s (1984) work, Rowley’s (1997) ‘network theory’ was also utilized in order to provide an expanded framework to account for community sport event stakeholder actions, not accounted for within Freeman’s (1984) stakeholder theory. This chapter provides detail on Freeman’s (1984) stakeholder theory and Rowley’s (1997) network theory and justification for their use in this thesis.

3.1 An Overview of the Selected Theoretical Frameworks

An overview of Freeman’s stakeholder theory and Rowley’s network theory of stakeholder influences are presented in sections 3.1.1 and 3.1.2 below.

3.1.1 Freeman’s Stakeholder Theory

The term stakeholder emerged in the 1960s as a counterpart to ‘stockholder’ and initially referred to other parties having a ‘stake’ in an organisations decision making
processes (Stern, 2008). Stakeholder theory was conceptualised over a decade later by Freeman (1984, p.25), who defines a stakeholder as ‘any group or individual who can affect or is affected by the achievement of the firm’s objectives’, and includes examples of stakeholders such as suppliers, customers, media, environmentalists, government, and local community organisations. A key aspect of the stakeholder concept is how stakeholder influence is distributed in accordance with key organisational decisions (Heller, 1997). Mitchell, Agle and Wood (1997) suggest that stakeholder theory approaches this issue in a systematic way, by acknowledging those stakeholders who are deserving or requiring of management attention.’ Freeman’s stakeholder theory ‘takes into account all of those groups and individuals that can affect or are affected by the accomplishment of organizational purpose. Each of these groups has a stake in a modern corporation, hence the term ‘stakeholder’ (Freeman, 1984, p.25).

Stern (2008) suggested that stakeholder theory focuses heavily on the aim of delivering profit as an essential point of business. However, Freeman et al., (2004, p.364) argued that in some respects ‘concern for profit is the result rather than the driver in the process of value creation’. In some cases community sport event stakeholders may not be the primary beneficiaries of profits generated, as Stern (2008) suggested. Instead, local governments who support a community event for example, may be primarily concerned with ‘maintaining and supporting healthy communities’ (Allen, et al., 2008, p.51). Becker-Olsen, et al., (2006) consider that the reasons organisations and individuals choose to become stakeholders in sport events include: media attention, reconfirmation of image or re-design of image, or an urge to give back to the community. Community members and groups become stakeholders of an event through their participation, the reasoning for which is, more often than not, associated with an
urge to be entertained and part of an experience (Allen, et al., 2006). Discussions which further explore the reasons that commercial organisations choose to utilise events as a marketing tool and align themselves as stakeholders, were provided within the literature review in Chapter Two.

Freeman (2010) argued stakeholder theory aids in the assessment of three particular problems. Firstly, it acknowledges changing business relationships and the need for value creation and trade. Secondly, it identifies the problem of ethics and capitalism, or the attempt to separate business and ethics, including the need to do the right thing. Lastly, stakeholder theory adopts a managerial mindset by outlining how managers can deal with relationships, partner ethics and capitalism and be successful.

For the purpose of this thesis, stakeholder theory is described as a framework which outlines how a business can operate optimally, and how stakeholder relationships can be effectively managed (Freeman, 2010).

3.1.2 Rowley’s Network Theory of Stakeholder Influences

‘Network analysis provides a means for examining how the pattern of relationships in a stakeholder environment influences an organization’s behaviour’ (Rowley, 1997, p. 894). This further compliments Freeman’s (2010) objective of understanding how business relationships work. Rowley (1997) described Freeman’s original stakeholder theory as focussing on ‘defining the stakeholder concept’ and ‘classifying stakeholders into categories that provide an understanding of individual stakeholder relationships’ (p.889). He further argues that researchers often fail to consider stakeholder influences beyond that of a dyadic relationship (Rowley, 1997). Many stakeholder oriented
researchers agree that organisations and stakeholder relationships expand beyond the dyadic hub (Phillips, 2003; Steurer, 2006; Neville and Menguc, 2006). Rowley (1997) argued that ‘employing social network concepts will generate an explicit theory of stakeholder influences based on the structural characteristics of an organisation’s network of relationships’ (p. 887). Trevino and Weaver (1999) and Laplume, Sonpar and Litz (2008) also expressed this viewpoint.

This extension of stakeholder theory is based upon two network based concepts: density of the stakeholder network and centrality of the focal firm within the wider network of stakeholders (Savage, Bunn, Gray, Xiao, Wang, Wilson & Williams, 2010). Firstly, density measures the number of connections between stakeholders in a network (Rowley, 1997). If high density exists (i.e. multiple links) then communication is considered more effective and there is an increase in stakeholder cohesion. Secondly, the term ‘centrality’ is synonymous with power. Centrality refers to power obtained through the structure of a network and the position of a stakeholder (Rowley, 1997).

This section has introduced the key components of Freeman’s (1984) stakeholder theory and Rowley’s (1997) network theory of stakeholder influences. The following section will analyse the two theories within an event and sport based context.

### 3.2 Theoretical Perspectives in a Sport and Event Context

‘Stakeholder theory conceptualizes [an organisation] as a series of groups with different respective relationships to it’ (Schneider, 2002, p.211). Positioning this basic framework within the realms of the event management field provides a valid analytical and interpretive tool. Allen, et al., (2008 p.129) noted that
It is no longer sufficient for an event to meet just the needs of the audience. It must also embrace a plethora of other requirements including government objectives and regulations, media requirements, sponsors’ needs and community expectations... The successful event manager must be able to identify the range of stakeholders in an event and manager their individual needs, which will sometimes overlap and conflict.

Parent and Seguin (2007) incorporated stakeholder theory in their analysis of the 2005 Montreal Aquatics World Championships Organising Committee. The case study acknowledged the varying needs and expectations event stakeholders can have and identified a power imbalance between partners as one of the factors which led to the event being pulled from Montreal, Canada (Parent & Seguin, 2007). Tsiotsou (2011) utilised a stakeholder approach while reviewing national and international sport sponsorship arrangements. The results of this study suggested that better stakeholder management was needed in order to fully exploit the benefits sport sponsorship could provide to sport event sustainability. Research conducted by Reid (2011, p.22) notes that ‘event strategic management processes are not dissimilar to [those within] an organisation’. Furthermore, she suggested that ‘the way in which event managers engage their stakeholders contain[s] many of the same characteristics that are evident in other organisations’ (p.22).

In their 2007 study of festival management, Ensor, Robertson and Ali-Knight (2007 p.223) highlighted the need for event managers to identify stakeholders as part of their ‘strategic planning process due to the various agendas’ events have to meet. Event stakeholders in this instance were defined as suppliers, event sponsors, government organisations and event participants. Freeman’s (1984) notion that stakeholders may also take on bilateral roles also applies to this thesis. Sport event suppliers may also be
sponsors. Government organisations may also be event participants. Such research and perspectives are relevant to the proposed study as they provide working examples which utilize stakeholder theory as a lens through which to analyse events.

Getz, Anderson and Larson (2007) incorporated Rowley’s (1997) network theory expansion of stakeholder theory into their study on how festival managers work with stakeholders. The authors specifically noted stakeholder identification and evaluation of stakeholder relationships as major issues. Leopkey and Parent (2009) overlaid Rowley’s (1997) social network approach within in their study of the International Skating Union 2006 World Figure Skating Championships and the Under Twenty FIFA World Cup, Canada 2007 in order to review stakeholder relationships.

This section has provided a brief analysis of Freeman’s (1984) stakeholder theory and Rowley’s (1997) network theory of stakeholder influences within an event and sport based context. The following section will narrow the analysis of these theories further by acknowledging the theoretical components directly relevant to this study.

3.3 Theoretical Components Relevant to this Study

The selected theoretical frameworks offer a unique perspective on the management of and issues associated with community sport events in addition to aiding in answering the established Research Questions. The applicable theoretical components include the exertion and legitimacy of stakeholder power and the influence of organisational values and corporate social responsibility initiatives. These are discussed in further detail in the following sections.
3.3.1 Power

Freeman (1984) incorporated the concept of ‘power stake’ as a major part of the stakeholder framework, specifically identifying the need for a congruent perception of power between an organization and its stakeholders. Power based relationships often exist between groups of people in organizations, and are described as a form of ‘Stakeholdership’ by Heller (1997). Stakeholdership extends to ‘groups of people or organizations that can be shown to have a theoretical or practical stake in an enterprise’ (Heller, 1997, p.468). While traditional types of authority are associated with situations where one firm, or organisation, dominates several stakeholders (Schneider, 2002), perceptions regarding power and/or stake can differ greatly depending on one’s standpoint (Freeman, 1984, p.63).

Mitchell et al., (1997, p.854) proposed that ‘virtually anyone can affect or be affected by an organizations actions’. Based on such conclusions they designed a stakeholder typology (see Table 3.1 below) which classifies the varying types of stakeholders associated with an organisation. This model is based on what they term latent and expectant stakeholders holding varying combinations of power, legitimacy and/or urgency.

While the table below is useful for associating power and legitimacy with specific types of stakeholders, its drawback is that it recognises stakeholders solely from a management perspective and does not consider how individuals or groups may classify themselves, or how they may be classified by the media or general public (Magness, 2008).
Table 3.1: Stakeholder Typology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latent Stakeholders</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dormant stakeholders</strong></td>
<td>Dormant stakeholders possess power to impose their will on a firm, but by not having a legitimate relationship or an urgent claim, their power remains unused. Power is held by those who have a loaded gun (coercive), those who can spend a lot of money (utilitarian), or those who can command the attention of the news media (symbolic).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discretionary stakeholders</strong></td>
<td>Discretionary stakeholders possess the attribute of legitimacy, but they have no power to influence the firm and no urgent claims. With absent power and urgent claims, there is no pressure on managers to engage in an active relationship with such a stakeholder, although managers can choose to do so.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demanding stakeholders</strong></td>
<td>The sole relevant attribute of the stakeholder-manager relationship is urgency. Demanding stakeholders are those with urgent claims but who lack power and legitimacy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expectant Stakeholders</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dominant stakeholders</strong></td>
<td>In the situation where stakeholders are both powerful and legitimate, their influence in the firm is assured, since by possessing power with legitimacy, they form the &quot;dominant coalition&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dependent stakeholders</strong></td>
<td>Stakeholders who lack power but who have urgent legitimate claims are characterized as dependent because these stakeholders depend upon others (other stakeholders or the firm's managers) for the power necessary to carry out their will.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dangerous stakeholders</strong></td>
<td>When urgency and power characterize a stakeholder who lacks legitimacy, that stakeholder will be coercive and possibly violent, making the stakeholder &quot;dangerous,&quot; literally, to the firm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Definitive stakeholders</strong></td>
<td>&quot;Coercion&quot; is suggested as a descriptor because the use of coercive power often accompanies illegitimate status. Stakeholders who exhibit power, legitimacy and urgency. Such stakeholders have claims which are urgent, Managers have to clear an immediate mandate to attend to and give priority to that stakeholders claim.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stakeholders have the potential to influence or affect a firm, and/or be influenced or affected by it (Freeman, 1984). This may be through ‘their words and deeds, through covert signals and overt protests, and most importantly, through their ability to help or hurt the firm's ability to create value. . . Some stakeholders may not be supportive, which may justify [their] defensive reaction’ (Schneider, 2002, p.212). It is therefore crucial to gain a better understanding of varying stakeholder perspectives on power. Rowley’s (1997) network approach expands upon Schneider’s (2002) perspective by incorporating the concept of centrality. Rowley (1997, p. 898) describes centrality as ‘similar to formal power, which among many conceptualisations may be defined as a hierarchical position. Network centrality implies a position of status’. While Freeman (2010) acknowledged that ‘hierarchy is still fundamental to organisational coordination’ (p.481), there is a noted problem of failing to recognise who gets to define what a stake and stakeholder are (Freeman, 2010). As authors who focus on the construct of power, Hardy and Clegg (2004, p.350) highlighted the importance of considering ‘in whose eyes is the power deemed illegitimate?’ Stieb (2009) also questioned who should have the authority to ‘dole out decision-making power?’ (p.405). Similarly, Jensen and Sandstrom (2011) queried who gets to define who a stakeholder is and what stake they have.

### 3.3.2 Legitimacy

Rowley (1997) acknowledged that while stakeholder theory is useful for classifying stakeholders and identifying how particular groups influence a firm's operations, he also considers that a more complex understanding of how firms respond to these influences is required. Schneider (2002, p. 217) states that 'legitimacy is the perception
that the actions of a stakeholder are desirable or appropriate’. The lack of organisational processes to verify assumptions made about stakeholders and their potential actions can make stakeholder management an arduous task (Freeman, 1984). Sport events and sponsor selection can also prove difficult when such organisational processes are absent (Amis, 2005; Ashforth and Gibbs, 1990; Meenaghan, 1983). The term ‘stakeholder’ connotes ‘legitimacy’. While managers may not think that certain groups are ‘legitimate’, in the sense that their demands on the firm are inappropriate, they need to equate ‘legitimacy’ to these groups in terms of their ability to affect the direction of the firm’ (Freeman, 1984, p.45). Waerases (2007) argued that for the traditional theorist possessing legitimacy signifies benefiting from sufficient voluntary external support to continue to exist and exercise domination. Tsiotsou (2011, p.559) argued that ‘legitimacy refers to the validity of a stakeholder’s claim upon the firm and that power is inextricably linked to legitimacy through the ability of a party to achieve desired outcomes despite resistance’.

In relation to sport management, Cuskelly and Auld (2006) suggested that individuals in organisations derive their power from two basic sources: positional - relating to the level of legitimate authority, and personal - those who do not necessarily hold formal authority, but exert considerable influence due to personal characteristics. Formal stakeholder relationships are usually formed as a relational contract, with the division of power between the two parties involved (Proven & Gassenhiemer, 1994). When stakeholders assume power based on a hierarchical perspective and with no existing agreement with the management team that unpredictable issues can arise. Sport
managers need, therefore, to remember that concept of power is not always found within the ‘formal structure’ of an organisation (Cuskelley & Auld, 2006).

Weber (1968) described legitimacy as the extent to which an organisation conforms with rationale. Wagner et al., (2011) considered legitimacy to exist when the actions of an entity are appropriate in accordance with the social constructed context. Santana (2012) expands on this, suggesting that legitimacy should be considered in relation to whether a specific entity is legitimate and also in relation to the legitimacy of the claim and the legitimacy of behaviour. Santana (2012) also made reference to the perspective of legitimacy in the eyes of society, hinting that external views of legitimate stakeholders are just as important as internal stakeholder views. Freeman (2010) differentiated between stakeholders by labelling them primary and secondary and associating different levels of power (See Figure 3.1 below). ‘Primary’ refers to stakeholder groups whose support is necessary for the firm to exist, and to who the firm may have special duties towards. Managers ‘need to understand the values and purposes’ of such stakeholders (Freeman, 2007; 2010). ‘Secondary’ stakeholders have no formal claim on the firm, and management has no special duties pertaining to them; nevertheless, the firm may have regular moral duties, such as not doing them harm’ (Freeman, 2010, p.14).
Heller (1997, p. 473) considered that ‘the essential ingredient of the stakeholder concept . . . is a difference in the distribution of decision-making influence’. This idea is based on the notion that some stakeholders hold more influence and power when it comes to management decisions, while other stakeholders hold less. Heller’s (1997) view is reflective of the sponsorship levels or status often used by event managers to denote a sponsoring organisation’s level of support (for example, gold, silver or bronze) stakeholders can find themselves associated with for an event (Gwinner and Swanson, 2003). Similarly, a study by Parent and Deephouse (2007) on stakeholder identification identified multiple levels of hierarchy as existing within a group of stakeholders – dependent on input and support. They noted that the event organising committee held
the responsibility of managing the hierarchies and associated stakeholders. Parent and Deephouse (2007) also expressed the view that the success of the event came down to the organising committee ensuring the satisfaction of each stakeholder.

Rowley (1997) argued that a particular stakeholder can hold more influence and power than another based on their central positioning within the stakeholder network. Such centrality is noted as being dependent on the ‘number of ties he or she has with other actors in the network’ (p.899). In relation to the context of this study this could incorporate a stakeholder's pre-existing relationships with other organisations or their ability to independently access other network members (Freeman, 1979, cited in Rowley, 1997). This is demonstrated visually in Rowley's Network Structure Pattern in Figure 3.2, which identifies the focal or central organisation, its links to stakeholders in the network and then the potential links those stakeholders can have with each other.

Figure 3.2: Network Structure Patterns and Relationships

Source: Rowley (1997, p.891)
In the above diagram, the solid lines represent stakeholder relationships which are centred around the focal organisation. The dotted lines indicate additional stakeholder links (e.g. pre-existing relationships) external to the cause. In the context of this thesis the event owner/manager occupies the central position.

In addition to stakeholder centrality, Mitchell, et al., (1997, p. 854) argued that ‘the degree to which managers give priority to competing stakeholder claims – goes beyond the mere question of stakeholder identification, because ‘the dynamics inherent in each [stakeholder] relationship involve complex considerations that are not readily explained’ by Freeman’s initial rendition of the stakeholder framework. Heller (1997) supported this claim, noting that there are many other considerations which can affect the influence stakeholders have on managers. In support of Freeman’s (1984) stakeholder framework, however, Heller (1997) highlighted the need to focus on understanding stakeholders, including who they are, their perceived stakes, and the organizational processes used to manage stakeholder relationships. Unfortunately it is ‘when these perceptions are out of line with the perceptions of the stakeholders [that] all the brilliant strategic thinking in the world will not work’ (Freeman, 1984, p.64). Hatch and Shultz (2001) held a similar viewpoint to Heller (1997) and Freeman (1984). They likened aligning stars to the positioning of stakeholders in a strategic sense and also acknowledge that lingering tensions can occur when stakeholder perceptions clash.

It is here this thesis may provide a valuable contribution to the better understanding of event stakeholder relationships, specifically, in terms of the continued assessment of stakeholder values, agenda’s and the management of stakeholder conflict. Additional contribution may also be made through the review of those groups, external to the
organisation, wishing to voice their opinions on certain internal operational aspects (Freeman, 1984).

3.3.3 Organisation Values

‘Under any definition with a stakeholder perspective, organisations are required to address a set of stakeholder expectations; thus, management choice is a function of stakeholder influences (Brenner & Cochran, 1991, cited in Rowley, 1997, p. 889). All organisations have values which link directly to the ideal image they wish to portray, whether this relates to their employees, competitors, other organisations (local, national or international), the media and/or the general public (McDonald, 1991; Monye, 2000; Cunningham, Taylor, & Reeder, 1993).

Freeman, Wicks and Parmar (2004, p. 364) suggested that stakeholder theory follows ‘the assumption that values are necessarily and explicitly part of doing business’ and that that the theory encourages managers to articulate the shared sense of the value they create and consider what brings their core stakeholders together. Freeman et al., (2004, p. 365) linked the importance of such an approach to an organisation’s ability to deliver set values and achieve ongoing success, and also suggest that ‘concern for profits is the result rather than the driver in the process of value creation’. Schneider (2002) added that stakeholder theory focuses on a number of ethical principles which steer management accordingly. As a result, top–level managers are often required to consider the ethical and moral values of diverse groups of stakeholders (Shockley-Zalabak & Morley, 1989). Jones (1995, p.418) proposed that the

...
manner and reputation. . . Corporate morality is reflected in the policies and decisions of the firm and in the nature of its direct dealings with corporate [and other] stakeholders.

Each stakeholder can have its own unique set of organisational values and policies, which may, or may not parallel the ideal image/s of the other associated organisations. The task of managing these differences is more complicated than regular individual choice within an organization because it takes place amid a multitude of societal values (Stern, 2008).

In relation to the management of sport events, the task of managing broad sets of values is complicated by the diverse types of stakeholders involved and the levels of perceived power each individual stakeholder believes they hold (McDonald, 1991; Mitchell et al., 1997). A basic premise of stakeholder theory is that ‘whatever the ultimate aim of the corporation or other form of business activity, managers and entrepreneurs must take into account the legitimate interests of those groups and individuals who can affect (or be affected by) their activities’ (Freeman et al., 2004, p.365). Thus, if there is a difference of opinion between the values of an organization and its members, and between the values of a stakeholder organisation and its members, ‘then it is a small wonder that successful transactions ever occur’ (Freeman, 1984, p.97).

One of the predominant values associated with supporting community sport events is the initiative, by organisations, to provide for and give back to the community (Allen et al., 2008). Such actions are often designed to align with the morals and values of the related community, and are commonly referred to as ‘corporate social responsibility’ which often takes on the form of ‘cause marketing’ (Monye, 2000; Cunningham et al.,
Freeman (1984, p.38) linked corporate social responsibility to the stakeholder concept by noting that

the distinguishing feature within literature on corporate social responsibility is that it can be viewed as applying the stakeholder concept to non-traditional stakeholder groups who are usually thought of as having adversarial relationships with the firm. In particular, less emphasis is put on satisfying owners and comparatively more emphasis is put on the public or the community.

Allen et al. (2008) stated that organisers of community sport events place strong emphasis on satisfying members of the local community as it is primarily these individuals who will participate in, support and potentially benefit from the event. To achieve satisfaction for community members, event organisers must align with identified morals and values of the groups concerned. Where value-laden decisions are concerned, Smith (1990. Cited in Beach, 1998, p.200) suggested that consumers can often express their apprehension about ‘corporate social responsibility through personal or organized boycotts against companies’. Webster (1975, cited in Beach, 1998, p.200) noted that the socially responsible consumer attempts to use their ‘purchasing power to bring about social change’.

When the values and image of an event or an event sponsor do not correlate with those of an event participant or an associated organisation, conflict can occur, very often publicly (Beierle & Konisky, 2000). Freeman (1984) prescribed the use of a ‘Values Analysis Process’ in an attempt to recognise incompatibility issues between stakeholders which are primarily associated with value discrepancies. Figure 3.2 below refers to the process in which the intrinsic and instrumental values of an organisation are collected and analysed in an attempt to recognise the possible differences between
these values and the values of stakeholders. Such recognition can result in the identification of potential conflict which could occur between stakeholders.

Figure 3.3: Value Analysis Process

Source: Freeman (1984, p.98)

Rowley (1997) offered an alternate view point to Freeman (1984) on stakeholder values and value alignment which is based on the density of stakeholder networks. ‘As density increases (and the number of ties between network members grow), communication across the network becomes more efficient . . . actors form patterns of exchange and produce shared behavioural patterns’ (Rowley, 1997, p. 897). While these behavioural patterns result in equivocal values and complimentary stakeholder alignment, an issue with such a high density level is that a focal stakeholder (e.g. the event owner) may have their associated level of control depleted.

The stakeholder framework also acknowledges the influence of societal based issues on organisational values. Freeman (1984) proposed that stakeholder and governing enterprise strategies and values need to be analysed in conjunction with identified
societal issues in order to ‘understand the place of the firm in society as it currently stands and where it might lead’ (p.99). This is illustrated in Figure 3.4 below.

Figure 3.4 Enterprise Level Strategy Process

The noted societal issues (located to the right in Figure 3.4 above) could account for the public health agenda issues identified in context to community sports event sponsorship and stakeholder management discussed in Chapter Two. Furthermore, acknowledging the influence of society on stakeholder strategies and values can also lead to the need for stakeholders to consider ethical decision making and corporate social responsibility. These considerations are discussed below.

3.3.4 Stakeholder Theory, Ethics and Corporate Social Responsibility

The concept of corporate social responsibility was primarily addressed in Chapter Two. Due to many elements of corporate social responsibility being linked to stakeholders and stakeholder theory, it is a topic which is also discussed from a theoretical perspective in this chapter. According to Freeman (2007; 2010) stakeholder actions can
incur both financial and moral consequences, requiring organisations to consider aspects of corporate social responsibility.

Managers need corporate social responsibility . . . to make self-interest and profit-seeking legitimate. If companies can do positive good – by helping the community, sharing a larger part of the pie with workers, and making safer and more environmentally safe products for consumers – then the fact that they make money isn’t so bad. (Freeman, 2010, p.201)

A plethora of other authors also link corporate social responsibility with stakeholder theory (Carroll, 1999; Lindgreen & Swaen, 2010; Laplume, Sonpar and Litz, 2008; Russo & Perrini, 2010; Walker, Heere, Parent & Drane, 2010). Specifically, McWilliams, Siegel and Wright (2006) noted that corporate social responsibility assists in satisfying a variety of constituents (i.e. stakeholders) above and beyond those with direct financial ties to the associated organisation - or in the case of this research, the event. The authors suggest that ‘stakeholder theory implies that it can be beneficial for the firm to engage in certain corporate social responsibility activities that non-financial stakeholders perceive to be important because, absent this, these groups might withdraw their support of the firm’ (McWilliams, Siegel & Wright, 2006, p.3). Carroll (1991) identified four specific categories of corporate social responsibility based on expectations of members of society which Freeman (2010) identified as an important contribution to stakeholder theory. These categories are economic, legal, ethical and philanthropic responsibilities and, as identified in Chapter Two, provide reasoning for the adoption of corporate social responsibility principles and policies. They also relate to the suggestion by Freeman (2010, p.201) that
corporate social responsibility helps take the hard edge off capitalism and shows that companies can care about more than the rich and powerful shareholders, but largely by abandoning the logic of how they do business and make decisions.

Russo and Perrini (2010) conceded that profits are no longer the sole objective of a company and that 'stakeholder identity is critical as well, since stakeholders have different relationships to the organisation, most depending on the communities in which they operate' (p.209). Laplume, Sonpar and Litz (2008) acknowledged that these can be a protection of interests and network positioning through the use of corporate social responsibility initiatives. The influence corporate social responsibility can have on organisational value identification, value alignment and stakeholder decision making processes assists in understanding why stakeholders choose to align and maintain relationships with community sport events.

Chapter Review
This chapter has identified and justified the use of Freeman's stakeholder theory and Rowley's network theory of stakeholder influences as a framework through which to analyse the results of the research. The following chapter explores the research design process, including the selection of case studies, identification of participants and the data collection and analysis methods.
Chapter Four
Methodology

This chapter details the methodology and procedures used to conduct the research for this thesis, along with the rationale for the selection of such procedures. The research design was based upon the research questions and objectives outlined in Chapter One, the introduction. The information incorporated below justifies the use of these procedures, including the selection of a qualitative research technique and the use of a case study approach. Details of the selection of case studies and the collection of data associated with each case study are provided together with a description of the processes utilized in data analysis stages. Information is provided regarding ethical approval, research limitations and the confidentiality and storage of sensitive data. To conclude, an outline of how the research findings are structured in Chapters Six, Seven and Eight is provided.

The research followed a number of sequential steps, from initial design, through to data collection and analysis. These steps are summarised in Figure 4.1 below before being discussed in further detail.

Table 4.1: An Overview of the Research Procedures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Consolidation of Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Research Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Qualitative Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- A Case Study Approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Selection of Case Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Identification of Participants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 4.1: Consolidation of Existing Literature

This phase of the research consisted of consolidating the available literature on the history of and existing research in event and stakeholder management involving sport event sponsorship with specific focus on New Zealand. One of the main findings noted from the review of existing literature was that research had previously been undertaken which specifically focused on regulated sponsor products such as alcohol, tobacco and gambling. The use of such products in a sponsorship context, were often guided by existing legislation (Collins & Vamplew, 2002; Fairburn, 1989; Meerabeau et al., 1991; Laugesen & Swinburn, 2000; Dominion Breweries, 2013; British American Tobacco New Zealand, 2013). This stage of the project identified a gap in the existing literature, which enabled the creation of a relevant and knowledge enhancing set of research questions, the selection of appropriate case studies and the design of semi-structured interview questions. These subsequent stages are detailed in the sections that follow.

Section 4.2: Research Design

To accommodate the aims of this research a realism paradigm was utilised, whereby exploratory knowledge of the real world is sought. This approach “emphasizes the
building of theories but also incorporates prior theory, and so is a blend of induction and deduction” (Perry, 1998, p.801). The realism paradigm is consistent with earlier studies used by scholars in event management, for example Stokes’ (2007) work on relationships and networks for event tourism. Realism seeks to understand the realities of a research problem by peeling off the individual layers of an identified issue and by drawing on knowledge gained from systematic research and evaluation (Perry, 1998). In order to do this, a qualitative method utilizing case studies of selected community sport events was adopted, the justification for which is detailed below.

4.2.1 Qualitative Research Design

‘Qualitative research is a means for exploring and understanding the meaning individuals or groups ascribe to a social or human problem’ (Creswell, 2009, p.4). Qualitative researchers focus on understanding the where, when and how, and under what circumstances behaviour comes into being (Bogdan & Bilken, 1982). Qualitative data therefore incorporates rich description or high-quality detailed information (Braun & Clarke, 2006; Creswell, 2000; Eisenhardt, 1989; Thorne, 2000). Such data can take on a variety of forms, including field notes, interview transcripts, documents and pictures (Coffey & Atkinson, 1996). Due to its flexibility, qualitative research allows the researcher to respond to the unique circumstances of their research and discover unexpected data (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Data collected is descriptive and analysed inductively, whereby theory emerges revealing an unpredictable picture, rather than a jigsaw puzzle where the completed artwork is revealed before the work begins (Bogdan & Bilken, 1982). In this sense, qualitative data can be used to describe a phenomenon, explain causality or develop theory (Gratton & Jones, 2004).
An increasing number of researchers ‘have shifted towards a more qualitative paradigm’ in order to utilize the well-grounded, rich descriptions and explanations it offers (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p.1). Furthermore, there has been a particularly significant increase in its use for leisure related research (Veal, 2011). Researchers have noted a number of distinctive advantages in the use of qualitative research. A qualitative approach to research can provide useful insight into the understanding of practices associated with a study of social activity, in-turn, attempting to improve upon these practices and activities (Merriam, 2009). Cresswell (1998) highlighted its usefulness for understanding social relationships and interactions. Gibbs (2002) acknowledged that qualitative findings are able to be expressed in terms of real consequences. Davidson and Tolich (1999) noted that qualitative research provides a precise description of peoples’ actions in a particular research location. Although qualitative research does not seek to generalise, results can accurately reflect the opinions or actions of the people in the study (Davidson and Tolich, 1999). Flyvbjerg (2006, p.227) argued that just because ‘knowledge cannot be formally generalized does not mean that it cannot enter into the collective process of knowledge accumulation in a given field or in a society’.

Grbich (2007) noted that there are usually multiple positions from which qualitative data can be collected and analysed. Davidson and Tolich (1999) suggested that validity of qualitative research can be strengthened via a triangulation of findings. Triangulation occurs when the research topic can be analysed from two or three different perspectives by utilising multiple sources of information. Veal (2006, p. 107) described true triangulation as occurring when ‘different data/methods address the same question’. With triangulation, if different sources of information are saying the same things, then the social researcher can have greater confidence that the findings are valid (Davidson &
Section 4.4, Data Collection, details the specific ways in which triangulation took place within this research.

In reply to Miles and Huberman’s (1994) and Baskerville and Myers’ (2004) criticism that participants of qualitative studies can be influenced by the researcher, an awareness of this limitation, in addition to the careful design of the interview techniques and analysis processes can reduce potential impacts on the proposed research. There is a growing acceptance, that qualitative researchers are ‘central figures who influence, if not actively construct, the collection, selection and interpretation of data’ (Finlay, 2002, p.212). It was acknowledged, during the study design stages that my previous event management experience, and coordination of the 2006 City to Surf could have potential influence over the planned research. Brannick and Coghlan (2007) term this as insider research and argue that a researcher can gain insight into a setting from direct experience within it. It is ‘because we are close to something or know it well, that we can research it’ (Brannick & Coghlan, 2007, p.60). Insider knowledge of a situation or event can have benefits. ‘An outsider may not have access to participants, and most importantly, organizational participants may not sufficiently trust someone who is perceived to be an outsider to share important, but sensitive, data’ (Noesk, 2007). In order to maintain a focussed perspective, researchers need ‘a continued awareness of their role in the construction of knowledge in an effort to enhance the trustworthiness . . . and accountability of the research’ (Finlay, 2002, p.211).

I was aware of my potential partiality to the topic and acknowledged the need to provide a holistic view of the data. This, in turn, allowed me to differentiate between objective and subjective considerations. In an effort to counteract potential predisposed
judgement a bilateral journal and field notes, detailing objective and subjective considerations, were maintained during the data collection period and are described in further detail in Section 4.4.

The presence of insider knowledge also enabled the use of the snowball sampling technique. Bryman and Bell (2011) described snowball sampling as utilising existing contacts to establish contact with others. Davidson and Tolich (1999) suggested that snowballing is a suitable approach when ‘a target population is unknown or when it is difficult to contact people in any other way’ (p. 111). This method was utilised on a number of occasions during the data collection process whereby ‘having identified a small band of likely informants, these informants [were] relied upon to generate contact with other people who shared in the activity the researcher [was] interested in exploring’ (Davidson & Tolich, 1999, p.111).

In summary, a qualitative approach was considered appropriate for this research as it aims to investigate the meaning individuals or organisations ascribe to social issues (Creswell, 2009; Merriam, 2009), the need to gather rich, informative and high quality detailed information (Braun & Clark, 2006; Cresswell, 2000; Eisenhardt, 1989; Thorne, 2000), an attempt to build on theory (Bodgan & Bilken, 1982; Perry, 1998) and the qualitative findings being able to be expressed in terms of real consequences (Gibbs, 2002) for the events industry. Beverland and Lindgreen (2010) and Davidson and Tolich (1990) highlighted the benefits of triangulation within a qualitative research setting to strengthen and validate the data. Triangulation was incorporated into the research design and collection methods and is discussed in further detail in Section 4.4. The process of adopting a qualitative approach also aided in identifying case studies as an
object of inquiry, whereby ‘the investigator explores a real life, contemporary bounded system (a case) or multiple bounded systems (cases) . . . through detailed in depth data collection involving multiple sources’ (Creswell, 2012, p.97). The case study approach is detailed below.

### 4.2.2 A Case Study Approach

Case study research involves the ‘study of the singular, the particular, [and] the unique’ (Simons, 2009, p.1), or a concentrated study of an example (Veal, 2006). Case studies can provide an in-depth understanding of an organisation, event or relationship which incorporates multiple entities (Flyvbjerg, 2007; Hancock & Algozzine, 2006; Gilgun, 2001; Stake, 1995). Theory can then be enhanced ‘by recognising patterns of relationships among certain constructs within and across cases and their underlying logical arguments’ (Eisenhardt, 2007, p.25). While this approach has been overlooked by many researchers in the past, due to its assumed narrow focus, social scientists are now moving towards its more frequent use as its benefits are being realized (Gerring, 2007).

Researchers accustomed to and supportive of case study research have identified a substantial number of benefits associated with its use. Case studies can make an important contribution to research and understanding in areas where limited knowledge is available (Cavaye, 1996; Dark, Shanks & Broadbent, 1998; Punch, 2005). The consolidation of existing literature during the initial research stages of this thesis identified a gap in the research literature on the influences stakeholders can have on event management and the changing nature of acceptable sponsors. A case study approach is useful for addressing research which asks how or why and when. Questions
take on the form of in-depth discussion and/or description (Eisenhardt & Graebner, 2007; Yin, 2004). Case studies are identified by Stake (1995) as a way in which to focus on a specific situation in order to answer a question effectively. Swanborn (2010, p.109) believed that ‘sampling ideas and perceptions from different groups of informants is one of the clear advantages of a case study’. The research questions designed for this thesis examined: the complexities of event stakeholder relationships and how these determine sponsor compatibility or incompatibility; how event management is influenced by pressure from particular stakeholders; and, how event stakeholders position their notions of power to facilitate change in event coordination. Four case studies were selected that could answer these questions effectively: the Christchurch Star City to Surf (henceforth referred to as the City to Surf), the McDonald’s Youth Duathlon (henceforth referred to as the McDonald’s Duathlon), the Adidas Auckland Marathon (henceforth referred to as the Auckland Marathon) and the Ports of Auckland Round the Bays (henceforth referred to as Round the Bays). Event descriptions and outlines for each stakeholder representative interviewed are provided in the proceeding chapter, Chapter Five.

A case study approach can incorporate an historical review of data and/or evidence associated with specific cases (Eisenhardt & Graebner, 2007; Yin, 2004). A component of the data collection and analysis involved reviewing prior issues affecting the present management of specific events, and the subsequent actions and approaches of associated stakeholders. Additionally, case studies can aid in the understanding of the complexity associated with actions and systems (Simons, 2009), and is also considered an effective way in which to study the management strategies of organisations (Eisenhardt, 1989; Larsson, 1993; Mintzberg, 1979). The management strategies of
event managers and complex relationships between event stakeholders are a key element in the research conducted. Gray and Wood (1991) extended the support of case study research further in this sense, noting that case studies make a key contribution to research which focuses on investigating collaborative partnerships.

‘The distinctive need for case studies arises out of the desire to understand complex social phenomena’ (Yin, 2004, p.4). In combination with a qualitative method, case studies can explore the complexities of a situation ‘beyond the scope of more controlled approaches’ (Gillham, 2000, p.11).

Case studies have been utilised in sport event research in the past. For example, Olkkonen (2001) utilised a case study approach in order to analyse the relationship between a mobile phone company and the 1998 International Ski Federation Snowboard World Cup. Olkkonen (2001) argued that the case study approach was an effective way to capture the detail required for the in-depth analysis associated with the research. Olkkonen’s (2001) case study directed its focus on the sponsors of the event, in turn enabling a detailed analysis and understanding of sponsor relationships. More recently, Collins, Jones and Munday (2009) incorporated case studies of the Olympic Games and the FIFA World Cup into their research on environmental impacts of mega sport events. Gibson, Kaplanidou and Kang (2012) focused on six community based sport events in Gainesville, Florida in order to assess associated aspects of economic, social and environmental sustainability. A case study approach was also deemed appropriate by Kose, Argan and Argan (2011) during their review of event management and marketing practices during the 2011 All Star Basketball series in Turkey.
The research conducted for this thesis incorporated many of the characteristics associated with the justifiable use of a case study approach. This case study approach assisted in gaining an in depth understanding of community sport events. Yin (2004) advocated such in depth understanding as one of the key benefits of the case study approach. The effective study of relationship patterns is noted as another attribute of a case study approach (Eisenhardt, 2007; Simons, 2009; Stake, 1995). The planning aspects associated with community based sport events and the identification of their significance in relation to community development and building on existing theory also justified the use of a case study approach (Eisenhardt & Graebner, 2007; Yin, 2004).

4.2.3 Selection of Case Studies

Case studies were identified and selected based on their ability to effectively address the research questions – as identified in Chapter One. The events chosen illuminated the evolving views associated with incompatible community sport event sponsors, in addition to highlighting the impacts of a public health agenda and incorporating a broad range of event stakeholders. Cases were also chosen on the basis of their links with sponsors who had more recently fallen under question from event stakeholders, lacked regulation and who were yet to be guided by legislation. Such sponsors included fast-food outlets (Davis, 2006; Sam et al., 2005; The Press, October 21, 2006), confectionary companies (Carrigan & Carrigan, 1997; Davis, 2006) and soft drink companies (Carrigan & Carrigan, 1997; Davis, 2006; The Press, May 10, 2006). The community sport events selected were New Zealand based. This was due to an existing familiarity with local events, policy and legislation, prior event/stakeholder controversy and an available network of contacts. In an attempt to achieve a national geographical balance, two events were selected from the North Island (Auckland), and two from the South Island.
(Christchurch). Recurrent events with a minimum ten year history of operation were utilized in order to assess any potential changes in sponsorship acceptance through changes to well established long standing relationships with sponsors. These criteria were designed to ensure that the community sport events chosen could serve as examples to other events, fill gaps in the current literature identified in Chapter Two and provide a basis for wider application of the research outcomes – as discussed in Chapter Eight. Flyvbjerg (2006, p.229) supported this approach and argues that ‘the generalizability of case studies can be increased by the strategic selection of cases’ especially ‘when the objective is to achieve the greatest possible amount of information on a given problem or phenomenon’.

Stake (1995) noted that cases should be selected in order to maximise what can be learnt from them. For analytical purposes, individual cases ‘are selected because they are particularly suitable for illuminating and extending relationships and logic among constructs’ (Eisenhardt & Graebner, 2007, p.27). Yin (2004) also supported this perspective. Stake (1995) noted the importance of considering an appropriate balance and variety when it comes to case selection. In accordance with the notion that case studies should focus on a small sample in an in-depth manner (Gerring, 2007; Simons, 2009; Stake, 1995), a total of four case studies of community sport events were conducted. These individual case studies are initially listed in Section 4.2.2 (A Case Study Approach) and are detailed further in Chapter 5.

For the purposes of the research a community sport event was defined as an event staged for social, fun and entertainment value, with a primary target of local participants. These events often produce a range of benefits, including engendering
pride in the community, strengthening a feeling of belonging and creating a sense of place. They can also help expose people to new ideas and experiences, [and] encourage participation in sports activities’ (Allen, O'Toole, Harris & McDonnell, 2008, p. 14). Such events can develop to a point where they also attract large numbers of visitors to a community (Janiskee, 1996).

4.2.4 Identification of Participants

As noted above, the first case study selected was the City to Surf. The researcher’s prior associations with the event allowed direct access to a number of the staff from event stakeholder organisations, including the event manager (The Christchurch Star), Sport Canterbury, the Rotary Club of Christchurch South, the Canterbury District Health Board, the Christchurch City Council and Foodstuffs Ltd (South Island). Staff from these organisations were approached via email and asked if they would be willing to participate in the study. A snowball sampling technique was utilized during this time. For example, the City to Surf coordinator was asked to provide contact details for additional event stakeholders. This resulted in the subsequent invitation of staff from Coca Cola Amatil (South Island) and The Heart Foundation to participate in the study. All of the stakeholders listed above provided provisional consent to be involved in the study. Informed Consent and Participant Information documents were then issued via email, and interview dates, times and locations were primarily scheduled to occur between April 29, 2010 and January 13, 2011.

The second case study selected was the McDonalds Duathlon. This was an event the researcher had previous knowledge of via her work with the City to Surf as both events usually took place during the same weekend. The knowledge of this event introduced an
element of convenience sampling to the identification of participants. Bryman and Bell (2011) noted that drawing a sample from a familiar area is common practice for business researchers. Gaining direct access to the McDonalds Duathlon event manager initially proved challenging. Contact via the event's website and listed email addresses received no response. A snowball sampling technique was, again, adopted via the use of a City to Surf stakeholder (the Rotary Club of Christchurch South) who provided the contact details for the event owner of the McDonald's Duathlon, the Rotary Club of Garden City. The event manager responded to the new emails sent and provisional consent to take part in the study was provided. An interview date, time and location was established. Additional interviews with stakeholders for this event were arranged via the further use of a snowballing technique during the data collection process, the latter of which is highlighted in Section 4.4.

Identification of additional participants was initially proposed via internet searches and event website identification. Stakeholder interest in the research project was to be gauged and a request for access to these stakeholders was to be made to the event manager. However, attempts to contact event sponsors via this line of enquiry failed to produce results. Phone calls were not returned and/or emails were not replied to by many. Those event managers who did make contact were hesitant to release the contact details of their event stakeholders and consequently declined to participate in the research. Reviews of methodology literature found that that was not uncommon. ‘Regardless of the approach taken to define a network, researchers often have difficulty identifying the complete set of organizations and relationships constituting the network’ (Rowley, 1997, p. 905).
As a result of the issues detailed above, the way in which research participants were approached was revised. Rather than relying on the event manager to supply the details of associated stakeholders, current contacts were again utilized and event stakeholders promoted on event websites were contacted directly by the researcher. Transcripts from the City to Surf case study were reviewed at this time in an attempt to identify additional participants. Stakeholders interviewed, including Coca Cola Amatil (South Island) and Sport Canterbury, both of which had made mention of similar events to the City to Surf which were based in Auckland. A snowball sampling method again proved a beneficial technique as it offered broader access to event owners, coordinators and stakeholders. Rowley (1997, p.905) described the approach as ‘useful for collecting relational data’. Those event stakeholders already interviewed were re-contacted in an attempt to gain access to other events in which they had previously identified themselves as being involved. This resulted in the confirmation of the Auckland Marathon and the Round the Bays events as an additional two case studies. Staff from organisations associated with both events, including the Auckland City Council, Coca Cola Amatil (NZ) and the Heart Foundation agreed to be interviewed. The Auckland Marathon owner and coordinator (The Long Run Ltd) and the Round the Bays owner (Fairfax Media New Zealand) also provided provisional agreement to an interview. Interview dates, times and locations were established with each stakeholder.

Figure 4.1 lists the four events selected as case studies and the associated stakeholder representative interviewed. Due to stakeholders holding roles across multiple events, a total of 15 stakeholder representatives were interviewed, across 24 separate event roles. The ‘x’ noted in the following columns represents a stakeholder’s involvement in an event. For example Coca Cola Amatil (NZ) was a stakeholder for the City to Surf,
Auckland Marathon and Round the Bays. An overview of each case study (event) and information on each of the associated stakeholders is provided in the following chapter, Chapter Five.

**Figure 4.1: Event Stakeholder Interview Matrix**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder Organisation</th>
<th>Respondent Codes*</th>
<th>City to Surf</th>
<th>McDonalds Duathlon</th>
<th>Auckland Marathon</th>
<th>Round the Bays</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Christchurch Star</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfax Media</td>
<td>R12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coca Cola Amatil (NZ)</td>
<td>R2B</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coca Cola Amatil (South Island)</td>
<td>R2A</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport Canterbury</td>
<td>R4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport Auckland</td>
<td>R15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Long Run Ltd</td>
<td>R14</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury District Health Board</td>
<td>R3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotary Club of Christchurch South</td>
<td>R5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foodstuffs South Island (Ltd)</td>
<td>R6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Heart Foundation (NZ)</td>
<td>R7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland City Council</td>
<td>R13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch City Council</td>
<td>R8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotary Club of Garden City</td>
<td>R10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDonalds (Christchurch)</td>
<td>R9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The respondent code is used to refer to interviewees in the reporting of data findings and analysis

**Section 4.3: Ethical Considerations**

Research ethics are designed as a form of regulation which covers researchers, the people and the fields they study (Flick, 2009). Miller, Mauthner, Birch and Jessop (2012, p.2) believed that

> ethical questions in the research relationship, the use of data and the interpretive and analytical processes have all become more significant as the landscape of qualitative research continues to
change and researchers face new issues when using new tools to produce knowledge.

Bryman and Bell (2011) argued the importance of ethics, noting that they cannot and should not be ignored as they impact upon the integrity of the research being conducted. This section details the ethical procedures followed for the purpose of this thesis, beginning with the application for ethics approval from the Griffith University Human Research Ethics Committee (HREC).

4.3.1 Ethics Approval

In accordance with the guidelines outlined by HREC, ethical clearance was required on the basis that the research involved the study of humans and information potentially sensitive in nature with regard to corporate confidentiality. Approval for ethical clearance was granted on March 22, 2010 together with authorisation for research to commence (GU Ref No: HSL/29/09/HREC). An ethics progress report was requested by HREC on April 6, 2011. This was submitted and approved on April 20, 2011.

4.3.2 Interviewee Ethical Procedures

Each interviewee invited to participate in the study was emailed initial information about the study, the purpose of the research, the proposed interview procedure, expectations of the interviewee, the use of data collected and the confidentiality in which the data would be treated. Documentation pertaining to the email is located in Appendices 9.1.
Confirmed interviewees were asked to read and sign an “Informed Consent” form at the beginning of their interview. A copy of this form is located in Appendices 9.2. The primary purpose of this document was to provide an overview of and background on the study, outline the benefits and risks associated with participating in the study. It also provided the researcher with permission to make an audio recording of the interview.

4.3.3 Data Storage and Confidentiality

The information gathered from respondents varied in degrees of sensitivity and was therefore deemed confidential. Transcripts and information gathered on individual cases was kept confidential at all times. The use of the data collected only occurred with the express written permission of the relevant respondent. In order to ensure the security of the information, paper copies of transcripts, digital interview recordings, interview audio tapes and documents were stored in a locked cabinet. Computer files and flash-drives containing voice recordings, transcripts and data analysis files were password encrypted. Printed media articles were taken from sources available to the public and so any identifiers were already public knowledge.

All information gathered for the purpose of this thesis will be continue to be stored as above for a period of two years. This will allow the researcher to re-visit any of the data for further research purposes associated with this thesis and address any enquiries should they arise. This is in accordance with the ethical guidelines produced by Griffith University’s HREC.
Section 4.4 Data Collection

This section outlines the data collection procedures adopted for this thesis. Firstly, justification is provided for the use of semi-structured interviews. This is followed by a discussion on the considerations and incorporation of triangulation. Lastly, identification points associated with reaching data saturation point are highlighted.

4.4.1 Semi-Structured Interviews

This study utilised semi-structured interviews as a means of understanding community sport event stakeholders’ perspectives. Interviews can be an essential source of information in qualitative case study research, as they offer the most appropriate way in which to access the views of participants and gain an understanding of how they have interpreted situations (Darke, Shanks & Broadbent, 1998). Each case study incorporated in-depth, semi-structured, qualitative interviews with the event manager of the selected community sport event. This was done so in order to gain an overview of the event manager's role and any issues related to, for example, sponsor selection or event stakeholder influence. In-depth, semi-structured, qualitative interviews also took place with a number of staff who represented the event stakeholder organisations. These representatives were interviewed based on their accessibility and willingness to participate. This approach aided in the understanding of event stakeholder perspectives and relationships.

A series of targeted interview questions was devised to act as a prompt for the semi-structured interviews noted above. These questions were based upon the research questions established at the design stage of the study, and from the themes identified within the literature review. Separate sets of research questions were designed for
event managers (Set 1: Event Manager Interview Questions) and consequent event stakeholders (Set 2: Event Stakeholder Interview Questions) in order to gauge the perceptions stakeholders had of each other and how event managers attempted to coordinate the varying stakeholders involved in their events. This latter acknowledgement utilizes Rowley’s (1997) stakeholder centrality theory (outlined in Chapter 3) and positions the event manager at the centre of the community sport event stakeholder network. This approach is outline further in Chapter 5 where a stakeholder relationship map has been provided for each case study (event). An interview schedule outlining the prescribed interview questions used can be found in Appendices 9.3.

Data collection began in April 2010, when a field trip to Christchurch, New Zealand took place. Eight interviews were conducted with stakeholders from the City to Surf and the McDonalds Duathlon. A second field trip to Auckland took place at the end of September 2010 in order to conduct a further six interviews with stakeholders from the Auckland Marathon and the Round the Bays. A third field trip to Christchurch took place in January 2011, where an additional interview with a stakeholder for the City to Surf and McDonald's Duathlon took place. All interviews were conducted face-to-face at the prospective interviewees’ workplace or at an alternate safe location of their choice. This choice enabled the researcher to establish a rapport with the participants (Gratton & Jones, 2004). Each interview took between 35 to 55 minutes. Interviews were recorded on a digital hand-held voice recorder, for later transcription. The initial sets of predetermined qualitative interview questions (See Appendices 9.3) were asked, from which further discussion and questions followed. Figure 4.2 located in Appendices 9.4 details the interview dates, locations, interview question sets used, supporting materials provided and where a snowballing technique was utilised.
4.4.2 Triangulation

Triangulation involves the employment of more than one method of research in order to produce greater confidence in the research findings (Bryman & Bell, 2011). Swanborn (2010) associated triangulation with the enrichment of case study data via diversifying methods of data collection. In order to strengthen the validity of the findings from the semi-structured interviews (Davidson & Tolich, 1999), the data collection process incorporated additional data collection techniques, including document collection and the maintenance of a journal and field notes. Together these acted as a method of triangulation (Davidson & Tolich, 1999).

Documents, including printed promotional materials, newspaper articles, organisation policy documents and stakeholder websites were utilised for the purpose of background information and for comparison with or expansion of information collected from respondents. Merriam (2009) noted that documents such as written records and visual data are a valuable resource for confirming insights gained through interviews. A number of researchers consider this process as an unobtrusive way in which to examine an environment and to triangulate emerging findings (Creswell, 2009; Gratton & Jones, 2004; Jennings, 2001; Merriam, 2009). A summary of the documents collected can be found in Appendices 9.5.

In accordance with acknowledging the researcher’s partiality to the topic, a bilateral journal was maintained. Following each interview, the researcher divided a page in her notebook into three columns. The first column outlined the main concepts discussed by the respondent taken from field notes made during the interview. The second column noted any personal thoughts or reflections from the researcher on these concepts based
on their prior event management experience. The third column identified potential links to concepts identified during the literature review process and/or from other case studies or stakeholders. Detailing both the objective and subjective considerations relative to the data collected further enhanced data validity via triangulation (Davidson & Tolich, 1999; Grbich, 2007), in addition to aiding in the practice of constant comparison. The information in this journal helped to modify or add to the interview question sets in addition to reconfirming the relevance of the chosen topic. Secondly, it assisted in identifying areas in which additional reviews of literature may need to take place and ascertain new stakeholder perspectives and opinions. Finally, journal notes helped to confirm when data saturation point had been reached.

4.4.3 Saturation Point

Verification and completeness of data occurs in a study when data replication takes place (Bowen, 2008). This completeness refers to the stage in data collection when information begins repeating itself and the researcher is confident nothing new can be gained by further conducting interviews (Auerbach & Silverstein, 2003; Hancock & Algozzine, 2006; Lyons & Coyle, 2008; Mills et al., 2010). This stage is referred to as ‘saturation point’. Charmaz (2003) noted that saturation point requires some form of data analysis to occur in order for the identification of repetitive thematic categories to take place and a conclusion to be drawn that data collection is complete. Saturation is discussed within this step of the methodology to establish when data collection was considered complete and a more systematic in-depth analysis of the data could begin. While the data analysis process associated with this research is outlined briefly below in order to explain how saturation was established, a more detailed description of the data analysis process can be found in Section 4.5.
Initial data analysis of the first two case studies took place following the field trip to Christchurch in April, 2010. Analysis of the second two case studies followed upon the researcher’s return to Australia from Auckland in October, 2010. Through a revision of note in the bilateral journal, a review of the interview transcripts and printed documents collected and the initial coding of transcripts, a number of saturation point markers were noted. Interview data were supported and verified by the responses of multiple stakeholders, printed documents and field notes. Similar stakeholder perspectives and points of difference were identified, along with similar approaches to stakeholder management and any repetition of issues experienced by event managers and stakeholders.

With regard to ascertaining that an appropriate number of case studies had been selected, Perry (1998, p.792) acknowledged that more than one case study ‘should usually be used in postgraduate research’ to enable cross-case analysis and the subsequent development of rich theory building. In doing so, however, it is also pertinent to remember that ‘we do not study a case primarily to understand other cases’ (Stoke, 1995, p.4). Cross-case analysis is something which occurs as an indirect result of conducting multiple case studies. Eisenhardt (1989) recommended the use of between four and ten cases, noting that with less than four cases theory generation is more difficult. Hedges (1985, pp.76-77) prescribed four to six case studies as reasonable for a serious research project. Perry (1998) noted that prestigious peer reviewed publications, such as the European Journal of Marketing, accept a minimum as low as two.
It is also important to acknowledge the difference in research approaches for general academic studies and postgraduate research. In many cases, researchers who have proffered ideal case study numbers fail to take into consideration the time and funding constraints associated with postgraduate research (Perry, 1998). The more case studies involved, the higher the costs involved (Hedges, 1985) and the more unwieldy a study can become (Miles & Huberman, 1994).

Further support for utilizing a small number of cases is proffered by Gerring (2007) who argued that in-depth knowledge of a small group is more helpful than superficial knowledge gained from assessing a larger number of examples. Single cases, or smaller samples, can be just ‘as viable as a complex case study or multiple case studies when the analysis is of high quality, is well documented and contributes to theoretical understandings’ (Gilgun, 2001, p. 1). ‘In qualitative research it is not the numbers that make the data valid, but rather the logical integration of data from different sources’ (Davidson & Tolich, 1999, p.34). Also in support of a smaller number of case studies, Flyvbjerg (2006, p. 241) noted that ‘the advantage of large samples is breadth, where as their problem is one of depth’.

In relation to the number of interviews conducted, within each case study, Perry (1998) noted that PhD interviews would ideally involve three interviews at different hierarchical levels. The research conducted for this thesis has provided a more in depth analysis of four case studies, utilizing a minimum of five interviews for each. Essentially, for qualitative research which incorporates a case study approach, it is not about how many cases there were or how many respondents were interviewed, but ‘the validity, meaningfulness and insights generated from qualitative inquiry have more to do with
the information-richness of the cases selected and the observational/analytical capabilities of the researcher than with sample size' (Patton, 1990, p.185).

As depicted in Figure 4.1, a total of four case studies and 15 interviews which spanned across a total of 24 stakeholder positions were conducted for the purpose of this thesis. The sample size was justified based on; the research being part of a postgraduate thesis and therefore limited by time and particularly available funding (Hedges, 1995; Miles & Huberman, 1994; Perry, 1998); the creation of a conceptual framework being noted as acceptable from as few as four case studies, according to Eisenhardt (1989); the use of four case studies allowing cross-case analysis in an in-depth, yet manageable manner (Gerring, 2007; Gilgun, 2001; Miles & Huberman, 1994; Perry, 1998; Simons, 2009; Stake, 1995); the number of cases selected falls within recommendations that more than one case, but less than six are appropriate for PhD studies (Hedges; 1985; Perry, 1998); and, those stakeholders interviewed in this case held key roles within each event and were therefore able to provide an in-depth and comprehensive viewpoint of the research, without information being spread too thinly (Mills, Durepos & Wiebe, 2010).

Section 4.5: Data Analysis

This research involved a staged data analysis process which incorporated a computer based and manual qualitative data coding processes supported by Auerbach and Silverstein (2003), Bazeley (2007), Gillham (2000), Holstein and Gubrium (1995) and Pope, Ziebland and Mays (2000). A cyclical process of analysis was also adopted which supported the use of constant comparison (Lyons & Coyle, 2007; Westbrook, 1990). These data analysis process are outlined in further detail below.
4.5.1 The Coding Process

The analysis of qualitative data requires the systematic grouping and summarising of descriptions and providing an organising framework that encapsulates and explains the respondents’ perceptions of the phenomena (Auerbach & Silverstein, 2003; Gillham, 2000; Holstein & Gubrium, 1995). Bazeley (2007) and Pope, Ziebland and Mays (2000) acknowledged that computer software can prove a useful aid when organising and reporting data. A number of software packages have been developed in recent years which aid in qualitative data analysis. For example, NVivo is predominantly useful for the analysis of text and language (Bazeley, 2007; Gibbs, 2002). NVivo can also help to organise and manage the data collected, in addition to providing visual links between themes and concepts which arise from the coding process (Bazeley, 2007).

‘Qualitative research uses analytical categories to describe and explain social phenomena’ (Pope, Ziebland & Mays, 2000, p. 114). These analytical categories are produced through a process of ‘coding’. Coding is a technique which is used within qualitative analysis to reduce and organise the data (Myers & Newman, 2007). In order to analyse the data, the researcher employed a three stage coding process of open, axial and selective coding (Creswell, 2006). This process was adopted as it offered a structured and organised way to review and reduce the data in addition to enabling unforeseen findings to emerge (Darke, Shanks & Broadbent, 1998).

The audio recordings of the interviews conducted with community sport event stakeholders were transcribed and imported into NVivo8. The first step of the coding process involved sorting text from the transcripts and collected printed documents via a process of open coding. Auerbach and Silverstein (2003) described this process as the
classification of repetitive ideas or concepts. The transcripts were read and re-read and words, phrases or segments of text were highlighted and linked (coded) to new and/or reoccurring categories - established as nodes within the NVivo8 software. Following this, axial coding took place in order to identify any relationships between the predominant concepts (Lyons & Coyle, 2007).

The process of axial coding “relates categories to subcategories, specifies the properties and dimensions of a category and resembles the data fractured during initial coding to give coherence to the emerging analysis” (Charmaz, 2006, p. 60). Sub-categories and links between the categories established during the open coding process were added at this stage through the use of tree nodes within the NVivo8 software program. Gibbs (2002, p.4) noted that during this process ‘the researcher does not count the occurrences of code rather, a link between the code and the coded text is maintained so that by retrieving the code the original words can be displayed’. An example of axial coding is provided below in Figure 4.2.

Figure 4.2: Data Coding Process (A)

‘If the values of the organisers . . . manifest and are no longer the values that we, as an organisation, have then we have an obligation to no longer participate. Because we are there promoting our business . . . promoting, improving and critiquing the health of our community. If anything goes against that then we no longer want to be involved in it’ (R3, Corporate Team Entrant).

The final coding step involved selective coding. This process assisted in identifying which themes were central to the study (Creswell, 2003) and aided in framing the discussion in Chapters Six, Seven and Eight. Major themes were grouped together and
reviewed against the consolidated literature, selected theoretical framework and research questions designed for the study in order to identify connections for reporting purposes. An example of the selective coding process is provided below in Figure 4.3. Additionally, in relation to the analysis of documents, a document matrix was developed linking individual documents from stakeholder organisations to each of the themes identified. This matrix can be located in Appendices 9.6.

**Figure 4.3: Data Coding Process (B)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Selective Coding Themes</th>
<th>Post-Selective Coding Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder role classification</td>
<td>Stakeholder Classification Perceptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-classification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchical status</td>
<td>Legitimacy of Power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-existing relationships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal agenda</td>
<td>Stakeholder Responsiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demands relative to event size</td>
<td>Image Maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant and public choice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public health agenda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resourcing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value alignment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate social responsibility (CSR)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Stakeholder Management Initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early detection of conflict</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detailed contract establishment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirmation of stakeholder expectations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular relationship review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of actions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishing policies for stakeholder alignment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsorship levels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.5.2 Constant Comparison

The process of constant comparison also took place whereby ‘as segments of text [were] identified, they [were] examined against previous categories for similarities and differences’ (Lyons & Coyle, 2007, p. 79). Interview data were initially analysed on a cyclical basis. Interviews associated with the City to Surf and McDonalds Duathlon case studies were conducted, transcribed and preliminarily analysed. This preliminary analysis included the identification of key themes and issues. Interviews were then conducted, transcribed and analysed with regard to the Auckland Marathon and the Round the Bays case studies. Westbrook (1990, p. 74) supported this approach to data analysis, noting that ‘qualitative methods encourage and support continuous examination as they are, by nature, cyclical’. Data analysis on a cyclical basis and the use of the constant comparison process aided in the adjustment of approaches and questions as the data collection and analysis progressed. This process also allowed a required change in the data collection approach after accessibility issues were experienced by the researcher shortly after the collection of data related to the two Christchurch-based case studies.

4.6 Summary of Limitations

A number of limitations were encountered during this research. These limitations included difficulty accessing stakeholders as well as travel, financial and time restrictions. Each is discussed in further detail below.

Firstly, attempts to contact event stakeholders during the initial stage of research enquiry frequently failed to produce results. Many phone calls were not returned and/or emails went without reply. Those event managers who did make contact were
hesitant to release the contact details of their event stakeholders and consequently declined to participate in the research. Reviews of methodology literature found that this was not uncommon. ‘Regardless of the approach taken to define a network, researchers often have difficulty identifying the complete set of organizations and relationships constituting the network’ (Rowley, 1997, p. 905). A snowball technique reduced but failed to entirely eliminate the impacts of this restricted stakeholder access. This meant that a limited number of stakeholder representatives were interviewed with regard to some case studies.

Secondly, insider knowledge proved advantageous in identifying and gaining consent from significant numbers of City to Surf stakeholders. This confirmed the arguments supporting insider knowledge, in that such knowledge of an organisation or situation can allow the researcher to gain direct insight into an organisation and enhance trustworthiness (Brannick and Coghlan, 2007; Finlay, 2002; Noesk, 2002). Accessing stakeholders associated with the Auckland Marathon, Auckland Round the Bays and McDonalds Duathlon proved more difficult due to a limited amount of insider knowledge, hence a reduced number of stakeholders were sourced from the associated events. This finding supports Noesk’s (2007) argument that outsiders may have difficulty accessing research respondents nor be trusted with important or sensitive data. Rowley (1997) confirms this occurrence to often be the case when researchers attempt to identify a complete set of organisations and relationships constituting a specific network.

Travel, financial and time restrictions were also faced by the researcher, primarily due to the distance between the researcher’s base in Brisbane, Australia and the study
area (New Zealand). Consequently, this limited the number and location of events selected as case studies.

Chapter Review

This chapter has provided an overview of the research design developed for this study. The use of a qualitative approach and incorporation of a case study methodology has been outlined and justified. An explanation of how each case study was selected and respondents identified has been provided. This was followed by a description of the data collection procedure and the three-stage coding process used for analysis purposes.

The following chapters outline and analytically discuss the qualitative data collected for this study. Chapter Five summarises and thematically displays the data collected from the event stakeholders. Chapter Six then provides an in-depth discussion and analysis of the findings, which incorporates the literature reviewed in Chapter Two and the selected theoretical frameworks summarised in Chapter Three.
Chapter Five
Descriptive Results (Part A): Case Study Overviews

This chapter introduces and describes the four community sport events chosen as case studies for the purpose of this thesis. The events were the City to Surf, the McDonald's Duathlon, the Auckland Marathon and Round the Bays. An in depth description of each event stakeholder, including where possible, a record of their involvement with each event, is provided. Stakeholder relationship maps, providing a holistic overview of stakeholder roles and relationships, have been created for each case study and are located in Section 5.5. These maps position the event manager as the central stakeholder in the community sport event network due to their management role across the event and their coordination of all associated stakeholders. This positioning aligns with Rowley’s (1997) network of stakeholder influences, whereby power is obtained through network structure, especially in regard to centrality within that structure. This approach is discussed in further detail in Chapters Six and Seven. A descriptive summary of thematic results from stakeholder interviews and an analysis of findings are located respectively in Chapters Six and Seven.

Due to the limited number of stakeholders willing to participate in this study, it is important to note that the stakeholders listed below represent a proportion of the total number of stakeholders associated with each event. Rowley (1997) confirmed such an occurrence is often the case when researchers attempt to identify a complete set of organizations and relationships constituting a specific network.
5.1 The Christchurch Star City to Surf

The City to Surf was an annual 12 kilometre fun run/walk, which had its starting point in Christchurch’s Cathedral Square and finished at QEII Stadium, to the North East of the City. Created and owned by The Christchurch Star newspaper (a division of APN Media), the event began in 1975 and has a 37 year history as the largest fun run in New Zealand’s South Island. Participant numbers have increased annually, with the event attracting approximately 14,000 entrants of all ages in 2010. Participants could enter as individuals or as team (e.g. corporate or school). Upon registering, participants received a registration sticker and access to a range of free sponsor products - including bottles of Powerade (The Christchurch Star, 2010). Following completion of the fun run/walk, participants gathered in an area behind QEII Stadium. This area comprised of a large stage, sponsor displays, food and drink stalls, and corporate sites sold to corporate teams to host their own end-of-event functions and advertise their products/services. Entrants gathered in front of the stage to listen to bands and watch sponsor presentations. At the end of the event, the event managers presented team awards and an array of individual spot prizes and a major prize consisting of a trip for two to the Sydney City to Surf.

Due to the September 4th, 2010 and February 22nd, 2011 earthquakes in Christchurch, the event route was significantly affected by ‘land cracks’. A number of buildings in Cathedral Square sustained major damage and were subsequently demolished, including the Cathedral itself. Many suburbs on the east side of the city were deemed uninhabitable and QEII Stadium, also located on the city’s east side, was demolished. (The Press, 2011; TVNZ, 2011). As a result, the 2011 City to Surf was cancelled. The event returned in 2012, offering a new route from Pioneer Stadium to Ferrymead Park.
Coca Cola Amatil (NZ) remained as the major sponsor however the naming rights product was switched from Pump back to Powerade. The reasons for and implications of this decision are discussed in Chapter Seven.

A total of eight City to Surf stakeholder representatives were interviewed for the purposes of this research. Those individuals interviewed were representatives of organisations who classed as stakeholders of the event at the time the research was conducted. Table 5.1 below identifies the role each stakeholder organisation held within the event as identified by the event owner. A detailed description of each stakeholder organisation and their involvement with the event will follow in Section 5.6.

Table 5.1: Stakeholders Interviewed from the City to Surf

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Stakeholder Type</th>
<th>Respondent Position Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Christchurch Star</td>
<td>Event Owner</td>
<td>Event Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coca Cola Amatil</td>
<td>Naming Rights Sponsor</td>
<td>Marketing Services Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury District Healthboard (CDHB)</td>
<td>Corporate Team Entrant</td>
<td>General Manager, Community &amp; Public Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch City Council</td>
<td>Facilitator &amp; Corporate Team Entrant</td>
<td>Events Development Adviser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foodstuffs (South Island) Ltd</td>
<td>Sponsor &amp; Corporate Team Entrant</td>
<td>Group Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Rotary Club of Christchurch South</td>
<td>Volunteer Group</td>
<td>Club President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Heart Foundation</td>
<td>Recipient Charity/Facilitator</td>
<td>Events Marketer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport Canterbury</td>
<td>Facilitator &amp; Corporate Team Entrant</td>
<td>Business Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A stakeholder relationship map, providing a holistic overview of stakeholder roles and relationships has been created for this study and can be found on the following page.
Figure 5.1: City to Surf Stakeholder Relationship Map

1) Sport Canterbury is partially funded by the Canterbury District Health Board
2) Coca Cola Amatil (NZ) supplies vending machines and product to the Canterbury District Health Board
3) The Canterbury District Health Board advertise with the Christchurch Star
4) Foodstuffs advertise with the Christchurch Star
5) Sport Canterbury and the Christchurch City Council are government funded
5.2 The McDonalds Youth Duathlon

The McDonald’s Duathlon is an annual run and cycle event held in Christchurch’s South Hagley Park for individuals between the ages of seven and 16. The event, which is organised by the Rotary Club of Garden City Christchurch, has taken place for over 14 years and draws over 1000 participants. Emphasis is placed on participation rather than competition. The event starts and finishes beside the Christchurch Netball Centre located within South Hagley Park. Seven to ten year olds take part in a 1km run, 4km cycle and 500m run. Eleven to sixteen year olds take part in a 2km run, 8km cycle and 1km run. Registered entrants receive a gift pack of sponsors products, including a breakfast pack from McDonald’s and a certificate of completion. Spot prizes are also drawn during the day (R9, volunteer group). Funds raised from the event are used to support youth projects throughout the Christchurch community.

A total of five McDonald’s Duathlon stakeholder representatives were interviewed for the purposes of this research. Those individuals interviewed were representatives of organisations classed as stakeholders of the event at the time the research was conducted. Table 5.2 below identifies the role each stakeholder organisation held within the event as identified by the event owner. A detailed description of each stakeholder organisation and their involvement with the event will follow in Section 5.6.

Table 5.2: Stakeholders Interviewed from the McDonald’s Duathlon

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Stakeholder Type</th>
<th>Respondent Position Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sport Canterbury</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>Business Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDonald’s (Christchurch)</td>
<td>Major Sponsor</td>
<td>Group Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch City Council</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>Events Development Adviser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Rotary Club of Garden City</td>
<td>Event Owner/Volunteer Group</td>
<td>Club President</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A stakeholder relationship map, providing a holistic overview of stakeholder roles and relationships has been created for this study and can be found on the following page.
Figure 5.2: McDonald's Duathlon Stakeholder Relationship Map

Pre-existing relationships indicated by dotted lines:

1= The event organising committee are also members of the Garden City Rotary club
2= Sport Canterbury and the Christchurch City Council are government funded organisations
5.3 The Adidas Auckland Marathon

This annual event usually takes place in October and includes a range of distance options for participants, including the full marathon, half marathon, quarter marathon, 5km run and walk and the kids marathon. The event course runs from Devonport (on Auckland’s North Shore), across the Harbour bridge and along Auckland City’s waterfront. The return leg follows the same course back to the Viaduct Harbour, finishing at Victoria Park.

Entrant numbers average approximately 14,000 and include a range of fitness levels, from elite runners through to the recreational runner/walker aiming to achieve a personal fitness goal or finish time. Registered entrants receive a race pack including t-shirt, race number and timing chip. Powerade, Coca Cola and Pump water are distributed to registered participants along the route and at the finish line (The Long Run Ltd, 2010). A corporate village and 'picnic in the park' is set up at the finish line to accommodate participants and supporters (from individuals and families to corporate groups). Entertainment is an important factor in the layout of tents and marquees. Teams have the opportunity to create their own team 'lounge' within the village and enjoy the entertainment on stage throughout the day.

A total of five Auckland Marathon stakeholder representatives were interviewed for the purposes of this research. Those individuals interviewed were representatives of organisations classed as stakeholders of the event at the time the research was conducted. Table 5.3 below identifies the role each stakeholder organisation held within the event as identified by the event owner. A detailed description of each stakeholder organisation and their involvement with the event will follow in Section 5.6.
Table 5.3: Stakeholders Interviewed from the Auckland Marathon

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Stakeholder Type</th>
<th>Respondent Position Title</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Long Run Ltd</td>
<td>Event Owner</td>
<td>Race Director</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coca Cola Amatil (NZ)</td>
<td>Major Sponsor</td>
<td>Marketing Activation Manager</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport Auckland</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>Community Sport Director</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland City Council</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>Program Manager – Event Sponsorship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Heart Foundation</td>
<td>Recipient Charity</td>
<td>Events Marketer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A stakeholder relationship map, providing a holistic overview of stakeholder roles and relationships has been created for this study and can be found on the following page.
Figure 5.3: Auckland Marathon Stakeholder Relationship Map

The Heart Foundation
Is the official recipient charity for the event and utilizes this position to promote its key values

Auckland City Council
Act as an event sponsor and facilitator. This organisation assists with the logistical elements of the event, such as road closures, parking and the booking of council owned venues.

Sport Auckland
Acts as a facilitator, encouraging participation in the event.

The Long Run (Ltd)
The owners and coordinators of the event

Coca Cola Amatil (NZ)
One of the major sponsors who provide product (Powerade, Pump water and Coca Cola) and sponsorship dollars.

Pre-existing relationships indicated by dotted lines:
1) Sport Auckland and the Auckland City Council are government funded
5.4 The Ports of Auckland Round the Bays

Round the Bays is an annual event, originally initiated by the Auckland Joggers Club in 1972. The event has grown to be one of the world’s largest fun-runs with nearly 40,000 registered runners. Today the event is a joint collaboration between the Auckland Joggers Club and Fairfax Media. The run is 8.4km long over a flat course that follows the contours of Auckland’s Waitemata harbour. It is started in the City on Quay St and finishes on the waterfront at St Heliers Bay. Every registered participant of Ports of Auckland Round the Bays receives a runner number to wear on the day and a personalised certificate recording the time they completed (Fairfax Media, 2010).

A total of five Round the Bays stakeholder representatives were interviewed for the purposes of this thesis. Those individuals interviewed were representatives of organisations classed as stakeholders of the event at the time the research was conducted. Table 5.4 below identifies the role each stakeholder organisation held within the event as identified by the event owner. A detailed description of each stakeholder organisation and their involvement with the event will follow in Section 5.6.

Table 5.4: Stakeholders Interviewed from the Round the Bays

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Stakeholder Type</th>
<th>Respondent Position Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fairfax Media</td>
<td>Event Owner</td>
<td>Marketing Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coca Cola Amatil (NZ)</td>
<td>Major Sponsor</td>
<td>Marketing Activation Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Heart Foundation</td>
<td>Recipient Charity</td>
<td>Events Marketer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland City Council</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>Program Manager – Event Sponsorship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport Auckland</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>Community Sport Director</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A stakeholder relationship map, providing a holistic overview of stakeholder roles and relationships has been created for this study and can be found on the following page.
Figure 5.4: Round the Bays Stakeholder Relationship Map

- **Coca Cola Amatil (NZ)**: One of the major sponsors who provide product (Fruit water).
- **The Heart Foundation**: Acts as a facilitator for the event and utilizes this position to promote its key values (See Section?)
- **Fairfax Media**: The event creators and owners. *N.B. This event is coordinated by Fund Events Ltd who declined to participate in this study.*
- **Sport Auckland**: Acts as a facilitator, encouraging participation in the event.
- **Auckland City Council**: Acts as an event sponsor (waiving council fees) and facilitator. This organisation assists with the logistical elements of the event, such as road closures, parking and the booking of council owned venues.

Pre-existing relationships indicated by dotted lines:
1) Sport Auckland and the Auckland City Council are government funded
2) Coca Cola Amatil (NZ) advertise with Fairfax Media
5.5 Event Stakeholder Summaries

This section provides a brief description of and background information on each stakeholder organisation from which a respective representative was interviewed for the purpose of this thesis. For continuity purposes, stakeholder descriptions are categorised and presented based on the stakeholder types identified previously in Section 5.4.

5.5.1. Stakeholder Type: Event Owner

This section provides an overview of each of the stakeholder representatives interviewed and classified as an event owner.

The Christchurch Star is a division of Australian owned APN News & Media and is best known in New Zealand for its namesake publication (The Christchurch Star) - a free broadsheet newspaper published on Wednesday and Friday respectively. The company considers itself to be committed to the community and supports a number of sport codes and cultural activities, including the organisation of events such as City to Surf, The Star Home Show and The North Canterbury Home Show (Christchurch Star, 2011). The City to Surf was initially developed by a group of Christchurch Star employees in 1974 and first took place in 1975. The company coordinates all facets of the event, this includes budgeting, marketing, sponsorship coordination, volunteer recruitment and training, event set up and break down. The Christchurch Star hires a full time event manager between October and April to oversee the entire event planning and provision process.
The McDonalds Duathlon was initially conceived by David Manson (the current event manager) over 15 years ago. David spent some time developing the event and trialling it at Bottle Lake Forest on Christchurch’s east side, before establishing it as a regular event. As a new member of the Rotary Club of Garden City at the time, he proposed to the club to adopt the event as a fundraising and community-building activity, run under his supervision. The event has since been an annual fundraiser for the club (R11, Personal Communication, May 3, 2010). The Rotary Club of Garden City was established in 1991. Each year the Club participates in a calendar of community and international projects and social events. Club members participate in tree plantings at local reserves, to running speech contests for high school students and holding fundraising evenings to supporting people with disabilities (Rotary Club of Garden City, 2011).

The Auckland Marathon is owned and managed by The Long Run Ltd., an Auckland based event management company, whose portfolio also includes managing the Mission Bay Jazz and Blues Streetfest. The Long Run Ltd. focuses on the operational and logistical aspects of the event, in addition to public relations and sponsorship. Their association with the event spans (directly and indirectly) more than 20 years, with one of the event managers recalling the logistical issues associated with re-directing the event route across the Auckland Harbour Bridge in 1991 (R14, Personal Communication, September 27, 2010).

Fairfax Media purchased the rights to the Round the Bays event from the Auckland Joggers Association in 2003 (R12, Personal Communication, October 1, 2010). Fairfax Media is the largest integrated metropolitan, rural and regional, magazine and digital media company in Australasia, with publications and websites in every State in
Australia and throughout New Zealand. It established its operation in New Zealand in 2003 following purchase of the publishing assets of Independent Newspapers Ltd (INL). The company publishes a range of newspapers, magazines and digital media (Fairfax Media, 2011). While Fairfax Media own the event, there is still a strong association with the Auckland Joggers Association. The management of the event is contracted out to local event management company Pants Events, whilst the promotion of the event remains with Fairfax Media and is specifically associated with the Sunday Star Times and Auckland Communities publications (R12, Personal Communication, October 1, 2010). Pants Events declined to participate as a research respondent, citing confidentiality concerns.

5.5.2 Stakeholder Type: Sponsor

This section provides an overview of each of the stakeholder representatives interviewed and classified as an event sponsor.

Coca Cola Amatil (NZ) was the major sponsor of the City to Surf – specifically its South Island based branch. The company manufactures, sells and distributes a diversified product portfolio including carbonated soft drinks, water, sports and energy drinks, fruit juice, flavoured milk, coffee and packaged ready-to-eat fruit and vegetable products. Coca Cola Amatil (NZ) had held the role of a major sponsor for the City to Surf for over 10 years after replacing Fresh Up, owned by Frucor New Zealand. Up until and including 2006 Coca Cola Amatil supported the event via its sports drink product ‘Powerade’. However, after complaints surfaced over the use of this product, the company was pressured to promote its ‘Pump’ water product as the sponsoring product instead. As part of the sponsorship agreement, Coca Cola Amatil (NZ) provide the City to
Surf with bottles of Pump water, in addition to a substantial amount of sponsorship dollars to assist with the costs of staging the event.

Coca Cola Amatil is also one of the general sponsors for the Auckland Marathon. It provides a combination of Powerade product (bottled and powder), Coca Cola (flat) and water to event participants, in addition to a nominal amount of funding to support event operating costs. The company has been involved as a stakeholder (sponsor) in the Auckland Marathon since 2001. While representing the New Zealand based Coca Cola Amatil organisation – the company’s representatives who coordinate and liaise with the Auckland Marathon are located at the company’s head offices in Auckland. Similar to their South Island counterpart, the Auckland based branch focuses on product manufacturing and is partially owned by The Coca Cola Company (Coca Cola Amatil, 2011).

Coca Cola Amatil also associate their ‘Pump’ water brand with the Round the Bays event, providing event participants with the product during the run and at the finish-line.

Foodstuffs South Island Limited is part of a national (New Zealand) co-operative. The organisation began acquiring supermarkets in the mid 1950s, with the subsequent formation of the New World group in 1963 and the PAK'nSAVE group in 1986. Foodstuffs South Island (Ltd) held a pre-existing advertising relationship with the Christchurch Star, prior to being approached as a sponsor by the City to Surf event managers in 2004. At this time, the Foodstuffs South Island Limited marketing coordinator agreed to provide the event with 15,000 Pams muesli bars to distribute
during the promotional lead up to the event and to participants at the finish line on event day. The Pams range of products is the exclusive brand of the Foodstuffs group. Initially launched in 1937, the Pams product range consists of approximately 2,500 lines including most of the volume selling grocery product groups in New Zealand supermarkets (Foodstuffs, 2011; Pams, 2011).

McDonald’s are the major and naming rights sponsor for the McDonalds Duathlon. McDonald’s is an internationally recognised fast-food chain, originating from the United States of America. In New Zealand, 80 per cent of McDonald’s restaurants are franchised by local business men and women who own and operate their restaurants as independent businesses (McDonalds, 2011). The McDonald’s Duathlon has had a long standing relationship with the owner/operators of Christchurch’s two largest McDonald’s restaurants located at Riccarton and Merivale, who agreed to sponsor the event under the McDonald’s banner from its initial beginnings 14 years ago (R9, Personal Communication, May 5, 2010). As the naming rights sponsor, they supply the event with products including McMuffins and other McDonald’s menu items, McDonald’s restaurant vouchers and funding towards the coordination costs associated with the event.

5.5.3 Stakeholder Type: Corporate Team Entrant

This section provides an overview of each of the stakeholder representatives interviewed and classified as a corporate team entrant.

The Canterbury District Health Board (CDHB) was a regular corporate team entrant in the City to Surf – and a team which often exceeded 700 participants, thus bringing in a
substantial amount of money for the event from ticket sales. The CDHB is the largest employer in New Zealand’s South Island, with over 8,000 staff employed across fourteen Canterbury-based hospitals and community bases. It collaborates with other health and disability organisations, stakeholders and the community to decide what health and disability services are needed and how to best use funding received from Government.

5.5.4 Stakeholder Type: Facilitator

This section provides an overview of each of the stakeholder representatives interviewed and classified as an event facilitator.

Sport Canterbury is one of New Zealand’s 17 Regional Sports Trusts (RST). At the time this research was being conducted it fell under the Sport and Recreation New Zealand (SPARC) umbrella (now Sport New Zealand). The trust has been a stakeholder of the City to Surf for over nine years, switching between roles as a sponsor, promoter, corporate entrant and supplier. At the time the research for this thesis was conducted Sport Canterbury had entered a corporate team in the 2010 event and were planning on doing so again in 2011. They also actively encourage participation in the McDonalds Duathlon in Christchurch.

The Christchurch City Council (CCC) is the local government body for the City of Christchurch. The Council’s ‘Leisure and Recreation’ division specifically oversees the provision of local community events and acts as a mediator between the Council’s other departments. Events may need financial support, traffic management assistance, modified parking requirements, or use of Council owned venues. The City to Surf has
utilised all of these facets since its inception – and especially more so in recent years as there has been requests from the CCC for event managers to develop detailed traffic management and health and safety plans. In addition to acting as a facilitator for the event, the CCC also regularly entered a large corporate team (Christchurch City Council, 2011). The CCC has been actively involved in the McDonald’s Duathlon as a facilitator in more recent years, when the duathlon was relocated to the Council-owned South Hagley Park. The ‘Recreation and Leisure’ division of the CCC granted approval for the event to take place within the park boundaries and continues to ensure that no other events take place in the park during the scheduled event day.

The Auckland City Council (ACC) is the local governing body of Auckland City. The City Events and Festival and Community Events (FACE) division of the ACC coordinate and aid in the provision of Auckland based community events. The ACC has been involved as a facilitator in the Auckland Marathon since at least 1991, as it coordinates the closure of the Harbour Bridge (R13, Personal Communication, September 28, 2010). The ACC also sponsors events which incorporate destination profiling of the City in addition to having a positive economic impact on the City. In this sponsor role, the ACC covers any costs associated with booking Council owned venues, submission of traffic management plans and additional Council-associated administration. Events are required to apply for this sponsorship. The Auckland Marathon is considered by the ACC to profile Auckland as a destination. A percentage of Council-related administration costs for this event are therefore sponsored by the ACC. The ACC also actively encourages participation in and supports the Round the Bays event in Auckland.
Sport Auckland is one of New Zealand’s 17 Regional Sports Trusts (RST), which fell under the Sport and Recreation New Zealand (SPARC) umbrella. The Trust actively encourages and enables participation in sport, recreation and physical activity within the local Auckland region and indirectly encourages community members to participate in the Auckland Marathon. Sport Auckland also acts as a facilitator, indirectly encouraging community members to participate in the Round the Bays event. This support is in keeping with its purpose of encouraging and enabling participation in sport, recreation and physical activity within the Auckland region.

5.5.5 Stakeholder Type: Recipient Charity

This section provides an overview of each of the stakeholder representatives interviewed and classified as an event recipient charity.

The Heart Foundation is a not-for-profit, non-government organisation that funds research and promotes heart health in order to reduce the rates of cardiovascular disease in New Zealand. It encourages people to make positive lifestyle changes and develop environments which make healthy choices more easily achievable. Acting as a facilitator, the Heart Foundation (NZ) was initially approached by the City to Surf event managers in 2006, following the controversy between Coca Cola Amatil and the CDHB (See Chapter One). The Heart Foundation saw an association with the City to Surf as an opportunity to encourage regular physical activity amongst the local community. The Heart Foundation aided in facilitating the City to Surf ‘Downsized’ sub-event (which started half way along the original City to Surf route). It was also one of the events recipient charities – receiving a percentage of the ticket sales from this sub-event (The Heart Foundation, 2011). The Heart Foundation (NZ) also acts as a facilitator for the
Round the Bays event, indirectly promoting the event and encouraging people from the Auckland community (and surrounding areas) to take part. For them, the event aids in encouraging people to make positive lifestyle choices, in addition to developing an environment which makes these easy. The Heart Foundation is also the ongoing recipient charity for the Auckland Marathon. It has been partnered with the event for more than seven years (R14, September 27, 2010). The Heart Foundation utilize the event to promote its values and objectives and specifically promote heart health (via regular physical activity) in order to reduce the rates of cardiovascular disease in New Zealand (Heart Foundation, 2011).

5.5.6 Stakeholder Type: Volunteer Group

This section provides an overview of each of the stakeholder representatives interviewed and classified as an event volunteer group.

The Christchurch South Rotary Club was actively involved in the City to Surf as a volunteer group for more than 15 years. Its primary role was coordinating one of the three drinking stations along the event route. In 2004 additional club members were given permission by the event managers to operate an exclusive BBQ and food station at the finish line to raise funds for some of the clubs community-based projects. The Christchurch South Rotary Club is a branch of Rotary International and was founded in Christchurch in 1957. There are approximately 50 male and female members. The club has taken on a number of other community-based projects in the past, including: work and finance to assist villagers in Tibet; financial support for the Canterbury Medical Research Foundation; assisting with the world-wide Rotary project to eradicate polio;
and assisting with community-based events including the City to Surf and the Christchurch Agriculture and Produce Show.

**Chapter Review**

This chapter has provided an overview of the four cases featured in the research conducted. The following chapter, Chapter Six presents a thematic overview of the research results on a descriptive basis. Discussion and analysis of these results, with reference to the literature review, theoretical context and research questions noted in Chapter One is detailed in Chapter Seven.
Chapter Six
Descriptive Results (Part B): A Description of the Findings

This chapter offers a thematic overview of the findings obtained from the data collection stage of this thesis. These findings originate from an established qualitative data analysis coding process and are presented as descriptive findings.

Research findings for this descriptive results chapter and the following analysis and discussion chapter (Chapter Seven) have been pooled based on thematic findings. The reasons for utilizing this approach stemmed from a number of methodological considerations. These included: 1) Respondents interviewed belonging to organisations that crossed stakeholder roles in more than one case study. 2) An inability to secure respondents on a case by case basis and the need to implement a snowball sampling technique (Refer to Chapter Four, Section 4.2.4). Presenting findings in this format, without separate sections devoted to individual cases, was noted as a viable way in which to present descriptive results (Yin, 2003). Pooling data in this way has the potential to also uncover new themes (Dopson, Ferlie, Fitzgerald & Locock, 2009) and ‘move toward a more integrated understanding of findings across contexts’ (West & Oldfather, 1995, p. 456).

Text from each respondent interview transcript and associated organisational documents (policies, strategies, media publications and marketing materials) was sorted using the NVivo8 software program and filtered through open, axial and reflective coding stages - as noted in Chapter Four. The primary themes and sub-themes which were identified are summarised in Table 6.1 below. Each theme is then discussed in further detail, with reference to the views and opinions of the stakeholders.
interviewed and associated printed documents collected located in the Appendices of this thesis. Any links between the primary and sub-themes are also noted in this chapter. An analysis and interpretation of these descriptive results will follow in Chapter Seven.

Table 6.1: Summary of Data Analysis Thematic Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Theme</th>
<th>Sub-Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Stakeholder Classification Perceptions** | Role classification
|                             | Self classification                             |
| **Legitimacy of Power**     | Hierarchical status                             |
|                             | Pre-existing relationships                      |
|                             | Personal agenda                                 |
|                             | Demands relative to scale                       |
| **Stakeholder Responsiveness** | Public health agenda                           |
|                             | Resourcing                                      |
|                             | Participant choice                              |
| **Image Maintenance**       | Value alignment                                 |
|                             | Corporate social responsibility (CSR)           |

6.1 Stakeholder Classification Perceptions

A number of community sport event stakeholder roles encapsulating individual roles, responsibilities and inputs were encountered and interviewed for the purpose of this study. Table 6.2 below, identifies these roles based on role classification provided by the corresponding event manager and provides a general definition of each stakeholder position. Each time an interview respondent (community event stakeholder) is identified within this chapter, a signifier will follow which clarifies the role of the stakeholder organisation to which they belong. A summary of identified stakeholder roles listed in Table 6.2 below. For example, R2a [major sponsor], R13 [facilitator]. Recognition of the difference in stakeholder roles provides context for the differing opinions and perspectives proffered in relation to the interview questions stakeholders
were asked. Specific role descriptions for each event stakeholder were provided in Chapter Five. It is also necessary to note that on occasion there were identified discrepancies between how event managers classified associated stakeholders and how individual stakeholders classified themselves. This discrepancy resulted in differing perspectives of role responsibilities and justifications for stakeholder actions.

Table 6.2: Stakeholder Role Descriptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder Role</th>
<th>General Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Major Sponsor</strong></td>
<td>Significant monetary and in-kind contribution to the event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Sponsor</strong></td>
<td>Limited monetary or in-kind contribution to the event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Volunteer Group</strong></td>
<td>A group volunteering their time to help with the various components of event preparation and provision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facilitator or Supplier</strong></td>
<td>A company or organisation which offers assistance (paid or otherwise) in relation to operational aspects of the event.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Corporate Team</strong></td>
<td>A company representing themselves as a whole via the purchase of multiple event registration packs for its employees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Entrant</strong></td>
<td>The organisation selected to receive a percentage of the profits raised from the event and associated publicity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recipient Charity</strong></td>
<td>The individual or company who owns the event and stipulates how it is coordinated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The assigned role and power a stakeholder possesses is dependent on how they are classified (Freeman, 1984). The question that often arises in relation to this point is who is it that defines a particular stakeholder, the subsequent role they play and the stake they have, in this case, in the event? (Jensen & Sandstrom, 2011; Mitchell et al., 1997). Perceptions regarding stakeholder classification and the stake or level of power which can result from this were noted as ‘differ[ing] greatly depending on one’s standpoint’ by Freeman (1984, p.63). In other words, conflicting views can arise regarding the expectations, responsibilities and rights of a stakeholder depending on who has classified their role. Based on the data collected for this study, there were two particular constructs which were identified in this respect. Firstly, whether a stakeholders role classification had been appointed by the associated event manager (role classification)
or secondly, if the stakeholder themselves had appointed themselves to that role (self classification). Such varying opinions were considered important as they impact upon stakeholder behaviour throughout the event. These constructs and identified issues are presented below.

6.1.1 Role Classification

The stakeholders interviewed for this study all held exclusive and sometimes dual roles in relation to the events with which they were involved. In many cases, such perceptions were met with little or no objection from other stakeholders or the stakeholder themselves. For example, R13 (facilitator) specifically identified his organisation’s role as that of a facilitator, due to their coordination and closure of the Auckland Harbour Bridge and traffic lanes. The event manager (R14) also considered R13 to be a facilitator. Similarly, R5 (volunteer group) identified R2a (major sponsor) as the major sponsor of the City to Surf, this viewpoint comparable to those of R2a and R2b (major sponsor). Stakeholders classified the role of the event manager consistently. For example, R5 (volunteer group) believed that it was the event manager who determined whether or not they and other stakeholders played a role in the event at all. R6 [general sponsor] considered ‘the event organiser [to] hold the majority of power’. This opinion was echoed by R2b [major sponsor]. Meanwhile, R3 [corporate team entrant] conceded that ‘if you have ownership of the event, then it’s perfectly okay to do what you want’.

6.1.2 Self-Classification

In some instances there were significant differences between stakeholder role-classifications, with varying opinions between the event manager, associated stakeholders, and/or the individual stakeholder themselves. For example, R1 [event
manager] classified R3’s organisation as a ‘corporate team entrant’. This view was also shared by other stakeholders, including R4 [facilitator] and R7 [recipient charity]. Yet, R3 [corporate team entrant] continually referred to their organisation as a sponsor of the event, noting that they had ‘always been relied upon to sponsor [the event]’. R5 [volunteer group] conceded that R3 [corporate team entrant] was ‘not [an] actual sponsor, just a competitor. . . [but that] they could still hold you to ransom though’.

Stakeholder role classification was identified as an important concept by many of the respondents, as it often determined their organisation’s hierarchical status and associated legitimacy and power. The majority of event stakeholders who referred to role classification also referred to hierarchical status in relation to their position within the event stakeholder network (R1 and R14 [event owner], R2a, R2b and R9 [major sponsors], R3 [corporate team entrant], R5 [volunteer group], R6 [general sponsor], R7 [recipient charity] and R13 [facilitator]). These concepts are discussed below under the theme legitimacy of power.

6.2 Legitimacy of Power

Legitimacy of power was a primary theme identified within respondent’s interview transcripts. Reference was made to stakeholder’s abilities or perceived rights to influence event management decisions. Such influence would often manifest in the form of requests made to event managers. More specifically, ‘legitimacy referred to the validity of a stakeholders claim, [while] power [was identified as] the ability to achieve desired outcomes despite resistance’ (Tsiotsou, 2011, p.559). Stakeholders considered that their placement, perceived by themselves or other stakeholders, within a hierarchical status structure influenced their associated level of legitimate power. Pre-
existing relationships were also highlighted as playing an influential role in the level of legitimate power a stakeholder held and are discussed further below. The personal views of those who held management positions were another factor which played a significant role in the demands made by their respective companies or organisations and was referred to by many stakeholders as ‘personal agenda’. Legitimacy of power was also linked to the size of an event, the size of the stakeholder’s organisation and the level of investment made by the associated stakeholder. The findings from the data which correspond to the primary theme ‘legitimacy of power’ in relation to the four indicators summarised above, are described in more detail below.

### 6.2.1 Hierarchical Status

Hierarchical status was identified as an important concept by many stakeholders as it ultimately determined legitimacy of power and perceived level of influence over the decision making processes associated with event management. In most cases, hierarchical status was relative to how high or low a stakeholder’s role was classified on a self-determined hierarchical scale. For example, R8 [facilitator] noted that their organisation’s hierarchical status and perception of power ‘would depend upon how much [they] invested in [the event]’. Aside from the event manager, who was deemed to hold the highest status, major sponsors were considered to hold a higher hierarchical status than many other stakeholders according to R5 [volunteer group]. R5 [volunteer group] considered their organisation as having a relatively low hierarchical status. The legitimacy of power a sponsor held was noted as dependent on whether they were a major or minor sponsor (R6 [general sponsor]). R9 [major sponsor] stated that ‘if there was an aspect of the event they did not like, then they would have 100 per cent influence over the matter’. Meanwhile, R7 [recipient charity] believed their organisation
had less hierarchical status as a recipient charity as they were dependent on the funding received from events, as is evident below:

If we are the recipient charity . . . it is a lot harder because we do not ultimately have any say and to be involved in the event is fantastic for us.  

(R7 [recipient charity])

This viewpoint, by R7 [recipient charity], was also echoed by event manager R14 [event owner], who noted that a previous charity had been ‘just outrageous in terms of its demands’. Meanwhile, R5 [volunteer group] considered their group to have very little say in the coordination of the event. ‘They don’t ask for our opinion and we do not offer it’. R1 [event owner] acknowledged the use of a ranking system amongst the event’s stakeholders. ‘After the sponsors there are a lot of our suppliers, anyone who associates their brand with our event. Then you have your corporate teams and the companies who buy the corporate sites’.

There were exceptions to the situations identified above. For example, R2a [major sponsor] and R2b [major sponsor] acknowledged that, aside from any events that their company owned, they did not ‘actually get involved in the running, management or layout of an event’. However, R2b [major sponsor] commented that as a sponsor, their company should always ‘be kept in mind’ by the event managers, when it came to making major decisions. Additionally, there were different viewpoints on the hierarchical status held by stakeholders who were either role or self-classified as facilitators. For example, facilitators R8 and R13 considered their organisations held a high hierarchical status, due to their direct involvement in traffic management, event logistics and the booking of council-owned venues. They acknowledged that the event
manager depending on them for the event to take place. In contrast, R15 [facilitator] believed their organisation played a behind the scenes role, encouraging participation in events and acting as an advocate for physical activity. R15 [facilitator] did not believe their organisation held a high hierarchical status.

6.2.2 Pre-Existing Relationships

Hierarchical status and any subsequent claims to legitimacy of power can be influenced by pre-existing relationships between the event stakeholders. Pre-existing relationships were identified by seven stakeholders (R1 and R14 [event owners], R6 [general sponsor], R4 [facilitator], R2a [major sponsor], R3 [corporate team entrant] and R5 [volunteer group]) as influencing or having the potential to influence hierarchical status and thus legitimacy of power. Examples of the pre-existing relationships between those stakeholders interviewed were identified in Chapter Five. In a move that failed to support the hierarchical status associated with community sport event major sponsors, R1 [event owner] admitted that they chose to ignore the requests of their major sponsor, instead abiding by the requests of R3 [corporate team entrant] and changing the major naming rights product from Powerade to Pump. ‘Powerade was [and] would still [be] today, the brand of choice, if we had our way’ (R2a [major sponsor]). R2a [major sponsor] also believed that, as an organisation, R1 [event owner] sided with R3’s [corporate team entrant] organisation due to ‘financial imperatives [which] swayed their thinking’. This comment referred specifically to the print advertising contract which existed between R3’s [corporate team entrant] organisation and R1’s [event owner] organisation prior to the event taking place. R1 [event owner] was contracted to print R3’s [corporate team entrant] monthly community publication. As a result, this
decision revoked the value R2a's [major sponsor] company identified as being a major sponsor.

6.2.3 Personal Agenda

Four stakeholders suggested that conflict pertaining to stakeholder alignment came about due to personal opinions or agendas. For example, R5 [volunteer group] conceded that whether their organisations choice to support an event ‘depended on the individual committee chairman each year’. R1 [event owner] stated that R2a's company [major sponsor] had sponsored their event for a number of years, with no real issues and that criticism was undoubtedly a result of a change in management personnel at R3's [corporate team participant] organisation. R2a [major sponsor] also suggested that it was often the personnel rather than the entity itself which created or caused conflict. Actions associated with a personal agenda were often considered to be in response to those sub-themes identified in the sections below which discuss stakeholder responsiveness and image maintenance. For example, stakeholders R1 [event owner], R2a [major sponsor] and R5 [volunteer group] mentioned personal agenda and consideration of values:

There's either personal agenda somewhere in the business or it's one of their values . . . I don't know which one of those two it is, but I think someone made it a personal agenda because they were so vociferous about [removing] the connection [between their organisation and the sponsors product. (R2a [major sponsor])

6.2.4 Demands Relative to Scale

Stakeholder influence is also relative to the scale of their involvement in the event itself. The possibility of demands occurring were occasionally suggested as being connected
with the size of the event, stakeholder and/or subsequent level (or size) of investment (R1 [event owner], R2a and R9 [major sponsors] and R7 [recipient charity]). In relation to the size of an event, larger events were considered to produce more attention both from the public and the media and therefore stakeholders paid more attention to the role they played. ‘Any story about [the event] now gets quite a bit of media attention [because] it is the biggest event of its kind in the South Island’ (R1 [event owner]).

Alternatively, a reduced level of interest and demand from community event stakeholders was identified with smaller events. ‘The profile of our event is a lot lower and therefore the politics are a lot lower’ (R9 [major sponsor]).

In relation to the size of an event stakeholder and their organisation’s level of investment, R7 [recipient charity] suggested that the level of legitimate power a stakeholder had depended on what kind of input they had. Furthermore, R13 [facilitator] believed that, based on their organisation’s level of investment and the length of their association with the event, they would ‘like to think [they have] got a lot of influence’. This opinion was repeated by R3 [corporate team entrant]. Meanwhile, R14 [event owner] and R8 [facilitator] acknowledged the major investment of R13’s [facilitator] organisation, paralleling this to their own level of involvement. In defence of their decision to support R3 [corporate team entrant], instead of their major sponsor R2a (see previous section on Pre-Existing Relationships), R1 [event owner] equated their organisation’s decision to the size of R3’s [corporate team entrant] corporate team. However, they also noted that the event took place one year ‘without [R3’s corporate team] and it did not affect numbers that badly’. Ownership of an event was considered as the highest level of investment. R7 [recipient charity], R2b [major
sponsor] and R3 [corporate team entrant] admitted that if their organisations owned the event then they would have more control over how it operated.

6.3 Stakeholder Responsiveness

Some actions and behaviours of stakeholders come about as a response to external pressures, as noted also by Frooman (1999). A stakeholder will respond to such pressures depending on how they directly affect the company or organisation (Speed & Thompson, 2000; Walliser, 2003). Community sport event stakeholders often responded to public health agendas, resourcing requirements and the influence of participant choice, all of which were identified as indicators of stakeholder responsiveness within the data. Davis and Jones (1996, p. 108) identified public health agendas as ‘fundamentally being about social and political change’. A public health agenda was generally associated with a call for increased promotion of healthy initiatives (Kelly et al., 2010) or the ‘identification of lifestyle disease risks to individual and social wellbeing’ (Fullagar, 2002). More specific elements associated with a public health agenda included, improving unhealthy eating habits and increasing physical activity (to reduce cardiovascular disease, obesity and diabetes), reducing unhealthy behaviours and curbing alcohol misuse and gambling addiction (Kelly et al., 2010; Kelly et al., 2011; Maher, 2006). Community sport events managers are increasingly relying on sponsorship for monetary support and provision of services and products (Boyle & Haynes, 2000; Davis, 2006; Garland & Ferkins, 2006; Jackson et al., 2001). An event manager’s decision to accept or turn down sponsorship can determine the sustainability of the event they own, manage or coordinate. Meanwhile, participant choice centred around an individual’s ability to choose and consume a sponsor’s products of their own free will. Many sponsors and event owners noted (including R2b and R9 [major
sponsors] and R6 [general sponsor]) that they provided event participants with healthy and unhealthy options and that, having done this, the responsibility to comply with any public health agenda was no longer their concern. The data which correspond to the primary theme ‘Stakeholder Responsiveness’ are described in more detail below.

6.3.1 Public Health Agenda

Some of the actions taken by stakeholders were believed to be in response to an overarching public health agenda. Such an agenda reflected increasing concerns over health related issues. R3 [corporate team entrant] identified a definitive change in the perception of products considered. ‘More research occurs, more evaluations occur and we become more aware. Three years ago it [aligning with an unhealthy sponsor] wouldn’t have made it onto our radar’ (R3 [corporate team entrant]). Stakeholders (including R7 [recipient charity], R1 and R14 [event owners], R2a, R2b and R9 [major sponsors] and R6 [general sponsor]) highlighted an increase in more specific health concerns such as obesity and cardiovascular disease. For example, the issue of obesity was noted as frequently arising in relation to the production and provision of products by R2a [major sponsor] and R2b [major sponsor]. The issue was also noted in the company’s ‘Compliance and Social Responsibility Charter’ (located in appendices 9.7), which states ‘the committee will review reports and, where appropriate, make recommendations to the Board in respect of obesity and other social issues which may be relevant to the company’. In their organisation’s ‘2009-2012 Strategic Plan’, R7 [recipient charity] identified the need for people to take steps to choose and eat healthier foods. This included ‘making heart healthy food choices for all New Zealanders’. R11 [event owner] noted in their promotional brochure that their event aimed to ‘promote healthy young people’. Meanwhile, in their community publication,
R3 [corporate team entrant] considered their organisation as having ‘a responsibility to protect and promote health [within] the Canterbury’ region.

The need to consider such a public health agenda was noted by stakeholders (including R2a and R2b and R9 [major sponsors], R1, R14 and R10 [event owners] and R6 [general sponsor]) as influencing many of their management, marketing and sponsorship decisions. The only identifiable exception to this was the choice of R2a’s [major sponsor] company to withdraw their sponsorship from the McDonald’s Duathlon due to a corporate decision to focus all their resources on the City to Surf (R2a [major sponsor] and R11 [event owner]).

Decisions made as a response to an identified public health agenda were calculated in relation to the impact they had or could have had on the stakeholder’s overall image. Community sport event stakeholders (including R1, R14, R10 and R12 [event owners], R3 [corporate team entrant], R4, R8, R13 and 15 [facilitators]) were more careful in assessing with which sponsors they aligned themselves with. Fast food providers, particularly, were noted as contentious by R1 and R11 [event owners], R3 [corporate team entrant], R4 [facilitator] and R7 [recipient charity]. ‘We absolutely do not want to be endorsing [fast food restaurants] in any way or brands like that’ (R7 [recipient charity]). R4 [facilitator] also conceded an unwillingness to be associated with [fast food restaurants]. R1 [event owner] acknowledged that in previous years a pizza restaurant chain had been a sponsor of their event, but that the event would now not want to be associated with that type of sponsor. R2a [major sponsor] admitted that their products played a role in contributing to the issue of obesity, but that they attempted to counteract this by incorporating corporate social responsibility initiatives into their
broader management practices. R11 [event owner] emphasised that sponsors’ products supplied to event participants was done so as a treat, i.e. a one-off special occasion. They were not encouraging children to consume such products on a regular basis. R11 [event owner] also acknowledged an increasing unwillingness by sponsors to supply unhealthy products to children. ‘I wanted some small bags of chips from [snack food supplier] this year. They said that they didn’t see that item as being [suitable for] children’ (R11 [event owner]). In their organisation’s 2007-2017 Events Strategy, R8 [facilitator] aimed to provide a ‘thriving healthy environment’ for residents and visitors. Meanwhile, in a further example of the influence a public health agenda can have on community sport event stakeholders, R3 [corporate team entrant] noted that if any type of sponsorship promoted an unhealthy message, it should not be associated with an event.

Encapsulated within a community sport event stakeholder's responsiveness to the public health agenda, was an identified sense of responsibility. From R1’s [event owner] perspective, a response to increasing health concerns was the reason a relationship was established between their organisation and that of R7 [recipient charity]. Alternatively, R9 [facilitator] admitted their restaurant trialled a salad bar in one of their Christchurch restaurants in an attempt to be seen as responsible. The trial was a failure, however, because of low sales. ‘We want to be responsible. You cannot have healthy cigarettes, but you can have healthy food. We’re ready to sell it – we just need people to buy it’ (R9 [major sponsor]). This also links directly with the sub-theme of participant choice and highlights the power consumers have based on their choice to purchase or use a product and service and whether that product or service continues to be provided.

Putting forward an alternative viewpoint on the public health agenda, as a major sponsor, R2b considered that companies, such as itself, were being responsible by putting money into events and getting people ‘off the couch’.
There was an identifiable difference between how sponsors of sports events, cultural events, sports teams and/or programs were perceived by stakeholders and believed to be perceived by the general public. R15 [facilitator] commented on Powerade’s sponsorship of the All Blacks and how there was appeared to be no issue regarding that alignment from a public health agenda perspective. There was also no criticism of the Coca Cola Christmas in the Park (R2a [major sponsor] and R13 [facilitator]) – a cultural event which annually draws over 180,000 people to its Auckland event, and 100,000 people to its Christchurch equivalent (R2b [major sponsor]), many of them children. R2a [major sponsor] suggested that ‘the link is not quite the same though as a sports drink and a sports event’. Furthermore, there was a noted difference between sponsors brands and products. In relation to a community event, it was suggested that there is a strong link with the sponsor’s brand. With a sport event, there was an explicit link with the sponsors product (R2a [major sponsor]). In addition, R2b [major sponsor] mentioned the re-launch of the Small Whites (junior soccer) program in New Zealand, for which McDonald’s play a major role. ‘There was not a murmur from the media, not a murmur’ (R2b [major sponsor]).

Strong links were identified between a public health agenda and stakeholder image maintenance (Section 6.4). For example, nearly all stakeholders who mentioned a health agenda also mentioned value alignment (R1, R11 and R12 [event owners], R2b, R2a and R9 [major sponsors], R3 [corporate team entrant], R4 and R15 [facilitators], R5 [volunteer group], R6 [general sponsor] and R7 [recipient charity]). Furthermore, stakeholders R2b [major sponsor], R3 [corporate team entrant], R7 [recipient charity], R9 [major sponsor], R12 [event owner] and R15 [facilitator] who made mention of a
health agenda also specifically mentioned image maintenance, value alignment and corporate social responsibility (See Section 6.5). Those stakeholders who identified the influence of public health agenda also mentioned some form of personal agenda driving it (R1 and R14 [event owners], R2a and R9 [major sponsors] and R5 [volunteer group]). Specific links were also made in relation to changes in staffing at executive levels and increasing public health agenda initiatives being introduced, thus linking the concept back to the primary theme of legitimacy of power (See Section 6.3). For example, R1 [event owner] noted that ‘personal agenda’ was exactly what drove the demand to change their events naming rights sponsor 2006. ‘[The event had taken place for] years with [R2a] as the major sponsor and no one said anything. . . [R3, a corporate team entrant] are now saying “no, give out water”.’ The need to consider a health agenda was also noted as impacting upon decisions regarding event resourcing. This theme is discussed below in further detail.

6.3.2 Resourcing

Event resourcing, primarily in the form of funding was identified by many stakeholders as fundamental to the continued existence of community sport events. It was acknowledged by most stakeholders that community sport events provide a range of benefits to individuals and the local communities in which they take place. The continued existence of such events was extensively supported by stakeholders. For example, R1 [event owner] and R7 [recipient charity] both considered events as holding an important place in society due to the fact that they provided for the community in addition to encouraging physical activity. R3 [corporate team entrant] acknowledged that community events offered social benefits by providing people with the opportunity to connect. More specifically, R4 [facilitator] suggested that community sport events
played 'a major role in introducing people, giving people something to aim for, and building community and family spirit'. Any criticism an event received from other stakeholders, was based on the resources (i.e. sources of funding, services or in-kind donations) obtained to aid in staging the event, rather than the event itself.

With the importance of community sport events, came a noted dependency on sponsorship by event managers. Such dependency was ascribed to the continued existence of the particular event. The pressing need for sponsorship was noted by R9 [major sponsor], R11, R12 and R14 [event owners] and R13 [facilitator]. ‘For organisations who are trying to set up and provide community events, the cost is too much. As an event manager you can’t afford to turn sponsorship down’ noted R5 [volunteer group]. R2b [major sponsor] expressed the opinion that it was a brave person who takes on and sets up an event these days. [Even] the ones that are already established . . . a number of those are going to go by the wayside in the next few years. Respondents noted that there were only limited opportunities to obtain and maintain event sponsorship within New Zealand, and more specifically in Christchurch. ‘If you take a look at the amount of money that is available for sponsorship in New Zealand, it’s a pool of money that is depleting quite rapidly’ (R2b [major sponsor]). Similarly, the 2007-2017 Events Strategy of R8’s organisation, highlighted that there were limited funds available for the provision of events within Christchurch. R4 [facilitator] agreed with this view, noting that ‘in Christchurch sponsors are particularly hard to get. They don’t give up their money very easily’. Other respondents noted that their dependency on sponsorship and limited sponsorship opportunities were further affected by the criticism event managers received for aligning with fast food, soft drink and confectionary companies. That is, there were companies able and willing to offer their
resources to event managers, yet their products were considered to clash with image maintenance, a public health agenda or personal agenda. R4 [facilitator] acknowledged that McDonald’s had the resources available to fund events. Our organisation ‘can probably get several thousand dollars to run an event from McDonald’s, but we wouldn’t. That event can’t run unless we’ve got the money’ (R4 [facilitator]).

R13 [facilitator] reasoned that unless those people criticising stakeholder relationships and event sponsors could provide the money themselves then they ‘had to come to grips that . . . Coca Cola, confectionary and the [like]’ would be sponsoring events. R5 [volunteer group] noted that there was always going to be someone who criticised a sponsor because they did not like them. R15 [facilitator] was hopeful that ‘the benefit that the event [had] to the community [was] greater than the harm or perceived harm that the sponsor did’.

6.3.3 Participant Choice

Some of the stakeholders (including R5 [volunteer group], R9 [major sponsor] and R10 [event owner]) who identified an existing public health agenda as influencing community sport event stakeholder alignments also stressed the need to consider public choice (R1 and R11 [event owners], R5 [volunteer group] and R9 [major sponsor]). Many stakeholders (including R2a, R2b, R9 [major sponsors] and R6 [general sponsor]) acknowledged sponsoring companies had diversified their product range to offer a variety of healthy options in addition to unhealthy options such as sugary drinks, fast food and confectionary products. Yet, participant choice of products continued to sway towards unhealthy options. Responsibility of adhering to the identified public health agenda was placed by on the individual event participant by some stakeholders.
In relation to the provision of McDonald's vouchers, chips and cookies for event entrants, R11 [event owner] noted that it was not something which their organisation encouraged participants to eat regularly. 'It’s a choice of their parents and it’s a choice of theirs . . . People have to make a choice and people have to be individually responsible for those choices'.

As a health advocate, R7 [recipient charity] explained that their organisation was there to provide people with the knowledge and tools to make the right choices. In R7’s [recipient charity] 2009-2012 Strategic Plan, a noted aim was to ‘educate people to choose the right foods’. R5 [volunteer group] noted that corporations such as ‘McDonald’s and Coca Cola both had healthy options if you wanted them’. R6 [general sponsor] mentioned a promotion they were involved in that offered the choice of a free bottle of water or soft drink, noting that they ‘still [gave] more soft drink away, but [participants] had a choice’. The respondents suggested that when healthy options were offered at community sport events they were not the most popular of choices by participants. This was reinforced by R1 [event owner] who noted that R3 [corporate team entrant] requested the provision of water for event participants instead of Powerade. However, R1 [event owner] acknowledged that participants tended not to drink the water immediately (unlike Powerade) and instead took it home. Furthermore, respondents believed that event stakeholders have no control over a person’s actions once the event has finished. ‘You might have no Powerade on the course, or products like that. But what happens when people finish the event? They go straight to McDonald’s for lunch’ (R14 [event owner]).
The responses community sport event stakeholders can have in relation to a public health agenda, resourcing issues and public or participant choices are often spurred on by issues relating to image maintenance. Such issues are detailed below in Sections 6.4.

6.4 Image Maintenance

The creation and maintenance of image is described by Amis (2009) as a culmination of positive values and reputation. All organisations have values which link directly to the ideal image they wish to portray, whether this relates to their employees, competitors, other organisations (local, national or international), the media and/or the general public (McDonald, 1991; Monye, 2000; Cunningham, Taylor & Reeder, 1993). Two specific indicators of image maintenance that emerged from the data for this research included value alignment and corporate social responsibility. Due to the potential for image association between stakeholders who align for the purposes of a community sport event (Gwinner & Eaton, 1999; Speed & Thompson, 2000), there is a pressing need to ensure that values of any aligning entities are compatible (Waliser, 2003). Meanwhile, corporate social responsibility is defined by Maon, Lindgreen and Swaen (2009, p.72) as

A stakeholder oriented concept that extends beyond the organisation’s boundaries and is driven by an ethical understanding of the organisation’s responsibility for the impact of its business activities, thus seeking in return society’s acceptance of the legitimacy of the organisation.

The results from the data which correspond to the primary theme ‘Image Maintenance’, in relation to value alignment and corporate social responsibility, are described in further detail below.
6.4.1 Value Alignment

Value alignment was noted as a key antecedent of image maintenance by R1 and R12 [event owners], R2b and R9 [major sponsors], R3 [corporate team entrant], R7 [recipient charity], R13 and R15 [facilitators]. Many stakeholders noted a need for value clarification in order to maintain an effective relationship within a community sport event context. The Compliance and Social Responsibility Committee Charter drafted for the company that R2a [major sponsor] and R2b [major sponsor] worked for, noted that there were ‘policies and controls to protect the company’s reputation’. In some cases, a personal agenda also played a role in the determining the aspects which could impact upon the company’s reputation. Regardless of the source of organisational values, R2b [major sponsor] identified priority of ‘a common set of values when entering into a relationship’ with a community sport event and its other event stakeholders.

Furthermore, a constant review of these values needed to take place to ensure a continuing fit with the event (R9 [major sponsor]). Clashes between stakeholders, due to differing values, could have a detrimental effect on their image. R3 [corporate team entrant] noted that their organisation needed to be aware of what message they were giving and whether an ‘event created behaviours which did not support health’. R12 [event owner] identified ‘an association with image and values’ which resulted in the need for caution when it came to aligning with and justifying sponsor relationships. Meanwhile, R13 [facilitator] commented that with any relationships their organisation established, they would need to make sure they did not generate any negative publicity.

This view was echoed by R7 [recipient charity], who noted that ‘by partnering with someone like McDonald’s, we’d be sort of going backwards on what we’re saying’. Referencing stakeholder values was identified as a way in which to justify legitimacy of power (See Section 6.3). For example, R3 [corporate team entrant] considered
themselves to have the right to influence ‘anything which could be aligned with [them], in any context at all. [It] became their responsibility’. R3’s [corporate team entrant] draft policy document entitled ‘Association of Ethics’, specifically mentioned that any sponsorship entered into (by R3) must facilitate health initiatives and ‘not conflict with the values or practices of [R3] . . . [nor increase] the risk of adverse public perception’. This policy document is located in Appendices 9.9.

Some stakeholders, highlighted the difference between stakeholder alignment, based on product values as opposed to those based on company brand values. For example, R2a [major sponsor] explained that within their company’s brand, different products were identified to hold different target markets. R3 [corporate team entrant] acknowledged that their company supported the current agreement between R2a [major sponsor] and R1 [event owner] as the product supplied by R2a [major sponsor] met with the prescribed values. R2 [corporate team entrant] also noted that if this product was to change then their company would have to reconsider the continued support of the event. As an event manager, R14 believed that different products can be aligned to different sections of an event.

Powerade is the first choice for us as the event drink. We put on concerts after the event, so the Coca Cola brand should be related to that and the after party. Pump should be associated with the kids marathon . . . essentially you have multiple brand strategies (R14 [event owner])

6.4.2 Corporate Social Responsibility

Many stakeholders made reference to the concept of corporate social responsibility or its associated components. There was a distinct notion of wanting or needing to give
back to the community by reinvesting in the local community and people (R2a, R2b and
R9 [major sponsors]). An example provided by R15 [facilitator] acknowledged the need
for organisations to consider how their manufacturing activities can impact upon the
local community and how they can mitigate any associated negative affects by
partnering with organisations which provide benefits to the community. R12 [event
owner] noted that as a company, one of their primary missions was to become as
engaged as possible within the communities in which they operated. R2a [major
sponsor] also stressed the importance of their organisation’s community involvement,
noting that their organisation needed to be able to display a holistic approach to their
business and that they were not just there for profit. However, R3 [corporate team
entrant] was somewhat critical of the corporate social responsibility approach,
suggesting that

sponsors get aligned in people’s minds as a community participant and they’re seen as a good thing. From a business perspective it’s probably quite valid, but it’s not the truth

The idea of social responsibility seems not to be limited to corporate businesses. For
example, R9 [major sponsor] agreed that although their organisation adhered to a form
of social responsibility, they did not consider themselves to fall under the ‘corporate’
banner. ‘To re-invest into our people and to our business and to re-invest back into the
community . . . it really is philanthropy’ (R9 [major sponsor]. This could account for
those stakeholders who did not specifically mention corporate social responsibility, yet
still identified its associated components, such as community involvement and giving
back.
Chapter Review

The stakeholder perspectives and identified issues associated with: image maintenance, stakeholder responsiveness, legitimacy of power and perception of identity all require consideration by community sport event stakeholders in order to achieve effective stakeholder management. The data described within this chapter has outlined the primary themes and sub-themes identified via an established qualitative data analysis coding process of the respondents interview transcripts and associated organisation documents (policies, strategies, media publications and marketing materials). An analytical review of these findings is presented in the following chapter which incorporates the stakeholder theory framework outlined in Chapter Three and the review of literature outlined in Chapter Two. Reference is also made to the research questions composed for this thesis and outlined in Chapter One.
Chapter Seven
Analysis and Discussion

The research conducted for this thesis is focussed upon the impact that a public health agenda can have on community sport event management and associated stakeholder actions. Such actions are manifested in stakeholder decisions to utilize their power, instigate corporate social responsibility initiatives and legitimize their role/s (perceived or appointed). This chapter presents an analytical discussion of the research findings in relation to the research questions detailed in Chapter One, the literature reviewed in Chapter Two and the selected theoretical framework outlined in Chapter Three. As presented and justified in Chapter 6, the findings (and subsequent analysis and discussion) have been pooled in order to highlight research themes and provide an integrated understanding across contexts (Dopson, Ferlie, Fitzgerald & Locock, 2009; West & Oldfather, 1995).

The research questions are:

1) How has a public health agenda influenced stakeholder power; corporate social responsibility and legitimacy within a community sport event setting?

   a) How and why is stakeholder power and legitimacy exerted?

   b) What is the relationship between corporate social responsibility and stakeholder decisions involving community sport events?

2) In turn, what effect do stakeholder power, corporate social responsibility and legitimacy have on community sport event sponsorship and management?
Each major section within this chapter commences with a brief overview. This overview links the content of each section with the applicable theoretical framework utilized for discussion and the research questions (RQ’s) noted above. Figure 7.1 below provides a diagrammatic overview of the variables influencing community sport event stakeholder relationships discussed in this chapter and maps the relationship between influential relationship factors, stakeholder alignment decisions and consequent implications for community sport event management.

Figure 7.1: Chapter Seven Diagrammatic Overview

This chapter begins by addressing the influential factors noted on the left hand side of Figure 7.1.

7.1 Recognising the Influence of a Public Health Agenda

The research findings highlight the increasing pressure for community sport event stakeholders to take a public health agenda into consideration when planning or participating in community sport events. Findings also suggest that the suitability of
certain sponsor services and products depend on the types of community members the event is marketed towards. Additionally, individual stakeholder choice can also override public health agenda driven decisions and actions.

This section utilizes varying components of Freeman’s (1984; 2007; 2010) stakeholder theory to account for and reflect on the influence a public health agenda can have on community sport events. These components include the identification of moral consequences and ethical responsibilities associated with stakeholder actions and a review of Freeman’s (2007) Enterprise Level Strategy in relation to societal influence. This section also addresses RQ1 and RQ1a as it discusses public health agenda influences within a community sport event setting and identifies why stakeholders may choose to exert power. RQ2 is also addressed via identification of the impacts a public health agenda can exert on community sport event sponsorship and management.

7.1.1 Taking a Public Health Agenda into Consideration

Following government regulations and legislative influences which began to emerge in the 1960s, the stereotypical realm of taboo sponsorship in sport has typically included tobacco and alcohol products and more recently gambling on sport contests (Boyle & Haynes, 2000). However, event owners, major sponsors and corporate team entrants consider this sponsorship taboo to have rapidly expanded in recent years to incorporate an array of additional products, such as fast food, sugary beverages and confectionary. For example, Carrigan and Carrigan, (1997) initially identified possible sponsorship issues with confectionary, the range of products now exceeds such boundaries. As a result, community sport event stakeholders now have to take obesity, heart health,
diabetes and other major health issues into consideration when aligning with events and sponsors.

As a result community sport event stakeholders experiencing the pressure of a public health agenda have tended to move away from alignments with unhealthy food and beverage brands and products. This pressure is illustrated by an event facilitator who stated that

it would be interesting what our take would be if an organisation came to us and pitched a mass participation event and at the same time one of their sponsors was KFC or McDonald’s or Lion Nathan [beer] . . . That would be the stage when we would have to sit back consider if it was going to be a problem for us.

Additionally, a general sponsor identified the public health agenda as a ‘huge issue . . . I think it is part of the obesity thing and heart attacks’. A major sponsor also conceded that the public needed to be educated to purchase healthier food options. Much of this focus was noted, by a corporate team entrant, to be spurred on by ‘changing health considerations’. These comments align with Freeman’s (1984) view that a societal influence can play an instrumental role in defining an organisation’s considerations and actions. In the case of this thesis, the societal influence presented itself in the form of a public health agenda, whilst the considerations and actions of organisations relate to event stakeholder choices to align with community sport event sponsors and their products or services.

Event owners interviewed acknowledged feeling pressure from certain stakeholders to exclude sponsors who clashed with the values of other event stakeholders. For example,
one event owner accepted that ‘if McDonalds was to come on board as a new sponsor now, the media would jump on it’. As an example, within the past two years the McDonald’s Duathlon has started to receive criticism due to the increasing concern of obesity levels in New Zealand. ‘Fast food companies have had various sponsorship connections with sporting organisations [and events] of all sizes . . . [While these] may be beneficial in providing greater opportunities for physical activity, [they] may also promote greater levels of consumption of unhealthy food’ (Waikato District Health Board, 2011, p. 8). Another event owner acknowledged that due to health initiatives, their event would never revert to having a pizza company as their major sponsor. These findings coincide with the perspectives of Collins and Vamplew (2002), Donaldson and Finch (2013), Koplan and Brownell (2010), Ludwig and Nestle and Nestle (2008) and Maher et al., (2006), all of whom note that criticism of sponsorships is increasingly being attributed to the push of a public health agenda.

7.1.2 The Suitability of Sponsor Products

The scrutiny of sponsor alignments increased when health issues were linked with events targeted towards children or families. An event owner noted this occurred in 2010 when he was trying to source snack foods for their event. The company he approached, however, did not see the product as being appropriate to promote directly to children, especially via a children’s community sport event. The Waikato District Health Board (2011) suggested that children and families are often the target of fast food advertising and that this, in turn, can influence preferences for and consumption of nutrient poor food. Such evolving views on sponsor products were also identified by Sam et al., (2005). Maher et al., (2006) considered this was due to the effect some sponsors products can have on the health of community members. This links directly to
Lurie’s (2010) study which associated the health of individuals to the overall health of the community as it addresses the health of children and the impacts of unhealthy food advertising on the broader community. As a result, companies that produce products deemed by public health groups as unhealthy are now being approached by community sport event managers with caution.

Respondents interviewed, including event owners and recipient charities, acknowledged that an underlying public health agenda was responsible for a growing number of sport event sponsors and their products being deemed inappropriate by individual members of the community, community groups and corporate organisations. The inappropriateness of certain sponsor products and the pressures for stakeholders to conform to a public health agenda are explained by Freeman (2007) as incorporating ethical responsibilities, in that individual stakeholders must consider the moral consequences of their actions. The responses from interviewees coupled with Freeman’s (2007) explanation confirm Carrigan and Carrigan’s (1997) initial predictions of a trend of increased ethical investments. An associated discussion on this topic in relation to stakeholder values, ethical considerations and alignment is presented in Section 7.2.

The findings of this research also confirm that stakeholders, such as corporate team participants, facilitators and recipient charities, whose business interests fall within the public health realm, feel compelled to influence the choices related to and the management of community sport events. For example a recipient charity noted that ‘it would be very contentious’ for their organisation to align with a seemingly unhealthy event sponsor. ‘I would probably say ‘no’ because of our values and public perception . . .
McDonald’s and ourselves going hand in hand for this event? It’s just not going to work’. While this perspective highlights a conscientious effort for stakeholders to align their values with organisations and causes and consider their public image, it also demonstrates the overarching influence of a public health agenda. This perspective connects the health of communities to the health of individuals (Lurie, 2010), whereby the promotion and provision of community sport events could be deemed as influencing (positively or negatively) the health of individual community members. This concept was illustrated by a corporate team entrant, who noted that

the linkage between healthy behaviour [partaken in at a community sporting event] and the unhealthy consequence of acquiring a sugary energy drink [at the end of an event] is providing the message that it is normal . . . and that’s wrong. From a health perspective we need to be aware of what [health] message we are giving to individual members of our community

Freeman’s (1984) Enterprise Level Strategy Process offers an insightful overview as it accounts for the influence societal issues can have on stakeholder and value analysis. This model has been adapted in Figure 7.2 in order to express a community sport event scenario. Based on interviewee responses, there is a two way flow between the processes of stakeholder analysis, value analysis and the identification of a public health agenda as a societal issue. For example, a public health agenda can act as a primary instigator which influences the stakeholder analysis process between an event owner and major sponsor. Alternatively, the pressure of a public health agenda can be something which a stakeholder may encounter following the values analysis process, which occurred between a corporate team entrant and major sponsor. Interviewee responses also indicated the potential for stakeholders, value analysis processes and a public health agenda to actually influence the community sport event strategy
development at an earlier stage. This is depicted in the two way flow between the ‘Community Sport Event Strategy’ and subsequent processes.

Figure 7.2: Strategy Process for a Community Sport Event (Adapted from Freeman, 1984, p.92)

7.1.3 The Impacts of Personal Choice on a Public Health Agenda

Respondents, including sponsors, event stakeholders and facilitators noted that while many organisations strove to support or align with a public health agenda, public choice often ignored it. For example, one event owner argued that if water was distributed at the end of the event, participants often chose not to drink it. An event sponsor suggested there was a need to supply both healthy options and less healthy options to consumers. The sponsor also noted that more often than not, community members still chose the unhealthy products. Meanwhile another major sponsor stated that, as an organisation, his firm wanted to be responsible. It’s not like we’re selling tobacco. You can't have healthy cigarettes, but you can have healthy food. We built a central island to accommodate a salad display area... There was a three month trial of it... The trial was a failure due to low sales. The media and the Health Board
would have you thinking that people want to buy salads more than anything else on earth.

These comments are in line those of Ludwig and Nestle (2008, p.1809), who noted that ‘even though fast-food companies may offer healthier items, most of their profits come from French Fries and soft drinks’. This would suggest that public choice can ignore a public health agenda and that individuals decide whether they choose to consume a healthy product over an unhealthy product. This aligns with Fullagar (2002, p.72) who identified leisure consumption as ‘a significant site for identity formation through the emphasis on individual freedom of choice’. For example, the Auckland Marathon event owner stated that ‘you might have no Powerade on the course and stuff like that. What happens when people finish? They go straight to McDonalds for lunch’. The response of the McDonald’s Duathlon major sponsor also highlighted similar issues: ‘We need to educate the people to buy healthy food. We can afford to create it. When people want to eat more healthy food, we’ll have it. We’re developing it. At the moment we’re trialling it and failing at every level’. Such beliefs have been criticised. For example, Kaplan and Brownell (2010, p. 1487) highlighted that a ‘strategy of the [fast food] industry is to claim that failures in personal responsibility are the cause of the nation’s obesity problem’. This shifts the responsibility of maintaining a healthy lifestyle back to the individual member of society (Lurie, 2010) and away from the company producing the unhealthy options for the community as a whole. Based on the stance of Kaplan and Brownell (2010) and Lurie (2010), the responsibility to maintain a healthy lifestyle rests with individual event participants with regard to (1) whether they participate in the event to begin with and to what extent, (2) whether they choose to consume any type of sponsors product following their participation and (3) to what degree they continue to abide by healthy lifestyle initiatives following the completion of the event.
From a theoretical perspective, Freeman’s (1984; 2004; 2009; 2010) stakeholder theory and Rowley's (1997) social network theory do not provide insight into an event participant’s choice to participate in an event and whether they consume (or not consume) an associated sponsors product. These theoretical frameworks were not selected for this purpose. In relation to personal choice, Fullagar (2002, p.72) considers that an ‘individual’s freedom to choose not to engage in physical activity has become an even more urgent government concern’.

The overarching public health agenda which exists within society has the potential to influence organisational values. Stern (2008) considers an organisation’s values to be set within a plurality of values which exist within society. According to Freeman et al. (2004) and Schneider (2002), these stem from ethical principles which guide stakeholder management. The identification and alignment of organisational values are discussed in Section 7.2 below.

### 7.2 Organisational Values and Corporate Social Responsibility

Schneider (2002, p. 211) defines organisational values as a set of ‘ethical principles guiding management’. Respondents emphasised their organisation's values and how these aligned with those of other organisations associated with the community sport event with which they were associated. Many respondents identified corporate social responsibility as a prominent factor when it came to developing their own organisational values and aligning with the values and objectives of other organisations and community sport events.
This section utilizes varying theoretical components contributed by Freeman (2007), Mitchell et al., (1997) and Rowley (1997). These components include recognising company versus product values, acknowledging that stakeholder density encourages value alignment, confirming that organisational success is reflected in value maintenance and Freeman's (2007) Value Analysis Model. This section also addresses RQ1 and RQ1b, with specific reference to the influence a public health agenda can have on corporate social responsibility and the relationship between corporate social responsibility and community sport event stakeholder decisions. RQ2 is also addressed in relation to implications stemming from stakeholder decisions associated with organisational values and corporate social responsibility.

7.2.1 The Establishment and Identification of Values
Musgrave (2011) considers the scrutiny of event stakeholders to be inextricably linked to environmental, social and economic factors. Similarly, respondents in this study acknowledged that an overarching public health agenda influenced not only their community event involvement and management, but also their general approaches to business including the establishment of values. For example a corporate team entrant noted in their Health First publication (April, 2006) that their organisation would not be seen to support anything that ‘contradicted key public health messages’ (p.3). Similarly a recipient charity identified an ‘ethical responsibility to create a health promoting environment’ in their Heart Foundation Food Advertising Statement (located in Appendices 9.8). Meanwhile, a facilitator identified the goal of creating a ‘thriving healthy environment’ alongside the need to ‘promote health, leisure and lifestyle choices’ in their 2007-2017 Events Strategy. A volunteer group chose to focus on the promotion and development of healthy young people, while a major sponsor identified
the need to consider the effects of obesity and other social issues in their *Compliance and Social Responsibility Committee Charter*. These findings support those of Davis and Jones (1996) who determined that social and political change can encourage the development of public policy specifically focussed on health. Additionally, this stance aligns with the viewpoint of Freeman (2007) in that social values have become an increasingly important aspect for stakeholder managers to consider. Freeman (2004) identifies the need for organisations to incorporate responsibility to the communities in which they operate as a key component of corporate social responsibility. This is evidenced by organisational values which have been established within a societal context.

Cunningham et al., (1993), McDonald (1991) and Monye (2000) state that organisations have values which link directly to their ideal image. In support of this, respondents, including, major sponsors, corporate team entrants, recipient charities and facilitators noted the establishment and maintenance of specific values in accordance with their organisation's objectives. For example, respondents echoed Freeman's (2004) argument that values are now a part of doing business. All the respondents interviewed identified specific sets of values by which their organisation or event operated. For example, the event owner of the City to Surf considered the event as a ‘healthy, active event; which gives a lot to the community’. One of the major sponsors acknowledged that their company’s values ensured that they did not directly ‘market to anybody under the age of 14’. Ensuring that organisational values are maintained is described by Freeman (1984) as a key component in ensuring the success of an organisation. In order to achieve success stakeholders can implement a series of actions. These actions are discussed in relation to power exertion in Section 7.3. In other situations, values can be
imposed on organisations by other funding or management organisations. For example, an event facilitator noted that ‘under our [organisation’s] new funding outcomes with Sport and Recreation New Zealand (SPARC) [now Sport New Zealand], one of the things that they want us to do is to be in the events space around increasing participation in events for both youth and adults’. These values, in turn, guided that organisation’s decisions to associate with community sport events and particular stakeholders.

7.2.2 Value Alignment

When choosing to align with other organisations within a community sport event setting, respondents including event owners, major sponsors, recipient charities, and facilitators noted that it was essential for their values to align not only with the event itself, but also with the event’s other stakeholders. For example, one event owner noted that their organisation was ‘approached by companies all the time to do things which wouldn’t necessarily fit with the audience so we turn them down’. Similarly, one of the major sponsors explained that their company ‘have a list of suitable and unsuitable events. Less than 10km is Pump (water), Powerade is unsuitable. To be honest Powerade just fits into [the event] and what we want to do’.

When stakeholder values align, stakeholder relationships can be forged and efficiently maintained. For example, when Pump became the naming rights sponsor for the City to Surf in 2010, a corporate team entrant identified a record number of entrants for their corporate team (Heartbeat, 2010). This scenario reflects the argument by Freeman et al. (2004) in that the sharing of values can bring stakeholders together and achieve ongoing success.
Value alignment issues proved more complex to manage when attempts were made by stakeholders to distinguish between a sponsor organisation and one or more of its associated brands. The event owner of the Auckland Round the Bays was conscious of their organisation being publicly associated with one of the event’s major sponsors. ‘We have Coke as a sponsor, but actually [they provide] Pump water. Now we know it is Coke, but the audience doesn’t and Pump is a Coke brand’ (event owner). This supports the findings of Pope (1998) and Becker-Olsen, Cudmore and Hill (2004) who considered differences in consumer’s opinions and the potential for discrimination between products and brands difficult to gauge when it came to sponsorship. On occasion, there were also differing values between product lines. For example, an event owner described how ‘Powerade . . . is the first choice for the course and it’s your after match drink. But then Coke [is used for the] . . . concerts after the event. Coke should then be the lead brand – the hero brand for the concerts and after party. Pump should be associated with the kid’s marathon for us’. The respondent for the major sponsor agreed with this sentiment, noting that sponsors needed to ‘make sure that [their] brands are actually in the right place for the right reasons against the right audience’. This suggestion links directly to image association via value alignment as noted by Lindgreen and Swaen (2010) and Speed and Thompson (2000). Meenaghan and Shipley (1999) considered that some sponsors seek linkage to an event or activity which intrudes on societal consciousness thereby ensuring exposure to their brand. A sponsor’s brand, whether it be associated with the company as a whole or with a specific product the company produces needs, to be compatible with the values of the event it sponsors in order to guarantee positive and beneficial exposure. For example, one major sponsor outlined a set of specific criteria for each product brand their organisation managed.
From a theoretical perspective the need to distinguish between company brand and product brand is important. Freeman (2010) and Mitchell et al., (1997) identified a need to assess differing values between companies or the products they produce and the potential for stakeholder value alignment. These two aspects are inextricably linked as differentiating between a company brand, such as Coca Cola, and one of the products they manufacture, such as Pump, can determine different sets of values and the potential for value alignment. Such is the case when events have changed official naming rights products, but not the company which actually owned them.

Literature regarding organisational values primarily refers to the matching of stakeholder values as value alignment. However, respondents suggested that they search for stakeholder values which can complement those of their company as opposed to those which are identical. A majority of the respondents interviewed referred to this process as ‘stakeholder fit’. For example, one event owner noted that their organisation tries ‘to make things fit with the event in some way. It has to tie in’. Another event owner provided a more specific example, having outlined that their main values include increasing the livelihood of young children:

*With The Ports of Auckland as the naming rights sponsor, the charity they support is the Trust Clean-Up Campaign. There was a lot of discussion at the time when they came in as the naming rights sponsor whether that link was children focussed enough. We actually decided that is the future for New Zealand kids – to be able to come to the beach and the city and have it a clean, healthy area to be in. We agreed it works.*
As an expansion on stakeholder ‘fit’, one major sponsor noted that ‘an event that may be a fit with our organisation and our brands one year may not necessarily be so the next’. This further highlights the explanation of stakeholder relationships and how organisational values can change over time. For example, one event owner stated, in reference to a corporate team entrant that ‘their [organisation’s] values and goals change year to year, and that as a result it was hard to keep up with where they were at’.

One event sponsor was adamant that their organisation would no longer want to be part of an event if the values of the event or of its other stakeholders changed to contradict their own. These views are similar to Verbeke and Tung’s (2012) findings, in as much as stakeholder preferences evolve over time.

Changing preferences can result in differences in opinion which can make successful stakeholder transactions difficult to achieve (Freeman, 1984). Within a community sport event context changing stakeholder preferences can result from changing stakeholder values and objectives. In turn, these can influence stakeholder decisions to maintain an ongoing relationship with an event. Freeman’s (1984) argument is illustrated by the actions of one event facilitator who acknowledged that their organisation was at one stage focussed on sport and sport participation, whereas they now considered themselves ‘heading down the road towards health’. This particular organisation’s change in objectives from general sport participation to the health benefits associated with physical activity resulted in changed preferences when it came to establishing new and maintaining existing stakeholder alignments.

Extending upon Verbeke and Tung’s (2012) findings, one major sponsor interviewed noted that stakeholder values changed over time. The sponsor also raised the issue of sponsors and event owners signing long term contracts, effectively binding the sponsor
with the event for an extended period (often three or more years). ‘There are pros and cons in locking a sponsor organisation in for a long period of time. Sometimes it works. [However], if [the relationship] is purely on [a] brand basis then that’s really tough and the event is putting itself at risk’. This acknowledgement raises issues in relation to stakeholder value analysis. Freeman (1984) devised the ‘Value Analysis Model’ (see Chapter Three) to identify and recognise stakeholder incompatibility issues and the potential differences between an organisation’s values and the values of other stakeholders. While useful in theory, it would need to be regular and ongoing, as opposed to a one off procedure at the beginning of the stakeholder relationship in order to account for changes in stakeholder values.

Rowley’s (1997) proposition on stakeholder density is relevant when reviewing long term stakeholder relationships as it suggests that dense relationships between stakeholder groups (i.e. those that have formed close relationships) have more chance of ensuring their values align. However, the development of stakeholder density and strong stakeholder relationships takes time (Freeman, 2007). One event owner acknowledged a deeper appreciation for stakeholders with which their organisation had had a longer relationship. ‘We look at the history with that sponsor . . . We’ve had a relationship with that sponsor for the past ten to twelve years now, so you have think about that too’. Alternatively, as mentioned above, with time comes changing perspectives, new staff members, updated policies and refreshed values. Therefore, Rowley’s stakeholder density model is only applicable in community sport event scenarios where perspectives and values continue to align. A long term stakeholder relationship does not necessarily guarantee an absence of changing values at some stage in the future.
Consideration of a diverse value set, whether product or organisation focussed, is needed when entering a multi-stakeholder relationship (Shockley-Zalabak & Morley, 1989). As Stern (2008) notes, there are instances when the values of one organisation may not align or fit those of others. Such occurrences and consequences are discussed in further detail within Section 7.3. Prior to this, the influence corporate social responsibility can have on establishing organisational values is discussed in Section 7.2.3 below.

7.2.3 Corporate Social Responsibility

‘In response to increasing rates of obesity, many food companies have announced policies of corporate responsibility’ (Ludwig & Nestle, 2008, p. 1808). As a result, community based sport events can offer an attractive way for companies to be seen as supporting their local communities (Cunningham et al., 1993; Irwin et al., 2002; Monye, 2000) or developing good public relations (Waaeras, 2007). The choice to participate as a sponsor in a community sport event was noted by many respondents as a way to give back to the community (as suggested by Allen et al., 2008; Walliser, 2003) and acknowledged as a core component of their corporate social responsibility. One event owner stated that ‘as a company one of our missions is to be as engaged as possible with the communities we operate in’. This was similarly noted by other sponsors. For example, one major sponsor noted that it was ‘important we are involved in the community and like any big business we have a chunk of money specifically for that’. The sponsor also referred to an organisational policy document (Compliance and Social Responsibility Committee Charter) which outlined specific stances and approaches to social issues and the company's reputation. An event owner and major sponsor
identified corporate responsibility as an integral part of their organisation’s business strategy on their website (2013), with specific mention to community involvement and giving back. An event facilitator also noted the growing importance of the corporate social responsibility approach to business and sport sponsorship, stating that ‘ten years ago, money was money and away you rode. There wasn’t social responsibility and that’s what it comes down to [now] in many respects’. This sentiment echoes the stance of Sheth and Babiak (2010), who suggest that the concept of corporate social responsibility within the sports industry is relatively new but becoming increasingly important.

Furthermore, respondents including event owners, major sponsors, volunteer groups, and facilitators, referred to corporate social responsibility simply as ‘social responsibility’. These respondents suggested that the concept had developed well beyond the realms of corporate business. For example, when was asked if their support of the McDonald’s Duathlon was a matter of corporate social responsibility, the major sponsor responded by saying ‘well I’m [i.e. my company] not corporate. Social responsibility maybe?’ Such arguments are in contrast to the opinions of Leonard and McAdam (2003), Carroll (1991), Lindgreen and Swaen (2010) who consistently refer to corporate social responsibility as being positioned within the corporate sector and involving executives and corporate behaviour. In a similar view, Freeman (2010, p.263) argues ‘that the size of a corporation is central to social responsibility’. However, interviewees in the case of this research represent organisations which varied in size and did not necessarily position themselves within the corporate sector. Their responses did tend not to support the arguments made by Lindgreen and Swaen (2010) Leonard and McAdam (2003), Carroll (1991) or Freeman (2010).
7.3 Power Exertion and Legitimacy

The action of exerting power can be understood by determining what factors encourage or necessitate the action in the first place. Parmar et al., (2009) suggest that power exertion can be a reaction to financial and moral consequences. Henry and Slack (2007) consider power to be exerted during times of conflict. While an exertion of power may be encouraged by the failure of aligning values, respondents for this research also identified issues with power emanating from pre-existing relationships, personal agenda and stakeholder or investment size. These are discussed in further detail below.

This section and the following sub-sections utilize varying theoretical components contributed by Freeman (2007), Mitchell et al., (1997) and Rowley (1997). These components include stakeholder typology, perceived power stake, network centrality and Freeman’s (2007) Enterprise Level Strategy. This section also addresses RQ1 and RQ1a with regard to influences associated with community sport event stakeholder power and legitimacy. It also highlights the why and how power and legitimacy are exerted by community sport event stakeholders, thus also addressing RQ1b and RQ2.

7.3.1 Value Alignment Failure

Community based events can be attractive to sponsors due to their ability to boost corporate image (Cunningham et al., 1993; Irwin et al., 2002; Monye, 2000). However, taking the plethora of values a diverse group of stakeholders may have into consideration can be problematic (Shockley-Zalabak & Morley, 1989). Freeman (2007) considered organisational values to drive stakeholder behaviour. When differing values fail to align, this has the potential to have a detrimental impact on the images of the
stakeholders involved (McDonald, 1991). In turn, failure can act as a further catalyst, encouraging certain stakeholders to exert their power. For example, one major sponsor was continually aware of the image their organisation promoted to the public. ‘We are very careful who we sponsor, where we sponsor and where that sponsorship is seen and promoted’. Additionally, an event facilitator commented on their association with the Auckland Marathon, noting that there was ‘potential conflict for [their organisation] in that [they] were sponsored by ASICS’ and the event was sponsored by ADIDAS (a rival company). Exclusivity in support in this instance was to the organisation’s primary sponsor (ASICS) as opposed to the competitor sponsor of the event (ADIDAS). Another event facilitator acknowledged that when entering into any stakeholder relationship their organisation would ‘make sure that [that relationship] was not going to generate any negative publicity’. This supports the stance of Koplan and Brownell (2010, p.1487) who stated that

the food industry has sought credibility by teaming with respected partners (eg. a beverage company partnering with a medical profession association). This tarnishes the partner and is seen as a cynical way of buying influence and good will.

Koplan and Brownell’s (2010) findings align with those of Ludwig and Nestle (2009, p. 1810) who note that a ‘professional health associations must avoid partnerships, product endorsement fees or other financial ties with industry that compromise their independence and public credibility’. If a relationship with an event has negative connotations, then that can in turn have a negative impact upon the sponsor. There is therefore a need for stakeholders to distance themselves, as far as possible, from anything political or controversial (Boyle & Haynes, 2000).
This approach was evidenced when, in 2012, when the City to Surf re-launched following the Christchurch earthquakes and the cancellation of the event in 2011 and switched from Pump as its major sponsor back to Powerade. The stance of the event's largest corporate team entrant proved to be the same as the one they had taken in 2006.

It was very disappointing to have the [event] revert to PowerAde sponsorship. [We] did not support the City to Surf in 2012. There was no corporate sponsorship, funding or hospitality provided for staff - any CDHB person who entered did so as an individual.

This decision highlights the fluid nature of events, the importance of stakeholder value alignments and how stakeholder preferences can change, the latter of which was identified by Verbeke and Tung (2012). The viewpoint of the organisation that the corporate team represented remained the same. Interestingly, the media furore that surrounded the same issue in 2006 did not re-occur in 2012. This was due to the organisation the corporate team represented deciding not to challenge the change in sponsorship as ‘there was too much happening locally to begin a negative media campaign’. This comment was in reference to the city’s recovery from the 2010 and 2011 earthquakes and suggests that there are unique situations when a potentially ‘dangerous’ stakeholder may choose not to use urgency and power and be a danger to the event, as described by Mitchell et al., (1997, pp. 874-878) in their stakeholder typology. It would also suggest that stakeholders who lack legitimacy can still act in a coercive manner. Similarly, Schneider (2002) argued that a stakeholder’s failure to support the actions or values of another stakeholder may result in a defensive reaction. In an event scenario, such defensive action may result in a stakeholder boycotting the event or limiting their support of the event.
Masterman (2007) noted most sponsors were seeking a return on their investment through increased sales. This sentiment was echoed by two of the major sponsors representatives who believed that being forced to replace Powerade with Pump as an event naming rights product had ‘no added value’ for their company. ‘Anyone can tell you what water tastes like . . . sampling pure water is ridiculously stupid. The reason you want to [conduct] sampling is to [market the product and access] people that do not understand what a product tastes like’. In the instance of the Round the Bays event, the event owner did not appear fully aware of their major sponsor’s stance. Instead they suggested that their event ensured ‘sponsors had a captive audience where Pump [could conduct] sampling’. This difference of opinion serves to highlight the importance of regular and ongoing discussions about value alignments between stakeholders, from both a sponsor’s company and product perspective (Becker-Olsen, Cudmore and Hill, 2004; Pope, 1998).

Walliser (2003, p.10) identified ‘notable differences in the perception of sponsorship . . . depending on the sponsorship area’ and that ‘generally, sponsors are more easily accepted in association with sporting events than with arts or social causes’. However, this proved not to be the case in relation to the respondents interviewed for this research. For example, one major sponsor and an event facilitator considered there to be more criticism over sponsorship of sport events than community events such as Christmas in the Park, a community focussed concert and picnic event. Another event facilitator identified the McDonald’s Teddy Bears Picnic as a non-sport event which received no overt criticism. There was little difference also between the sponsorship of sport events and sport teams. One event facilitator highlighted the existing All Blacks
and Powerade sponsorship relationship, noting that ‘The All Blacks are all over the television promoting Powerade . . . like it’s one of New Zealand’s biggest sports brands. They have got no problem jumping on the Powerade bandwagon. It’s interesting.’

### 7.3.2 Pre-Existing Relationships

Pre-existing relationships can impact stakeholder decision making processes. ‘In reality, it is unlikely that all stakeholders will be linked directly to each other . . . but the nature of any existing between-stakeholder relationships influences a stakeholder’s behaviour and, consequently, the demands it places on the focal organisation’ (Rowley, 1997, p. 890). For example, one major sponsor considered that the choice of an event owner to align with certain stakeholder’s requests was

> because we don’t spend any money with (event owner), whereas (corporate team entrant) do. There’s definitely a challenge for (event owner), it’s their community event and their way of giving back to the community. However, they have got financial imperatives that are no doubt swaying their thinking.

Firstly, this aligns with the views of Rowley (1997, p.890) who stated that ‘since stakeholder relationships do not occur in a vacuum of dyadic ties, but rather in a network of influences, a firm’s stakeholders are likely to have direct relationships with one another’. For example, in relation to the Auckland Marathon, it was revealed that one of the event facilitators held a pre-existing relationship with one of the events other facilitators. This also proved to be the case with the Round the Bays event where a sponsor company advertised prior to the event with the event owner. Additional pre-existing relationship notes for each case study are located in Chapter Five. Secondly, the acknowledgement of ‘special duties’ within Freeman’s (1984) Primary and Secondary
Stakeholder model could account for scenarios such as pre-existing relationships and the subsequent choices event managers or other stakeholders make due to these relationships (See Figure 3.1, Chapter Three). Pre-existing relationships can also be affected by stakeholder disagreements taking place within the community sport event environment. For example, one major sponsor noted that their company had a limited relationship, from a vending point of view with an event stakeholder who had questioned the health benefits of their products. The product range supplied by the sponsor had been considerably reduced and was now limited to sugarless beverages.

7.3.3 Personal Agenda

The decision to exert power or influence sport organisations has previously been linked to personal characteristics (Cuskelley & Auld, 2006) and individual personalities (Reid, 2011). This was found to be the case also in this research. For example, one major sponsor also noted the choices he made in relation to his company were based on values instilled in his own upbringing. The event owner of the City to Surf identified a personal agenda as the major instigator behind the 2006 event controversy. ‘That’s what happened in 2006. We’d had years of being associated with the major sponsors and there were no problems’ until a change in personnel took place at the organisation which entered the largest corporate team entrant. The event’s major sponsor agreed with this viewpoint, noting that ‘it was probably the personnel rather than the entity itself [that sparked the sponsorship challenge]. . . There’s either personal agenda somewhere in the business or it’s one of their values . . . I think someone made it a personal agenda because they were so vociferous about the connection and not wanting it there’. In his Value Analysis model, Freeman (1984) suggested a segue from the intrinsic values of individual executives to the values of the organisation for which those
individuals work. Interviewee responses suggested that an individual’s intrinsic values and the impacts these can have on personal agenda within an organisation are unavoidable. In turn, the decision making influence a stakeholder may have, as noted by Heller (1997, p. 473) is much broader.

7.3.4 Event Scale, Profile and Level of Stakeholder Investment

Respondents, including event owners and facilitators, implied that the size of an event, organisation or brand can determine whether or not it is worth challenging an event manager’s decision or stakeholder relationship. For example, one event facilitator noted that ‘bigger events are more politically inclined; thus more chance of demands from stakeholders on larger scale events’. An event owner acknowledged that their decision to address the relationship with one of their corporate team entrants was due to the size of the corporate team. This parallels Reid’s (2011, p.26) findings who suggested that power is exerted by ‘event stakeholders who are the largest in size and have been involved [in the event] over an extended period of time’. This was also supported by one event owner who noted that the brand associated with their event resulted in a lot of attention from the public and the media ‘It’s the biggest event of its kind in the South Island and people come from all over the place just to do it’. The major sponsor of the McDonalds Duathlon held a similar view point, noting that one of the probable reasons their company’s event avoided media attention was due to the profile of the event being ‘relatively small and that the politics were therefore a lot lower’.

The amount a stakeholder invests in a community sport event can also influence whether or not that stakeholder chooses to exert influence over an area of the event. One event facilitator noted that ‘the amount of investment is definitely linked to how
much say you have got in what goes on’. This viewpoint was similarly noted by a respondent from an event recipient charity, who identified an equal level of expectation. ‘The level of power you have over what happens depends on what kind of input you have’. Expectations were also noted by this stakeholder as increasing when money was invested. Parent and Deephouse (2007) also confirmed that the level of a stakeholder’s input was proportional to their exertion of power over an event. From a theoretical standpoint, Freeman et al., (2004) and Stern (2008) highlight the importance of stakeholder’s financial investments and their concern for consequential profit. While in a community sport event setting, sponsorship may not result in direct profit, a sponsor will ensure direct influence in the event to ensure indirect profit from the marketing and promotional aspects associated with their role and financial commitment.

7.3.5 Factors Influencing Legitimacy

The concept of legitimacy suggests that the ‘actions of a stakeholder are desirable or appropriate’ (Schneider, 2002, p.217) and confirms the ‘validity of a stakeholder’s claim’ (Tsiotsou, 2011, p.559). The legitimacy of a stakeholder’s request can be associated with their role identification and position within the hierarchical structure of the event.

Role Identification

As identified in Chapter Five, the stakeholders interviewed for this thesis all held specific and sometimes dual, roles in relation to the events with which they were associated. In many cases, such roles were met with little or no objection from other stakeholders or the stakeholder themselves. The type of role a stakeholder considered themselves to hold or were perceived to hold by others, influenced the legitimacy of
their power. For example, one sponsor noted that the level of influence a stakeholder had ‘depends on whether you are a major or minor sponsor’.

In some instances there were significant differences in perceived and assigned stakeholder role identification, due to differing perceptions between the event manager, associated stakeholders, and/or the individual stakeholder themselves. For example, one event manager classified an event stakeholder as a corporate team entrant. This view was also shared by other stakeholders, including facilitators and the recipient charity. Yet, the corporate team entrant concerned continually referred to their organisation as a sponsor of the event, noting that they had ‘always been relied upon to sponsor [the event]’. Freeman (2007) refers to the concept of power stake in order to explain the involvement or ‘stake’ a stakeholder can have in an organisation. In the community sport event context, event stakeholders have a stake in the event itself. In reference to the research findings, Freeman (2007) also confirms perceptions regarding the stake an organisation has can differ depending on viewpoint (for example, who it is that is assessing the power stake an organisation may have in an event). This issue also arises in relation to the hierarchical status assigned or adopted by a stakeholder.

Stakeholder role identification was considered important by many of the stakeholders interviewed for this thesis because it resulted in determining hierarchical status and associated legitimacy of power. However, this raises the question of who defines what a stakeholder is, as discussed by Hardy and Clegg (2004), Freeman (1984), Jensen and Sandstrom, (2011), Magness (2008) and Steib (2009). For example, Freeman (1984) noted that perceptions of power can differ depending on one’s standpoint. Similarly, Magness (2008) highlighted the difference between how a stakeholder may classify
their own organisation and how that organisation may be classified by other groups. As a major sponsor, one respondent considered their company to hold ‘the ability to influence the event’ if and when needed. Another sponsor noted that as a major sponsor the event managers need to always keep their company in mind. Correspondingly, an event facilitator linked the status associated with a major community sport event role with an equivocal level of action: ‘Because you don’t have a major role in the event, you don’t feel like you can come out and say that you do not agree’. However, an exception to this argument is displayed by the Waikato District Health Board and their criticism of the McDonald’s Duathlon, for which they were not a direct stakeholder. Such criticism may well fall into the societal issue vortex identified by Freeman (1984) which highlighted the broad influence of society on organisational values and strategies. This would suggest that the Waikato District Health Board is a strong advocate for a public health agenda and the reduction of the marketing unhealthy food to children. Pressure is placed upon the event manager to change their sponsor to one which has healthier connotations.

Hierarchical Status

Freeman (1984) suggests that defining an individual or group as a stakeholder automatically connotes their legitimacy. This view is supported event owners, major sponsors, corporate team participants, volunteer groups, recipient charities and event facilitators who noted that stakeholder hierarchy plays an important role in determining legitimacy of actions. This supports the notion that power and authority are linked to hierarchical structure, social relations and role (Hardy & Clegg, 2004; Held & McGrew, 2003). In this sense, some stakeholders hold more influence in management decisions while others hold less (Heller, 1997). Role identification can, therefore play a
prominent role in determining a stakeholder’s hierarchical status, which in turn influences the legitimacy of their actions. For example, a volunteer group questioned the role of one of the corporate team entrants. ‘They’re not actual sponsors though are they? They’re just competitors’. Almost all of the respondents interviewed identified some form of stakeholder hierarchical structure linked to the legitimacy of power exertion. For example, the event owner of Auckland Marathon acknowledged the use of ‘sponsor hierarchy, with everything up to full rights [for naming rights sponsors]. Without them the event doesn’t go ahead’. In this instance the adopted sponsorship hierarchical structure was determined based on stakeholder classification from the perspective of the event manager.

In relation to stakeholder classification, one event owner noted that ‘sponsors came first, then suppliers (anyone who associated their brand with our event), then our corporate teams come in after that bracket’. It is here where there appear to be major issues, with the perspectives of event owners/managers and other stakeholders - those being classified and those partaking in self-classification. Power is commonly linked to sponsorship hierarchy, such as the gold, silver and bronze status levels identified by Farrelly, Quester and Burton (1997) and utilized by the event owner of the McDonalds Duathlon. An event sponsor also noted that legitimacy of a stakeholder’s demand ‘depends on whether you are a major or minor sponsor. I would suggest that the event organiser has the majority of power’. This correlates with views of other stakeholders that event ownership ensures utmost control over event operation and value alignment. More specifically, a recipient charity highlighted the issues associated with role identification and corresponding hierarchical structure. They noted that the difference between being a stakeholder in partnership with an event and being a recipient charity
associated with an event is that the latter position connotes very little influence in how the event is coordinated and therefore very little legitimacy.

This viewpoint supports the work of Parmar, Freeman, Harrison, Wicks, de Colle and Purnell (2010) who note that stakeholder legitimacy can be justified when based on delegating stakeholders into either primary or secondary subsets (See Figure 3.4, Chapter Three).

Primary refers to groups whose support is necessary for the firm to exist, and to who the firm may have special duties towards. Secondary stakeholders have no formal claim on the firm, and management has no special duties pertaining to them; nevertheless, the firm may have regular moral duties, such as not doing them harm.

(Freeman et al., 2010, p.14)

While this approach attempts to overcome the issues surrounding stakeholder classification and legitimacy, it does not appear to provide enough separation between stakeholder types and the legitimacy of their claims to power. Factors such as a stakeholder's history (e.g. length of relationship, strength of network) and multiple stakeholder positions can impact upon a stakeholder's choice to act and can also influence the impacts on event managers. The quality of a relationship can also influence stakeholder behaviour (Battacharya, 2009). For example, one event owner acknowledged that their organisation would review ‘the history of the sponsor, their involvement, the product they supply, the fit of the event’. This suggests that community event stakeholders are assessed and potentially ranked based on their contribution to the event, be it potential or previous. It is the different levels of stakeholder contribution which appear to confirm hierarchical status and legitimacy of power. From
a theoretical perspective, stakeholder theory offers little explanation to account for instances when the level of a stakeholder’s contribution reflects their role and legitimacy of power. Stieb (2009) argued that ‘Freeman provides no way of assessing whether one stakeholder has made a greater contribution than another’ (p.405).

The legitimacy of a stakeholder should not necessarily just be based on the entity making the claim, but also the claim itself and the associated behaviour of the claimant (Santana, 2012). Freeman (1984, p.45) identified legitimacy based on a ‘stakeholders ability to affect the direction of the firm’ (or in the case of this thesis, the event). Legitimacy based on role was lacking in the case of one stakeholder due to their classification as a corporate team entrant rather than a major sponsor. However, consistent with Freeman’s (1984) theoretical approach, the corporate team entrant affected the event financially because of their withdrawal in protest to the choice of major sponsor.

Event managers providing special attention to one set of stakeholders more so than another was also identified by stakeholders as an issue for contention. It was noted that it was not necessarily an equal level of attention across all stakeholders that was required, more so that event managers needed to be aware of the influence any stakeholder can have and treat them accordingly. Freeman (2007) also argued that secondary stakeholders can influence the relationships an organisation has with its primary stakeholders. Firstly, secondary stakeholders can directly influence the organisation (such as event owner/manager) without having to establish a pathway through a primary stakeholder. Government and media can directly impact community sport events through implementing policy and regulation or promoting certain aspects
of stakeholder’s views to the public. Secondly, the identification and separation of primary and secondary stakeholders reverts back to stakeholder classification, thus returning to the question of who is identifying the primary and secondary status of the stakeholders.

One sponsor however, did highlight an issue with their defined role. While the role of the naming rights sponsor is automatically assumed to indicate high status by other stakeholders, the associated benefits are not always considered as important by the sponsor. One major sponsor noted that ‘the naming rights were not necessarily the be all and end all’ in relation to their continued support of the event. ‘If you ask someone what the name of the event is it’s the City to Surf, not [the sponsors name] City to Surf’. This was due to the event brand having been long established as the ‘Christchurch Star City to Surf’. It was also noted that their continued support of the event came as an attempt to lock other competing products out of the event.

Existing event stakeholder hierarchical structures predominantly focus on one type of stakeholder: the sponsor. An expanded and more inclusive event stakeholder hierarchical structure could provide insights for event owners and managers. A formal hierarchical structure can aid in defining roles and duties of groups in a clearer manner (Wicks, Gilbert & Freeman, 1994). Increased awareness of hierarchy is needed as stakeholders exert power (Freeman, 1984). The concept of incorporating a hierarchical approach to organising stakeholders is also supported by Jensen and Sandstrom (2011), who noted a ‘failure to recognise who gets to define what a stake and what stakeholders are’ (p.481). This was echoed by Mitchell et al., (1997, p.854) who designed a stakeholder typology model which expanded on Freeman’s Primary and Secondary
approach and classified stakeholders based on a management perspective and power stake. For example, a major sponsor of an event could be described as a dominant expectant stakeholder. ‘Their influence is assured’ due to the possession of legitimate power. However this approach does not identify event stakeholders based on their classified roles and also fails to consider occurrences of self-classification. Hardy and Clegg (2004, p.350) highlight the need to confirm in whose eyes the power is deemed legitimate. Legitimate stakeholder requests were identified by the event manager in the case of the Auckland Marathon with regard to one of its facilitators. Here it was noted that it was the facilitator that had ‘more involvement than anything, but that is okay because they’re a major investor in the event’. In this example, power is exerted and considered legitimate by all stakeholders involved in the event.

Hierarchical status and associated legitimacy can also be analysed through the network analysis work conducted by Rowley (1997). ‘The primary focus of social network analysis is the interdependence of actors and how their positions in networks influence their opportunities, constraints, and behaviours (Wasserman & Galaskiewicz, 1994. Cited in Rowley, 1997, p. 894). Centrality refers to ‘power obtained through the network’s structure, as opposed to power gained through individual attributes’ (Rowley, 1997, p. 898). Those stakeholders who consider their organisations to hold a central position and hold links with other stakeholders have legitimate power in this light. For example one corporate team entrant identified a higher status and thus more centrality, as being directly linked to a sponsorship role and an associated level of resources injected. Figure 7.3 presents a revised stakeholder relationship map for the City to Surf case study as an exemplar of Rowley’s (1997) stakeholder centrality approach. This event was selected as an example due to its ability to illustrate the
complexity of the situation (Simon, 2009) and strategic organisational approach (Eisenhardt, 1989; Larsson, 1993, Mitnzberg, 1979) and further justifies the decision of utilizing a case study approach – as outlined in Section 4.2.2 of Chapter 4 (Methodology).

Figure 7.3 re-positions the City to Surf’s corporate team entrant in a central position based on their pre-existing relationships with other City to Surf stakeholders. Rowley’s (1997) centrality approach could aid in explaining the corporate team entrant belief that their position within the stakeholder network was significant. This perspective could account for the power exerted and the belief that such power exertion was legitimate based on their position within the stakeholder network.

Figure 7.3: Updated Network Structure of the City to Surf (based on Rowley’s, 1997, Centrality Theory)
Essentially, Rowley (1997, p.898) argued that ‘as the focal organization’s centrality increases, its ability to resist stakeholder pressures increases’. Different levels of centrality and density result in different scenarios. ‘Network centrality implies a position of status’ similar to a hierarchical position associated with formal power (Rowley, 1997, p.898). Similarly, hierarchy is fundamental to organisational coordination (Freeman, 2010). In relation to this research, the focal firm is predominantly identified as the event owner/manager. Different case studies offered different network densities depending on the number of pre-existing relationships.

It could be argued that stakeholders who hold pre-existing relationships with other community sport event stakeholders can potentially encroach upon on the central position of a community sport event stakeholder network. This suggestion is based on Rowley’s (1997) description of stakeholder network density and the suggested change in stakeholder network centrality in Figure 7.2.

Importantly, Freeman (1984) noted that the traditional model of one group maintaining authority over others is metamorphic. Such status is influenced by changing values and a need to maintain image. Ongoing changes in organisational values are further supported by respondents including event owners, corporate team entrants, general sponsors and event facilitators. It is also dependent on factors such as event size and level of input. In the case of the City to Surf, the corporate team entrant may have once been considered a dormant latent stakeholder under the Mitchell et al., (1997) model. This shifted in 2006 when the organisation faced a change in personnel and identified a threat to its image. As a result, the stakeholder became a ‘dangerous expectant stakeholder’ with urgency and power, but which lacks legitimacy. This is accounted for in the design of Mitchell et al., Stakeholder Typology model. The authors note that the
model ‘allows predictions to be made about managerial behaviour with respect to each class of stakeholder, as well as predictions about how stakeholders change from one class to another and what this means to managers’ (p. 855).

Power, legitimacy and urgency arguably play a role in determining stakeholder actions. However, expecting an event manager to predict when an external organisation may change its values, decide to incorporate a public health agenda and/or take on new and influential staff is not plausible. Furthermore, problems occur based on which stakeholder organisations or representatives are faced with the task of considering other stakeholder actions and whether this exertion of power is legitimate. Individual groups may classify themselves differently than the views held by the event managers, the media or general public. This issue is highlighted by Freeman (2010) who identifies the failure to recognise who gets to define what a stake is and who stakeholders are.

7.4 Event and Stakeholder Management Implications

A public health agenda and resulting changes in community sport event stakeholder perspectives has impacted upon the overall management of community sport events. In establishing why event stakeholders consider it necessary to adhere to a public health agenda, Rowley (1997, p.895) notes that ‘an organization must acquiesce to external pressures, since its survival is contingent on its compliance with expectations from institutional constituents, such as the state, and professional and interest groups’. This section highlights the issues identified in the previous sections within this chapter in relation to the implications they have on community sport event management, sponsorship, funding opportunities, policy and legislation.
This section utilizes varying theoretical components contributed by Freeman (2007), Mitchell et al., (1997) and Rowley (1997). These components are summarised in Table 7.1 in Section 7.4.1 below. The table addresses components of RQ1 and RQ1b with regard to confirming the influence a public health agenda can have on community sport events and stakeholder decisions which can affect the management of such events. RQ2 is also addressed with regard to the effects stakeholder power, corporate social responsibility and legitimacy have on community sport event sponsorship and management.

7.4.1 Event Stakeholder Management

Freeman (1984) argues that stakeholder management can be an arduous task if organisational processes are lacking. Tsiotsou (2011) identifies the need for better stakeholder management in order to fully exploit the benefits of sport sponsorship. Similarly, Myllykangas and Kujala (2011) argue that each stakeholder needs to be satisfied with what they give and what they receive in order to maintain a long term relationship [with an event]. Many research respondents of this study suggested ways in which stakeholders and stakeholder relationships could be better managed. These suggestions are categorised, summarised and reflected upon from a theoretical perspective in Table 7.1.
Table 7.1: Proposed Stakeholder Management Initiatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Suggestion</th>
<th>Theoretical Association</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessing New Stakeholder Relationships</strong></td>
<td>Researching an event, its values and existing stakeholders is necessary prior to a stakeholder confirming involvement or continued involvement.</td>
<td>This supports the need for Freeman’s (1984) ‘Value Analysis Process’ outlined in Chapter Three and encourages recognition of organisational and stakeholder values and potential areas of conflict.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Constructing Detailed Stakeholder Contracts</strong></td>
<td>Establish solid and detailed contracts with all stakeholders in order to protect those involved.</td>
<td>The ‘Values Analysis Process’ identified by Freeman (1984) in addition to the confirmation of Rowley’s (1997) stakeholder network structure and stakeholder centrality can assist in clarifying community sport event stakeholders’ roles and responsibilities. These can be written into a stakeholder contract and referred back to should the need arise. The establishment of a specific community sport event stakeholder hierarchical model (see suggestion below) may also assist in the contractual process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reviewing Existing Stakeholder Relationships</strong></td>
<td>Review existing stakeholder relationships on a regular basis. Stakeholder expectations may vary over time, potentially resulting in conflict at a later date. It is important to confirm and reconfirm stakeholder expectations on a regular basis.</td>
<td>The need for ongoing value analysis is discussed in Section 7.2.2 and highlights the regular review of stakeholder values as opposed to the proposed primary value analysis discussed by Freeman (1984). This will aid in the early identification of and response to any conflict between stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Acknowledging Implication of Stakeholder Actions for Community Sport Event managers</strong></td>
<td>Stakeholders must take into consideration how their actions can impact upon other stakeholders as this affects continuing stakeholder alignment.</td>
<td>A familiarity with other event stakeholders and potential implications of stakeholder actions is more likely when stakeholder density exists (Rowley, 1997). Higher density also suggests an increase on communication levels between stakeholders. Within a community sport event setting, the closer the stakeholder alignments, the lesser the chance of adverse effects from stakeholder actions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expanding on Existing Sponsorship Hierarchies</strong></td>
<td>The establishment of a hierarchical stakeholder model could be a useful way in which to rank stakeholders and provide structural guidance, based on their level of input. This approach takes all event stakeholders into account as opposed to just sponsors.</td>
<td>Such a hierarchical model expands on Freeman’s (2010) ‘Creating Value for Stakeholder’ and on Mitchell et al., (1997) stakeholder typology by specifically identifying community sport event stakeholder roles and expectations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.4.2 Sponsorship and Funding Opportunities

The impacts of a public health agenda and the criticism of unhealthy sponsor products were identified by sponsors, facilitators and event managers as limiting community sport event funding opportunities. One event facilitator noted that event funding was already severely limited and that event managers were sourcing funding from wherever they could. Because of this, they were not in a position to be too critical. This stance aligns with the findings of Whitford (2009), who argued that the government does not have an endless supply of funds [to support events]. Whitford (2009) also noted that the government needs to be flexible when it comes to policy in order to allow event managers to source alternative funding. A different event facilitator acknowledged that their decision to not support an event was not necessarily due to the fact that it is sponsored by McDonald’s, but because pressure had been placed upon them from government based institutions. Musgrave (2011) specifically identifies an increasing rise in the scrutiny of event management practices and a resultant change in the way in which events operate. More specifically, issues related to sourcing funding, were identified by existing event sponsors. The majority of event facilitators acknowledged that sponsors were ‘notoriously hard to get’ and did not ‘give up their money very easily’. This facilitator also noted that ‘McDonald’s, Cadbury’s and the big guys’ proved to contradict this pattern and were often more than willing to fund events to demonstrate their corporate social responsibility discussed in Chapter Two and Section 7.2.3.

The funding and sponsorship issues identified above link directly to the findings of previous researchers, including Boyle and Haynes (2000), Davis (2006), Garland and Ferkins (2006), Jackson et al., (2001) and Waikato District Health Board (2011). These
authors note that issues regarding a lack of sponsorship funding could have significant negative effects on the sport industry due to such a high dependency on this type of support. Carrigan and Carrigan (1997, p.61) suggest that ‘sponsors dictate which sports survive’. Freeman (2007) also confirms that stakeholder support is needed in order for an organisation (or event) to exist. The findings from the research conducted for this thesis suggest that this stance has evolved in more recent years.

As a self-prescribed primary source of event funding, an event facilitator for the Auckland Marathon and Auckland Round the Bays acknowledged that ‘unless [government organisations such as themselves] were willing to increase funding levels they would have to come to terms with the fact that event managers would always turn to alcohol, Coca Cola and confectionary organisations to fund their events’. However, event owners for the City to Surf and McDonald’s Duathlon noted that not all event managers were willing to take this approach.

Respondents, including facilitators, sponsors and event owners, noted that event managers are already facing issues associated with maintaining participation rates, managing operational costs and sourcing funding. Prior to the increasing pressures of a public health agenda, event managers have stood by their fast food, soft drink and confectionary sponsors due to their reliance on sponsorship funding (Davis, 2006). Freeman’s (1984; 2004) stakeholder theory was originally intended for profit making within an organisational sense. Within a community sport event context however the concern is financial sustainability. The financial sustainability of community sport events is further hindered by the introduction of event and sponsorship associated regulations and possible legislation. This issue is discussed in further detail below.
7.4.3 Policy and Legislation

The pressure for community event stakeholders to consider the influences of a public health agenda has resulted in increasing consideration of associated product and sponsorship legislation and policy. The major sponsors for the Auckland Round the Bays, Auckland Marathon and the City to Surf noted that in 2006 and 2007 the New Zealand government was close to introducing legislation which would limit the types of products which could be associated with events and schools:

It nearly happened. Ultimately if we got the right set of circumstances again and a government with the willpower to make it happen, then absolutely it would happen.

(R2A, Major Sponsor)

Koplan and Brownell (2010, p.1487 suggest that in some cases, ‘to avoid public criticism and forestall government intervention, the food and beverage industry hopes that self-regulation is sufficient’. The respondent from the recipient charity for the Auckland Marathon, Auckland Round the Bays and the City to Surf recommended the introduction of some form of government regulation in order to ensure public health initiatives could be achieved. These respondent opinions align with those of the World Health Organisation (Hawkes, 2007) and the Waikato District Health Board (2011), both of whom suggest a need for advertising regulations and the introduction of a fat or sugar tax and restricting access to unhealthy products. In support of the call for sponsorship regulation, Yarrow and Jasinski (1996) and Close et al., (2007), suggest that government authorities tend to have an integral role in influencing community sport event coordination. Kaplan and Brownell (2010, p.1487) add that ‘government intervenes frequently to improve public health’.
A consequence of such government influence was noted by one of the major sponsors interviewed. The sponsor stated that as a result of government input, primarily in the format of legislation, events may cease to exist due to restrictions on stakeholder alignments and funding sources. Tamburri (1998) argues along similar lines, noting that when event sponsorship legislation was adopted in Canada, a consequential $60 million CAD annual loss for the event sponsorship industry took place. Similar findings were identified from Boyle and Haynes (2000), Davis (2006), Ferkins and Garland (2006) and Jackson et al., (2001). Ludwig and Nestle (2008) suggest that government regulation could result in additional warnings being added to fast food commercials, outlining the likely consequences of consuming hydrogenated fat and too much sugar. Again, such regulation could deter community sport event sponsorship alignments due to negative health connotations.

Alternatively, some organisations are choosing to self-regulate sponsorship policy and their support of community sport events. For example, one corporate team entrant organisation established an ‘Ethics of Association’ policy (a draft of which is located in Appendices 9.9). The policy specifically identifies food and beverages in conflict with nutritional messages the organisation was attempting to promote. For example, ‘sponsorship will not be accepted from external parties whose values, practices, products branding are in conflict with the stated vision, aims, objectives or policies of [the organisation].’ The introduction of such policy and specific clauses limiting stakeholder alignments could indirectly impact upon community sport events by limiting future corporate team entrant possibilities, along with any other type of stakeholder relationship.
Chapter Review

This chapter has discussed the findings of the research data combined with the existing literature and selected theoretical framework outlined in Chapters Two and Three. This chapter has also identified an underlying change in the nature of community sport event sponsorship and the impact of a public health agenda. Furthermore, it has analysed the background to organisational values, objectives and corporate social responsibility. The specific factors which drive power exertion and influence legitimacy have also been discussed. Lastly, the chapter has focussed on the effect the above findings can have on community sport event management.

The concluding chapter to this thesis follows. The chapter highlights the relevance of the findings prior to acknowledging the limitations to the research and offering suggestion for future research within the community sport event arena.
Chapter Eight
Conclusion

This research sought to develop an in depth understanding of community sport event stakeholders and their sponsor-focussed incompatibilities. More specifically, an examination was conducted of the impacts a public health agenda can have on community sport events, stakeholder relationships and the sustainability of community sport event sponsorships. Case studies of the City to Surf, McDonald’s Duathlon, Auckland Marathon and Auckland Round the Bays were used to explore this research problem. The following research questions were developed and presented in Chapter One. The questions that framed the research design and data collection process were primarily addressed in Chapter Seven in conjunction with an analysis of the research findings. They were as follows:

1) How does a public health agenda influence stakeholder power, corporate social responsibility and legitimacy within a community sport event setting?
   a) How and why is stakeholder power and legitimacy exerted?
   b) What is the relationship between corporate social responsibility and community sport events?

2) In turn, what effect do stakeholder power, corporate social responsibility and legitimacy have on community sport event sponsorship and management?

This final chapter presents a summary of the research findings, followed by a discussion of the associated theoretical, practical and policy making implications. This summary and discussion is followed by an acknowledgement of the research limitations and
potential future research areas. Section 8.5 highlights the ongoing relevance of community sport event stakeholder power exertion and the influence of a public health agenda. Lastly, a concluding statement re-states the relevance, importance and contribution of the research conducted.

8.1 Summary of Key Findings

A number of key findings were identified following the analysis of the research data. These findings were discussed in Chapter Seven and relate to the broader themes of a public health agenda, stakeholder network positioning, corporate social responsibility and stakeholder power exertion. These findings are summarised below in Table 8.1.

Table 8.1: Summary of Key Research Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Health Agenda</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) A public health agenda is significantly influencing event policy and legislation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Community sport event stakeholders are questioning their relationships with other community sport event stakeholders due to the pressures of a public health agenda.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Community sport event sponsorships are effected more so by a public health agenda than the sponsorships of cultural or arts focussed events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Despite the introduction of sport sponsorship policies predominantly pertaining to a public health agenda, the decision to abide by such policy remains in the hands of individual stakeholder’s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Stakeholder values encapsulating public health agenda initiatives are prone to change over time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stakeholder Network Positioning</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Stakeholder centrality within a community sport event stakeholder network structure is associated with positional influence and legitimacy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) A lack of density within a community sport event stakeholder network can be detrimental to achieving event goals and meeting event objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Corporate Social Responsibility</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) Corporate social responsibility initiatives are encouraging companies to align with community sport events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) Corporate social responsibility has experienced a paradigm shift, whereby the concept is applicable to a broader range of organisations beyond the corporate arena.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stakeholder Power Exertion</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10) The position a stakeholder holds (perceived or assigned) within a community sport event network influences the level of power that a stakeholder is able to exert.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11) The positioning and maintenance of stakeholder values is often dependent upon personal agenda.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.2 Implications for Theory, Policy and Practice

A series of research implications stemmed from the findings of this research. These have been categorised below in terms of their theoretical, policy and practice associated contributions. Each implication is referenced in accordance with the findings (one through eleven) summarised in Section 8.1.

8.2.1 Implications for Theory

This section refers to findings five, six, seven, eight, nine and ten and identifies a number of implications associated with theoretical contribution. Each applicable finding, originally noted in Table 8.1, is relisted below and is followed by a discussion of associated consequences.

(Finding Five) Stakeholder values encapsulating public health agenda initiatives are prone to change over time.

In finding five, community sport event stakeholder values (and thus stakeholder alignments) were identified by many respondents as being fluid in nature. Community event stakeholders acknowledged that organisational values and objectives were constantly being modified and updated to meet evolving legislative and regulatory requirements, conform to corporate social responsibility pressures and to account for changes in staffing of management roles (i.e. personal agenda). Consequently, theoretical frameworks attempting to review and explain stakeholder values need to account for the fluid nature of organisational values and incorporate longitudinal and flexible methods in order to aid stakeholders in establishing long term relationships.
(Finding Six) Stakeholder centrality within a community sport event stakeholder network structure is associated with positional influence and legitimacy.

(Finding Seven) A lack of density within a community sport event stakeholder network can be detrimental to achieving event goals and meeting event objectives.

Finding six and seven provide strong evidence that Rowley’s (1997) density and centrality models compliment Freeman’s (1984; 2010) stakeholder theory within a community sport event setting. Combined, these theoretical approaches are particularly relevant in assessing community sport event stakeholder role classification, hierarchical structures and associated legitimacy of power exertion. Within the context of this research, these theoretical approaches aided in better understanding the impacts of pre-existing relationships between community event stakeholders and the influences these relationships may have on stakeholder demands. Rowley (1997) considered that the density of a stakeholder network was crucial in ensuring long term stakeholder relationships. The complexities (including hierarchical structure and pre-existing relationships) associated with developing and maintaining dense stakeholder networks along with understanding the positional opportunities within a stakeholder network (central or otherwise), need to be communicated effectively to event managers who are often situated at the helm of community sport event networks.

(Finding Eight) Corporate social responsibility initiatives are encouraging companies to align with community sport events.

With reference to finding eight, stakeholders are choosing to align with community sport events in order to enhance identity, acknowledge philanthropic responsibilities and engage with the community within which they are positioned. These reasons are identified by Freeman (2010), Laplume et al., (2008) and Russo and Perrini (2010) as...
key elements of corporate social responsibility. This finding enhances existing theory, which incorporates corporate social responsibility initiatives, by reconfirming community sport events offer avenues from which corporate social responsibility objectives can be achieved. Consequently, stakeholders of community sport events should ideally review their own stance on corporate social responsibility in addition to being aware of other stakeholder’s (stances to corporate social responsibility) and the factors which can influence corporate social responsibility initiatives. Such attention towards corporate social responsibility and community sport event alignment may aid in establishing ongoing beneficial alignments between community sport events and their associated stakeholders.

(Finding Nine) Corporate social responsibility has experienced a paradigm shift, whereby the concept is applicable to a broader range of organisations beyond the corporate arena. Finding nine questions the applicability of social responsibility in a corporate sense. This implies that there has been a significant advancement in the theoretical understanding of corporate social responsibility and that the term itself may need to be revised and redefined in order to reflect a move away from the corporate sector. Community sport events attract stakeholders from a wide range of backgrounds which cannot be categorised within the corporate arena. Consequently, community sport event managers need to be flexible and willing to work with and manage event stakeholder’s from varying backgrounds, which may hold diverse perspectives on social responsibility objectives.
(Finding Ten) *The position a stakeholder holds (perceived or assigned) within a community sport event network influences the level of power that a stakeholder is able to exert.*

A stakeholder’s position within a community sport event stakeholder network directly influences the level of power they may choose to exert, reconfirming the theoretical viewpoints of Freeman (2007), Mitchell et al., (1997) and Rowley (1997). This finding also serves to highlight the issue of perspective when it comes to stakeholder positioning. Community sport event stakeholders need to have a definitive understanding of their role and responsibilities within the event stakeholder network. Ensuring continuity in stakeholder role classification through effective and ongoing communication with other stakeholders could aid in ensuring perceived and assigned stakeholder roles and responsibilities align. This issue is also identified briefly as a potential future research area in Section 8.6.

### 8.2.2 Implications for Policy

This section refers to findings one, four and eleven and identifies a number of associated implications for policy development. Findings in this instance were noted to closely interrelate. Each applicable finding, originally noted in Table 8.1, is relisted below and is followed by a discussion of associated consequences.

(Finding One) *A public health agenda is significantly influencing event policy and legislation.*

In finding one, a public health agenda can directly influence the development and introduction of community sport event policy and legislation. Such policy and legislation can be initiated by community sport event stakeholders through
internal policy or by external local and national government legislation. Such legislation can restrict sponsorship advertising, funding, stakeholder alignments and support public health agenda initiatives. Community sport event managers should be proactive in identifying potential sources and sections of policy and legislation which could impact upon their event and stakeholder relationships. Furthermore, event managers need to take into consideration that the boundaries which encapsulate a public health agenda are constantly changing and expanding. This has been evidenced in the more recent inclusion of confectionary, soft drinks and fast food as taboo sponsor products and funding sources.

(Finding Four) Despite the introduction of sport sponsorship policies predominantly pertaining to a public health agenda, the decision to abide by such policy remains in the hands of individual stakeholder’s.

Evidence from this research suggests that public health agenda initiatives can be overridden by public choice. This is applicable in a community sport event setting from an event participant perspective and from the perspective and choices made by stakeholder organisations. Firstly, research respondents acknowledged that while organisations may choose to diversify their product ranges to incorporate healthier options, the responsibility to purchase or consume such diversified products lays solely in the hands of the individual community event participant. Community sport events may therefore adapt to offer their participants a choice of sponsor products when it comes to crossing the finishing line, for example a bottle of Powerade or a bottle of Pump. Secondly, event stakeholder organisations will need to closely review the benefits and disadvantages of aligning or not aligning
with fast food, confectionary or soft drink companies and associated policies and legislation. For example, an event accepting funding from a fast food company may result in negative media attention and the loss of other stakeholders (if associated with a breach of an internal policy document) or a fine (if associated with external government legislation).

(Finding 11) The positioning and maintenance of stakeholder values is often dependent upon personal agenda.

In reference to finding eleven, personal agenda can influence decisions made by community sport event stakeholder organisations and impact upon the maintenance of organisational values or even the development of internal sponsorship or stakeholder alignment policy documents. Depending on the intensity of invested agenda, individuals can also encourage external policy development which aligns and supports the policies of the organisation for which they work. Community sport event managers should be understand and regularly monitor their stakeholder’s organisational values and objectives for aligning with the event. Event managers need also to consider the potential for individuals within stakeholder organisations to influence varying aspects of stakeholder relationships.

8.2.3 Implications for Practice

This section refers to findings one, two and three and identifies a number of implications associated with practical contribution. Each applicable finding, originally noted in Table 8.1, is relisted below and is followed by a brief discussion of associated consequences.
(Finding One) A public health agenda is significantly influencing event policy and legislation.

In finding one, current and future changes in event and sponsorship policy or legislation may impact on sponsor selection and potential funding sources. As a result, community sport event managers need to consider how they will prepare for limitations to be placed on sponsor alignments that may not support public health agenda initiatives. More specifically, the influence of a public health agenda on community sport event policy and legislation may limit the types of sponsors products which can be associated with an event, the range of sponsor advertising available (including product distribution and product logo placement) or the amount of sponsorship funding available from manufacturers of unhealthy food and beverages.

(Finding Two) Community sport event stakeholders are questioning their relationships with other community sport event stakeholders due to the pressures of a public health agenda.

In reference to finding two, the pressure placed on event stakeholders by a public health agenda to question existing and potential community sport event stakeholder relationships was identified as having significant effects on the management of community sport events. Firstly, the pressure of a public health agenda created increased attention on the management of stakeholder networks and stakeholder value alignments. Secondly, public health agenda pressure limited the numbers of stakeholders event managers can approach as potential sponsors. New approaches to the management and sustainability of community sport event
stakeholder relationships in order to ensure community sport events retain stakeholders while also taking public health agenda initiatives into account.

(Finding Three) Community sport event sponsorships are effected more so by a public health agenda than the sponsorships of cultural or arts focussed events.

There were distinct differences noted between the influence a public health agenda can have on a community sport event versus a community cultural event and the age ranges of participants. Healthy sponsor initiatives were much more predominant in sport associated events and in community sport events in which children participated. This implies that the stakeholder's associated with community sport events need to ensure they consider public health agenda initiatives and possible scrutiny from health advocates should they develop stakeholder relationships which fail to promote such initiatives. Additionally, just as a public health agenda has expanded the range of taboo community sport event sponsor products, there may also be the potential for a public health agenda to expand its impact across cultural or arts focussed events.

8.3 Research Considerations

As this was not a longitudinal study, the data collected only provides a snapshot of community sport event stakeholder views. Community sport event sponsor perceptions and public health agendas are fluid in nature and constantly changing. This thesis investigated stakeholders who were associated with the prescribed events at the time of data collection. It is important to note that these relationships may have since changed.
If the research could have been conducted over a longer timeframe, a map of changing viewpoints and stakeholder alignments could be constructed.

Additionally, research findings hinted that community sport event stakeholders did not always choose to adhere to public health agenda pressure and policy. These findings were noted by a select number of stakeholders, as not all event participant groups were available to be interviewed.

These considerations lead into suggestions for future research.

**8.4 Future Research Areas**

There are a number of future research areas identified as arising from this thesis. These primarily stem from the research findings and limitations identified above.

Firstly, following the finding that decisions to adhere to public health agenda were attributed to personal choice, a research limitation noted was that not all stakeholders (including event participants) were interviewed for the purpose of this thesis. Future research on a wider range of community sport event participants and sponsor consumers would aid in further exploring this finding.

Secondly, existing stakeholder hierarchical structures focus on event sponsors (i.e. bronze, silver, gold) rather than a broader acknowledgement of all associated community event stakeholders. This was a suggestion noted by respondents and discussed in Chapter Seven, Section 7.4. In consultation with a broader range of event stakeholders, an event stakeholder ranking model could be developed in
order to assist in counteracting issues arising from differing stakeholder role classifications.

Thirdly, a longitudinal case study of additional community sport events could assist in mapping more detailed changes in public choice, sponsorship selection, stakeholder alignment and public health agenda influences and would address the limitation of the existing research providing a snap shot approach of community sport event stakeholder issues.

Lastly, in response to a number of the research respondents questioning company versus product values, further research is suggested on event participant perception of broader organisational values (of sponsors) and the differing perceptions of the products they manufacture.

8.5 Ongoing Relevance of Research

The relevance of this research is illustrated by the impact a public health agenda is continuing to have on sport events and sponsor products. Examples of stakeholder power exertion and the influence of a public health agenda are illustrated in recent media articles relating to the 2012 London Olympic Games, sponsorship decisions by Cricket Australia and media debates in New Zealand with regard to the introduction of a tax on sugary drinks.

From a legitimacy of power perspective, the 2012 London Olympic Games saw naming rights sponsor McDonalds demand that the sale of hot chips by other vendors be banned across all 40 games venues as this was considered to be in
direct competition to their selling of the branded McDonald’s French Fries (Clark, 2012). The LOCOG obliged, quoting sponsor obligations as the reason for supporting the request. From a public health agenda perspective, the international event’s range of commercial sponsors also included Cadbury, Coca Cola and Heineken. These sponsors were criticised by local politicians who argued that the high calorie food and drinks on offer were at odds with the Olympian athletic ideal. (Clark, 2012).

In October 2013, Cricket Australia was criticised by health groups following their refusal to run an advertisement during the Ryobi Cup advising that sport and alcohol do not mix. The advertisement was produced by Healthway, a major sponsor of the Western Australia Cricket Association. Days later, Cricket New South Wales signed a three year contract with Carlton and United Breweries, despite being sponsored by the ‘What’s your plan B?’ anti-drink driving campaign. This decision highlights the issues associated with stakeholder values, choice and power exertion. It also confirms that some ‘sports administrators [are] choosing advertising dollars in favour of public health’ (Corderoy & Barrett, 2013).

Results from a recent study (November, 2013) in the United Kingdom suggest that ‘a 20 per cent tax on drinks with added sugar could reduce the number of obese and overweight people in the UK by 465,000’. New Zealand health experts and some government ministers have taken particular notice of the article and are calling for a similar tax to be introduced in New Zealand (Wannan, 2013). The debate is still in its early stages, with comments from sugary drink manufacturers yet to be received. The issue does however raise implications for future
community sport event sponsor alignments with beverages sweetened with sugar, which are a common source of sponsorship for such events and the ongoing debate of a public health agenda.

8.6 Concluding Statement

This thesis provided research findings which develop an understanding of stakeholder relationships in conjunction with a public health agenda. The research findings can contribute to: theoretical insights and the body of literature associated with the management of community sport events; the factors influencing stakeholder relationships; and the changing nature of sponsorship. The ongoing relevance of this research has been highlighted by (1) the research respondents who voiced their concerns regarding the increasing pressures of a public health agenda and future implications for community sport event policy, funding and the management of stakeholder networks and (2) the continuing media attention surrounding event sponsorships and public health initiatives, as noted Section 8.6. The findings of this thesis are also intended to highlight potential issues in relation to sponsorship decisions and offer support to community sport event managers in an attempt to maintain sponsorship as a viable source of funding for such events.

In closing, further evidence is beginning to emerge which indicates that public health agenda concerns have expanded to incorporate generalised sport provision and an even broader range of sponsor products and services. According to a study conducted by Cancer Council Victoria and the Obesity Policy Coalition, the majority of Australian’s want fast food chains like McDonald’s and KFC to stop sponsoring children’s sport clubs and programs as such sponsorship encourages unhealthy diets (Bainbridge, 2013). In
an incident involving the AFL in 2010, St Kilda City Football Club was pressured by women’s groups and community groups to withdraw from a sponsorship arrangement with a local brothel. The groups argued that the stakeholder alignment sent out the wrong public health message (Firkin, 2010). Such examples further support the desirability for stakeholders to establish boundaries that define the impact of any public health agenda on sport and event sponsorship.
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Information for Participants

1.0 Research Objectives

The objective of this research is to produce an applied model of the issues and dilemmas faced by event managers (in terms of sponsor selection and stakeholder influence), which can assist event managers in a more practical approach to event management and the potential resolution of event stakeholder conflict. Key focal points of the study include identifying:

• What measures do stakeholders, of community sport events, use to determine whether a sponsor is deemed incompatible and/or liable to be associated with agenda driven controversy?

• How do stakeholders position their notions of power (perceived or otherwise) to facilitate change in the decision making processes associated with the sponsorship of community sport events?

• How does the pressure from particular stakeholders of community sport events change the way in which event managers coordinate their events and select sponsors?

1.2 Who is conducting the research?

The research is being conducted in association with the academic requirements for completion of a doctoral degree at Griffith University. The primary researcher’s details are listed below:

Rachel J. Batty
1.3 Background

While sponsorship may be considered a creative marketing tool, there is a need for event stakeholders to consider their social responsibilities in relation to the messages they are sending to the general public (Ferkins & Garland, 2006). The need for such consideration can also be related to the generation of image and good will (Friedman, 1970; Masterman, 2007).

Some companies who associate themselves with community sport events are receiving criticism relating to the types of products and/or services they are promoting. The stereotypical realm of taboo sponsorship, which traditionally includes tobacco and alcohol products (Collins & Vamplew, 2002; Fairburn, 1989; Meerabeau, Gillett, Kennedy, Adeoba, Byass & Tabi, 1991; Laugesen & Swinburn, 2000; Dominion Breweries, 2009; British American Tobacco New Zealand, 2009), has evolved to a point where products, such as soft drinks, confectionary (Carrigan & Carrigan, 1997) and fast food outlets (Sam, Batty & Dean, 2005) are viewed (by some event stakeholders and community members) in a similar fashion. Maher, Wilson, Signal and Thomson (2006) suggest that this is due, in part, to increasing public health concerns (especially within New Zealand) and amplified levels of corporate social responsibility in terms of sponsorship partnerships involving debateable products. The changes and increasing number of incompatibilities occurring between event stakeholders and the forces behind agenda driven sponsorship controversy needs to be examined and understood in order to minimise future sponsorship conflict and maintain sponsorship as a viable source of funding for community sport events.

1.4 Participant Contribution

As a participant of the study, you will be requested to partake in a face to face interview, in which a series of questions relating to your organization’s involvement in, and contributions to the (insert local community sport event title). Certain sections of the interview will highlight particular issues or problems you may have encountered as an event stakeholder, or with other stakeholders of the associated event.

Duration of Interview: Approximately 30 to 45 minutes.
Please note that as a voluntary participant in the study, you will not be required to impart any information considered confidential to your organization. Anonymity is also an option, if you so desire.

The interview will be recorded on a handheld device and later transcribed. Copies of these transcripts will be available to you on request. These recordings will be destroyed once transcription is completed.

1.5 Confidentiality
Due to the case sensitive nature of some of the information collected, please be aware that the researcher will uphold the upmost levels of confidentiality in regards to any information you provide.

• All printed material be stored in locked cabinets
• Research will not be accessed by anyone except the researcher
• Research material will not be published or distributed without your prior consent
• All material will be destroyed after a 5 year period

1.6 Upon Completion of Research
Upon completion of research, participants will be contacted to see if the wish to receive a summary of the research findings.

The final PhD thesis will be also submitted online to the Australian Digital Thesis Program.

1.7 Ethical Considerations
Should you have any concerns regarding the ethical conduct of this research project, please contact the Griffith University Human Research Ethics Committee on +61 (0)7 3875 5585, or via research-ethics@griffith.edu.au.

1.8 Further Information
If you have any further questions regarding this research please do not hesitate to contact me via telephone: +61 (0)7 3735 7489, or email: r.batty@griffith.edu.au.
9.2 Informed Consent

Project Title:
An Analysis of Community Sporting Events and their Stakeholders

INFORMED CONSENT

Research Team:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rachel J. Batty</th>
<th>Prof. Graham Cuskelly</th>
<th>Prof. Kristine Toohey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(PhD Student/Preliminary Researcher)</td>
<td>(Supervisor)</td>
<td>(Supervisor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Tourism, Leisure, Hotel &amp; Sport Management</td>
<td>Griffith Business School</td>
<td>Department of Tourism, Leisure, Hotel &amp; Sport Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+61 (07) 3735 7489</td>
<td>+61 (07) 5552 8472</td>
<td>+61 (07) 5552 9204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:r.batty@griffith.edu.au">r.batty@griffith.edu.au</a></td>
<td><a href="mailto:g.cuskelly@griffith.edu.au">g.cuskelly@griffith.edu.au</a></td>
<td><a href="mailto:k.toohey@griffith.edu.au">k.toohey@griffith.edu.au</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

- I understand that my involvement in this research will include a taped interview;
- I have had any questions answered to my satisfaction;
- I understand any risks involved;
- I understand that there will be no direct benefit to me from my participation in this research;
- I understand that my participation in this research is voluntary;
- I understand that if I have any additional questions I can contact the research team at any time;
- I understand that I am free to withdraw at any time, without comment or penalty;
- I understand that I can contact the Manager, Research Ethics, at Griffith University Human Research Ethics Committee on 3875 5585 (or research-ethics@griffith.edu.au) if I have any concerns about the ethical conduct of the project; and
- I agree to participate in the project.

Name:  
Signature:  
Date:  

Griffith Business School  
Department of Tourism, Leisure, Hotel & Sport Management  
Nathan Campus  
Griffith University  
170 Kessels Road, Nathan, Brisbane, QLD 4111, Australia  
Ph. +61 (0)7 37357489
9.3 Interview Questions

For the Event Manager:

Who are the primary sponsors of your event?

What consideration did you give in terms of the selection of these sponsors?

Have you noticed a change in the way in which you select sponsors today, compared to when your event began? If so, how?

In addition to sponsors, who do you determine as additional stakeholders of your event?

- Why do you consider these groups/organisations/individuals as stakeholders?

Has your event ever received publicity of any kind regarding either the sponsors and/or stakeholders?

- How did you cope and manage such publicity?

What level of input do sponsors and/or stakeholders have in regards to the coordination of the event?

Have you ever experienced demands from sponsors or stakeholders related to the management of the event?

- How did these demands relate to your preformed ideas on input levels?
- How did you manage the situation?
- Have there been any repercussions?

What types of challenges or issues associated with event management and securing sponsorship (if any), do you consider could occur in the future?

For Event Stakeholders:

Do you have a written agreement or contract with the event managers which details the give/take relationship you have?

How long have you been associated with (the event)?

What are your primary reasons for choosing to sponsors / continuing to sponsor (the event)?

How do you perceive your organisations objectives as fitting with those of (the event)?

How do you perceive your organisations values as fitting with those of (the event)?

What do you consider as your primary obligation to the event as a stakeholder?

What is the event managers obligation to your organisation?

How much say do you consider yourself to have in terms of the coordination of (the event)?

- If so, what types of suggestions have you made / input have you had?
- Do you believe your level of say is based upon some form of hierarchical structure
## 9.4 Stakeholder Interview Details and Process Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Interview Set Used (See Appendices)</th>
<th>Snowball Technique</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Christchurch Star</td>
<td>May 4, 2010</td>
<td>Cafe of Respondents Choice</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Contact details for Coca Cola and Foodstuffs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfax Media</td>
<td>October 1, 2010</td>
<td>Head Office</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coca Cola Amatil (NZ)</td>
<td>September 30, 2010</td>
<td>Head Office</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coca Cola Amatil (SI)</td>
<td>May 3, 2010</td>
<td>Christchurch Offices</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Contact details for Head Office. Ref. made to Adidas Auckland Marathon/Ports of Auckland Round the Bays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport Canterbury</td>
<td>May 6, 2010</td>
<td>Christchurch Offices</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Reference made to Auckland Marathon and Sport Auckland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport Auckland</td>
<td>September 28, 2010</td>
<td>Auckland Offices</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Long Run Ltd</td>
<td>September 27, 2010</td>
<td>Cafe of Respondents Choice</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury District Health Board</td>
<td>April 29, 2010</td>
<td>Cafe of Respondents Choice</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch South Rotary</td>
<td>May 6, 2010</td>
<td>Home of Respondent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Provided contact details for Garden City Rotary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foodstuffs South Island (Ltd)</td>
<td>April 29, 2010</td>
<td>Head Offices</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Heart Foundation (NZ)</td>
<td>September 27, 2010</td>
<td>Head Offices</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland City Council</td>
<td>September 28, 2010</td>
<td>Auckland Cty Offices</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch City Council</td>
<td>January 13, 2011</td>
<td>Christchurch Offices</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden City Rotary</td>
<td>May 3, 2010</td>
<td>Cafe of Respondents Choice</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Provided contact details for McDonald’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDonalds (Christchurch)</td>
<td>May 5, 2010</td>
<td>McDonalds Restaurant</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 9.5 Summary of Documents Collected for Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Title/Subject</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Relevance to Research</th>
<th>Relating Case Study (or Studies)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| *Christchurch City Council*  
Events Strategy 2007-2017 | Christchurch City Council Website | Identifies Council goals and aims in relation to the provision and support of Christchurch-based events | Christchurch City to Surf  
McDonalds Youth Duathlon |
| *Foodstuffs South Island (Ltd)*  
About the Company | Foodstuffs South Island Website | Details to goals and values of Foodstuffs South Island (Ltd) | Christchurch City to Surf |
| *Canterbury District Health Board*  
Ethics of Association (Sponsorship) Policy. Fourth Draft. | Canterbury District Health Board (R4) | Outlines the organisations goals and values in addition to providing guidelines for sponsorship alignment and effects on organisational image | Christchurch City to Surf |
| *Christchurch City to Surf 2010*  
Registration Pack | Christchurch Star (R1) | Provides background and images of the event, in addition to outlining the events' goals and identifying associated stakeholders | Christchurch Star City to Surf |
| *McDonalds Youth Duathlon*  
Promotional Brochure | Garden City Rotary (Respondent 9) | Provides background and images of the event | McDonalds Youth Duathlon |
| *McDonalds Youth Duathlon*  
Participation Certificate | Garden City Rotary (R9) | Identifies major event sponsors | McDonalds Youth Duathlon |
| *The Heart Foundation*  
Promotional Brochure | The Heart Foundation (Respondent 7) | Details the goals and values of The Heart Foundation (New Zealand) | Christchurch City to Surf  
Adidas Auckland Marathon  
Auckland Round the Bays |
| *Adidas Auckland Marathon*  
Summary Information Sheet | The Long Run Ltd (R12) | Provides background and images of the event, in addition to outlining the events' goals and identifying associated stakeholders | Adidas Auckland Marathon |
| *Auckland Round the Bays*  
About the Run | Auckland Round the Bays Fun Run Website | Provides background and images of the event, in addition to outlining the events' goals and identifying associated stakeholders | Auckland Round the Bays |
## 9.6 Document Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Role Identification</th>
<th>Self Classification</th>
<th>Hierarchical Status</th>
<th>Pre-Existing Relationships</th>
<th>Personal Agenda</th>
<th>Demands Relative to Size</th>
<th>Health Agenda</th>
<th>Resourcing</th>
<th>Personal Opinion</th>
<th>Value Alignment</th>
<th>Corporate Social Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heartbeat 2010 (R3)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health First 2006 (R3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4 Website (2011)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R7 Food Advertising Statement (2011)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3 Website (2011)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2a &amp; R2b Code of Business Conduct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2a &amp; R2b Compliance and Social Responsibility Committee Charter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R9 Website (2011)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R12 Website (2011)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R15 Website (2011)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R10 Website</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R8 2007-2017 Events Strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3 Ethics of Association Policy Document (Draft)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 9.7 Coca Cola Compliance and Social Responsibility Charter

### Compliance & Social Responsibility Committee Charter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Introduction</strong></th>
<th>This Charter defines the purpose, authority and responsibility of Coca-Cola Amatil Limited’s Compliance &amp; Social Responsibility Committee (C&amp;SSR Committee).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Functions**    | The C&SSR Committee is a committee of the Board of Directors. Its functions are to assist the Board of Directors in determining whether:  

- the systems of control which management has established effectively safeguard against contraventions of the Company’s statutory responsibilities; and  

- there are policies and controls to protect the Company’s reputation as a responsible corporate citizen. |
| **Responsibilities** |  

#### Statutory  
The C&SSR Committee will review compliance with laws relating to:  
- occupational health & safety;  
- environmental protection;  
- product safety;  
- trade practices; and  
- other legislation as the Committee or the Board sees fit. |
| **Policies** | The Committee will review the Company's policies and standards which reflect on the Company's reputation, including:  
- quality standards;  
- the policy on dealing in the Company's securities; and  
- disclosure policy. |
| **Diversity** | On an annual basis, the Committee will:  

- recommend to the Board the measurable objectives to be set on an annual basis in accordance with CCA’s Diversity Policy;  
- review and report to the Board, on an annual basis, on the effectiveness of CCA’s Diversity Policy; and  
- review and recommend to the Board any amendments to CCA’s Diversity Policy. |
| **Social** | The Committee will review reports and, where appropriate, make recommendations to the Board in respect of:  
- political donations;  
- community sponsorship and support; and  
- obesity and other social issues which may be relevant to the Company. |
| **Membership** | The membership of the C&SSR Committee shall consist of at least three Non-Executive members of the Board of Directors. The Chairman and members of the Committee shall be appointed by the Board of Directors and the Chairman will not be the Chairman of the Board.  
The Committee may consult with such members of management or others as it may deem necessary to obtain the necessary information to carry out its duties. |
| **Meetings** | The C&SSR Committee shall meet at least 3 times per annum.  
A quorum for meetings will be 2 members.  
The Secretary of Coca-Cola Amatil Limited will be Secretary of the Committee. The Secretary, in conjunction with the Chairman of the Compliance and Social Responsibility Committee, will prepare an agenda which will be circulated to the members prior to each meeting.  
The Committee may invite any members of management to attend any of its meetings.  
The Chairman of the Committee will report the findings and recommendations of the Committee to the Board at its next meeting. The minutes of all Committee meetings will be circulated to |
## Compliance & Social Responsibility Committee Charter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Committee has the authority to approve political donations. Matters of significant importance and proposed changes to policies shall be referred to the Board of Directors with the Committee’s recommendation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

members of the Board.
9.8 Heart Foundation (New Zealand) Advertising Food to Children Position Statement

Advertising Food to Children Position Statement

Food advertising can and does influence children's eating habits - their food preferences, food requests, choices, and consumption. Children watch a substantial amount of television and are exposed to high volumes of advertising, both from television and other advertising media. Depending on their age, children are especially vulnerable to the influence of food advertising as they may not distinguish the commercial nature of advertising nor differentiate between advertisements and programmes. This influence is occurring at a time when their food preferences are developing. These food preferences and food choices consequently influence both current and future health. Therefore, childhood is a key time to encourage healthy eating habits and food preferences. However, advertising and marketing of unhealthy food to children undermines these attempts. There is strong public support for greater protection of our children. In a 2007 survey, over 80% of New Zealand parents and grandparents stated they would like advertising of unhealthy food to children stopped.

New Zealand has an ethical responsibility to create a safe and health-promoting environment for its children to grow within. A key part of this is ensuring healthy food choices are available for our children and they are protected from marketing of unhealthy foods. Restricting marketing of unhealthy food to children has been assessed as a highly cost-effective intervention to help reduce childhood obesity. The Heart Foundation supports actions intended to reduce the marketing of unhealthy foods to children. This requires restrictions on the type, volume, and location of food and beverage promotion to children.

New Zealand has taken a self-regulatory approach to managing advertising of unhealthy food to children, and has two main self-regulatory codes. These are the Advertising Standards Agency's 'Children's Code for Advertising Food' and ThinkTV's 'Advertising on Television: Getting it Right for Children'. Self-regulatory codes play a useful role in establishing key principles and there are opportunities to strengthen the Codes further by widening their scope and coverage, strengthening pre-vetting and compliance incentives, and using one consistent nutrient profiling system to define healthy and unhealthy foods. However, robust and independent evaluations of the Codes have not been undertaken, thus their impact on the marketing of unhealthy food to children remains unknown. Independent and robust evaluation of the Codes is a priority.

Most importantly, although the Codes could usefully be strengthened, the Foundation does not consider that a self-regulatory regime will ever have the scope and rigour to protect New Zealand children in the rapidly evolving marketing environment and recommends that government regulation is implemented to control the volume and extent of unhealthy food marketing to children. It is recommended that a combined or co-regulatory approach (a self-regulatory approach within a legislative framework) is established which will ensure that not only the content of advertisements is controlled, but volume, timing, repetitiveness, placement, use of persuasive techniques, and coordination across media is curtailed. This will ensure New Zealand's children get the protection they deserve from advertising of unhealthy food.

Goal:

To protect New Zealand children from marketing of unhealthy food and beverages.

Objectives:

1. That the government regulates to protect children from the volume and extent of marketing of unhealthy food and beverages targeted at them.
2. That within this regulatory framework, the existing voluntary Codes are maintained but independently and robustly evaluated and strengthened to ensure compliance and effectiveness.

**BACKGROUND PAPER**

For further information, see Advertising Food to Children Advocacy Plan: background paper

**REFERENCES**

CDHB Ethics of Association (sponsorship) Policy

**Second-Fourth Draft: 22 March 22 April 2010**

*Purpose and Scope*
This policy sets standards for the acceptance of sponsorship by the Canterbury District Health Board (CDHB). This policy applies to all CDHB staff and Board/Committee members.

*Responsibilities*
- Clinical Leaders review sponsorship proposals.
- Managers review sponsorship proposals, develop Draft Sponsorship Agreements and Sponsorship Risk analyses, and approve some proposals.
- The Clinical Board reviews major sponsorship proposals in accordance with this policy and makes recommendations to the Chief Executive Officer.
- The Chief Executive Officer is the policy owner and is responsible for approving or declining major sponsorship proposals.

*Definitions*
For the purposes of this policy, *sponsorship* means a business deal whereby an external party or (parties) meets all or part of the costs of a CDHB project or activity in exchange for commercial benefit. A *sponsor* is an external party who provides sponsorship.

*Associated documents*
- Gift-Sensitive Expenditure Policy² (CDHB Manuals Vol 4; Authorities and Purchasing)
- Conflict of Interest Policy (CDHB Manuals Vol 3; Human Resources)²

*Policy*
The CDHB policy on sponsorship is:
- Sponsorship is welcomed in general, provided it meets the criteria in this policy.
- Sponsorship must contribute to the vision of CDHB - to promote, enhance and facilitate the health and well-being of the people of Canterbury.
- Sponsorship will not be accepted from external parties whose values, practices, products and/or branding are in conflict with the stated vision, aims, objectives or policies of CDHB¹.

¹This is likely to include (but is not limited to) situations where the proposed sponsor is strongly linked to:
- the gambling industry
- the production, sale or promotion of tobacco or alcohol
- the production, sale or promotion of food or beverages where the overall or specific approach is in conflict with nutrition messages promoted by CDHB
- Sponsorship must not place any unacceptable obligation on any CDHB staff, Board or Committee member.
- Proposals for sponsorship must be reviewed in accordance with the process outlined in this policy.

Process
1. Any proposal for sponsorship should be discussed with the appropriate Service Manager and Clinical Director.
2. The Service Manager should complete a) a Draft Sponsorship Agreement and b) a Sponsorship Risk Analysis, using CDHB Templates which include:

Draft Sponsorship Agreement
- A description of the CDHB project or activity and the nature, financial value and duration of the sponsorship, including the obligations the sponsorship places on both parties.
- A description of the benefits to CDHB.
- A description of the benefits to the proposed sponsor.
- A summary of the business or other activities of the proposed sponsor.
- A declaration by the proposed sponsor that acceptance of the proposed sponsorship does not place any obligation on CDHB or CDHB staff, Board or Committee members other than as stated in the proposal.

Sponsorship Risk Analysis
- An analysis by the Service Manager of any potential conflicts between the values, practices, products and branding of the proposed sponsor and the stated vision, aims, objectives or policies of CDHB
- An analysis by the Service Manager of any potential risks to CDHB of the proposed sponsorship, including adverse public perception, warranted or otherwise, that may be created.
3. The Draft Agreement and Analysis should be forwarded for review and authorisation according to the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scope of sponsorship</th>
<th>Reviewed by</th>
<th>Authorised by</th>
<th>Reported to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;$1,000</td>
<td>Clinical Leader</td>
<td>Service Manager</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;$10,000</td>
<td>Clinical Leader</td>
<td>General Manager</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;$10,000 OR if involves naming rights for a CDHB facility or activity</td>
<td>Clinical Board</td>
<td>Chief Executive Officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Sponsorship proposals for review by the Clinical Board should be forwarded to the Secretary of the Clinical Board, who will include it in the papers for the next Clinical Board meeting. The Clinical Board will review the sponsorship proposal and either return it to the Service Manager with a request for further information or forward it, with a recommendation for approval or decline, to the CEO. The CEO will approve or decline the sponsorship proposal and advise the Service Manager.
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