Fostering Community Development Through Sporting Events Strategies: An Examination of Urban Regime Perceptions[1,2]

Laura Misener
University of Windsor

Daniel S. Mason
University of Alberta

This article examines the perceptions of members of urban regimes in three cities: Edmonton, Manchester, and Melbourne, regarding the use sporting events for broad-based community outcomes. In Edmonton, members of the urban regime interviewed did not perceive the sporting events strategy to be directly tied to community development objectives. In Manchester and Melbourne, regime members believed that the use of events for development was uniquely tied to communities and community development goals. In addition, regime members in the latter two cities provided examples of symbolic attempts to foster community around the sporting events strategies. While this study could not reveal whether attempts to meet the needs of local communities were being achieved through the sporting events strategies, it is at least encouraging to note that those who control resources and conceive of, oversee, and implement growth strategies within cities view community development as important to these strategies.

Governments around the world, particularly in Western nations, have embraced neoliberal policies as a means of improving global economic competitiveness. Neoliberalism is associated with an extremely narrow urban policy repertoire based on capital subsidies, place promotion, supply side interventions, central city makeovers, and local boosterism—all designed to get a step ahead of the competition (Jessop, 2002; Peck & Tickell, 2002). Sporting events have emerged as a key neoliberal entrepreneurial endeavor (Hall, 2006) for cities seeking to attract and retain mobile capital (Harvey, 1989; Kearns & Philo, 1993). Events are deemed unique opportunities for business and political elites—who wield significant power in the city—to secure resources for development efforts and promote the city in the global marketplace (Andranovich, Burbank, & Heying,

Misener is with the Dept. of Kinesiology, University of Windsor, Windsor, Ontario N9B 3P4, Canada.
Mason is with the Dept. of PE and Recreation, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada.

2001; Hall, 2004). When acting in concert over sustained periods, these groups have been described as urban regimes (Mossberger & Stoker, 2001; Stone, 1989). However, the strategies employed by regimes are not without controversy; Hall (2006) argued that "the sustainability of place competitiveness strategies, let alone its real benefits are increasingly questionable" (p. 67).

Despite growing concerns about the actual economic and other benefits realized by hosting sporting events, the strength of the neoliberal discourse of competitiveness and the desirability to host sporting events by urban regimes remain strong. For this reason, it is critical to find ways of addressing the potential of sporting events to have positive impacts upon host communities. In the context of large scale sporting events, Babiak and Wolfe's (2006) research on Super Bowl XL demonstrated the importance of socially responsible event activities as a way to include local community groups and enhance consumer loyalty. Another example of how a city has taken up the approach of using a large-scale sporting event as a development tool has been the case of Cape Town, South Africa, in its bid to host the 2004 Summer Olympic Games (Hall, 2004; Hiller, 2000). Cape Town sought to use the games to contribute not only to the economic transformation, but also the social transformation of that postapartheid city (Hiller, 2000). While Cape Town was unsuccessful in its bid to host the Olympic Games, sporting events are now being recognized for their potential to build social and symbolic capital.

It has been argued that the challenge is to determine how to develop and market sport events in ways that foster community (Green, 2001). It is at this juncture that this research explores the potential role of sport for community development and social inclusion. As a starting point, it is critical to understand the views of those who control resources and conceive of, oversee, and implement growth strategies within cities—those who constitute urban regimes. Thus, this research examines the perceptions of members of urban regimes toward socially responsible event activities in three cities; Edmonton, Canada; Manchester, United Kingdom; and Melbourne, Australia.

This article represents one piece of a larger project examining how cities' sporting event strategies are tied to a general community development and community networking agenda. The first stage of the project focused on the coalitions that undergird a sporting events strategy in Edmonton, Manchester, and Melbourne, which have featured sport-centered development prominently in local growth agendas (cf. Misener & Mason, 2008). Misener and Mason's (2008) study employed archival sources to identify and categorize regimes in each city to determine their type. Results suggested that all three cities constituted a form of symbolic regime, with Manchester and Melbourne focusing on urban revitalization and Edmonton taking a focus on symbolic reimaging (Misener & Mason, 2008).

After establishing the existence of regimes in each city, and classifying them according to the types developed by Stoker and Mossberger (1994), the current study employs in-depth interviews and archival data to examine the perceptions of members of urban regimes in the three cities regarding issues of corporate social responsibility surrounding the events strategy. The goal here was to explore how those involved in the acquisition, hosting, and management of events and their legacies view community development and corporate social responsibility and how this fits within a broader events agenda that has typically focused on eco-

nomic development, tourism, and civic branding. For the purpose of this portion of the study, our examination of social responsibility focused on the use of sporting events for broad-based community outcomes, in particular the symbolic attempts to foster benefits for groups outside the urban regime. It has been argued elsewhere that sporting events may serve as a means of developing social capital (Misener & Mason, 2006) and contribute to community development (Hiller, 2000). Therefore, understanding the role of growth coalitions in the formation of a social and community agenda around event strategies is key to developing a hosting framework that fosters community development objectives of cities and their surrounding regions.

Urban Regime Theory

Along with the emergence of neoliberal policies of capital accumulation, place promotion, and growth strategies, has come the development of theories of growth politics and urban governance. The most prominent of these, urban regime theory, is used as a tool to describe public-private sector relationships. As one of the originators of urban regime theory, Stone (1989) defined urban regimes as "the informal arrangements by which public bodies and private interests function together in order to be able to make and carry out governing decisions" (p. 6). Urban regime theorists attempt to explain "the linkages between private capital and political power and the potential synergies that can be exploited between these spheres of urban society" (Pierre, 2005, p. 447). Primary regime members are those who exhibit the greatest degree of power to influence resources and the strategic direction of development. Typically, highly influential politicians, business elites, and prominent public figures account for these primary members. Secondary regime members are those who are less able to exhibit control over resources but are highly connected to development strategies and have a key interest in the outcomes of development. Examples of these members would be those from community development groups and officials representing educational institutions, such as universities.

Stoker and Mossberger (1994) have argued that regimes form around different senses of common purpose, such as tradition and social cohesion, selective projects, and ideology or image change. Ideology and culture constitute important bases of coalition building and form the foundation of regime character (DiGaetano & Klemanski, 1999). In the context of sport as a tool for urban development, urban regime theory has been employed as an explanatory tool in several contexts, such as Schimmel's (2001) critique of the sports-led growth strategy in Indianapolis; Pelissero, Henschen, and Sidlow's (1991) account of the construction of a sports stadium in Chicago; Sack and Johnson's (1996) study of a major tennis event in New Haven; and Henry and Paramio-Salcines' (1999) research on symbolic regimes in Sheffield. In each of these studies, local regimes used sport strategies to focus their policy agenda around a common purpose.

Given that different types of regimes have distinct policy agendas determined by the coalition of regime participants, Stoker and Mossberger (1994) identified three types of regimes relevant for cross-national comparative research: organic, instrumental, and symbolic. An organic regime seeks to protect the status quo by

conservatism and exclusivity. Instrumental regimes tend to be short lived, characterized by an orientation toward project completion. The symbolic regime is based on the perceived need for a new image in cities wishing to change direction. For symbolic regimes, the objective of economic growth is mediated by a sense of 'value' based upon the chosen image of the city. The coalitions guiding the process of using sporting events for growth and development in Edmonton, Manchester, and Melbourne represent symbolic regimes (Misener & Mason, 2008).

Edmonton is an economically prosperous city where sport is used to promote and create a positive image of the city, attract tourists, and bring in more investment opportunities. Thus, the coalition in Edmonton represents a *progressive symbolic regime*, where financial growth is not necessarily the end in itself, but rather, an activity that coincides with the regime's broader values about what the city represents. Coalitions in Manchester and Melbourne represent *urban revitalization symbolic regimes*, which attempt to transform a city's image to attract capital and investment. Both cities have undergone economic and social declines in recent history, and thus the use of sport-centered strategies is targeted at combating this degeneration, in addition to marketing and promoting the city (Misener & Mason, 2008).

Community Development

Neoliberal processes of governance acknowledge that the state cannot be wholly responsible for ensuring social equality, local development, and community mobilization (Mohan & Stokke, 2000). Community development is oft-cited as a means of ensuring these issues are addressed. However, the concepts of community and community development have numerous, and often times contested, meanings. Therefore, for the purposes of this research project, we clarify these terms below. In doing so, we have sought to ensure a relative openness about community-based concepts to allow for local distinctions to emerge.

Community implies both a geographical proximity of persons, as well as some social commonality that binds people and networks together. In this way, it differs from the wider context of city as community which inherently suggests geographical dispersion, and varied groupings, networks, and interests. Craig (1998) argued that community development is often thought of as a localized approach to community problem solving. Research on community development is wide and varied. Numerous definitions exist of community development; however, for the purpose of this research community development was defined as building active and sustainable local communities based on social justice and mutual respect, and changing power structures to remove the barriers that prevent people from participating in the issues that affect their lives. This definition builds upon McMillan and Chavis' (1986) theoretical characterization of community development, which offers a holistic approach to the development of a community's human, economic, social, and environmental resources to stimulate opportunities for membership, influence, and mutual development of social networks.

The community development context differs across organizations and cities. A holistic view of community development focuses on principles of local empowerment, participatory governance, demand-responsiveness, administrative autonomy, greater downward accountability, and enhanced local capacity (Chavis &

Wandersman, 1990). It opens up the possibility to (re)create local networks of community development practitioners and community members who share a common approach and can use external resources to support the development and capacity of local residents to influence local development initiatives (Diamond, 2008). In essence, this view focuses on activities that empower local residents to build their own capacity to affect social change. This perspective of community development addresses an agenda that rests on the premise of social justice, and people's right to participate in society. It counters the community development agenda that has emerged for many associations as a means of helping people conform to wider economic and political forces rather than a concern for a community's needs and desires. Thus, issues of widespread community participation, capacity building, social integration, and social capital are central (Diamond, 2007; Gilchrist, 2004; Putnam, 2000).

Method

A collective case study design was used to explore each of the cities (Stake, 1995). This design employs a joint study of a number of cases to investigate a phenomenon, general population, or general condition which can enhance theory building. Edmonton, Manchester, and Melbourne were chosen for this cross-national research project because they have developed comprehensive event strategies, hosting a variety of sporting events of different sizes and levels, and have used these events as an integral part of civic development strategies. All three cities are in Commonwealth countries with similar systems of government, which made the exploration of the urban coalitions fairly similar and relatively comparable (cf. Misener & Mason, 2008). In addition, each of these cities has existed as a "second" city within their respective countries, often overshadowed by the larger, more globally visible cities such as Vancouver, London, and Sydney (Black, 2008). In essence, these cities are distinct from large urban metropolises, which already have an idiosyncratic tourism character (Shoval, 2002). Smith (2005) reasoned that sport has been used by cities as a way to promote national identity, modernity, and progress. For each of these cities in this study, reimaging through sport has been a deliberate representation and reconfiguration of the city's image to accumulate economic, cultural, and political capital to present the image of a modern, progressive center worthy of visitation and investment. Thus, from the perspective of local elites, the city has much to gain from the use of events as part of urban development. Given the unique characteristics described above, it is also hoped that the selection of cities will lead to a better understanding—and perhaps improved theorizing about—the use of sport in the development of community within cities. To accomplish this, it was important to solicit the views of those who make decisions regarding the hosting of events, the operation of the infrastructure developed, and the marketing and promotion of the city. In addition, the views of representatives of the community who might benefit from the legacies of facilities and programs were also sought.

As discussed above, the first stage of this project led to the determination of key players in the urban regimes (see Misener & Mason, 2008). For the current research, regime members who clearly had a 'stake' in the sporting events or were

directly affected by those events (i.e., government officials, private industry professionals), and representatives from community groups (i.e., neighborhood coalitions) who were indirectly affected by events were identified and contacted for interviews. In some cases, regime members had prominent roles in the business community and also served on volunteer boards. For example, one interviewee was a prominent commercial litigator and partner in a law firm, and served as a director of a group involved in attracting major events to a city. Similarly, a board member of a local economic development commission also served as a senior manager of a major telecommunications company. Thirty-one semistructured interviews were performed in person with 39^3 members of the urban regimes. Interviews were performed in each of the three cities between August 2003 and July 2006, varying in length from 45 min to 1.5 hr. Either the first or second author was present for all interviews, with both being present for 19 of the 31 interviews. Interviews consisted of personnel such as City Mayors, Chief Executives, Marketing Officers, Community Development Officers, and private industry professionals. Interviews were performed with these primary regime members and some secondary regime members, such as leaders of community leagues and neighborhood coalitions (Stone, 1989) until there appeared to be a repetition of data (i.e., data saturation; Creswell, 1994).

Interview questions were developed based on the initial analysis of documentation. In addition, the theoretical framework guided the interview questions, focusing on the sporting event strategy, community participation and partnerships, social inclusion, and city specific community development concerns. These issues are consistent with achieving active and sustainable local communities based on social justice and mutual respect, and finding ways to change the power structures to remove the barriers that prevent people from participating in the issues that affect their lives (McMillan & Chavis, 1986). Each interviewee was also asked to articulate his/her notions of community development. All interviews were transcribed verbatim, resulting in 586 pages of interview records. Interviews were sent back to individual participants for member-checking (Creswell, 2003; 2007). Documentation, such as municipal government documents and transcripts of pertinent meetings, was also collected a priori online and during visits to each city to corroborate data collected from interviewees and other public documentation. Over one hundred documents were collected, representing more than 2300 pages of supporting data. All data were manually coded (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) and managed using N7 qualitative software (Richards, 2005). Themes and key issues that emerged from the data sets were critically analyzed to explore the perceptions of regime members and reflect upon instances where growth coalitions sought to meet the interests of local community. The following results section will present findings from the coded data for each city, as well as representative examples supporting these data.

Results

Analyses of the significant amount of data collected from the interviews and documents revealed that the community development agenda was perceived very differently in each of the cities. Not only did the supposed meanings behind com-

munity development differ, but also the degree to which hosting sporting events could—and has been—a part of this agenda were perceived differently. Table 1 summarizes the results of this portion of the study. To represent the variations, results will be presented independently for each of the cities, focusing specifically on issues of community particular to the city, and the relevant themes that emerged from the data. In addition, examples of where urban coalitions sought to meet the interests of the local community in addition to their own interests were extracted from the data and are used to corroborate regime members' perceptions about community development initiatives.

Edmonton—"The City of Champions"

Members of the urban regime in Edmonton did not perceive the use of sporting events as part of a specific community development agenda to the same extent as those interviewed in Melbourne or Manchester. Rather, the general neoliberal ideology of community, meaning the city as a whole (Smith & Keller, 1986), was used as a way to demonstrate/justify that everyone in Edmonton would benefit from events and feel a greater sense of community simply by virtue of events occurring in the city. Regime member responses to questions about community and community development focused on issues of civic pride, economic development, and enhanced reputation in the national and global community. "Civic pride is one of the number-one benefit of events" (Business Unit Manager, Northlands Park Inc.). Little attention was paid to the issue of community as a locally defined concept, nor did any of the respondents speak specifically about the ways in which events can or are being tied to specific local social development initiatives.

Some regime members referred to the general sense of community, such as the Executive Director of the Edmonton Sport Council who stated, "Edmonton is using sport as an economic driver, as a driver to build the community through building a sense of community; or perpetuating that sense of community that I already have." His referral to this feeling of community relates to the city as a whole and the citizens' pride in the sport teams and events strategy. Other regime members made similar comments, referring to a reputable schedule of community-run festivals and events, as well as outside perceptions of the city being a distinct and close-knit community. The Vice-President, Economic Development for Edmonton Economic Development Corporation (EEDC)[4] argued that,

> We are very uniquely positioned, the Edmonton person—typical type of person who lives in Edmonton—is very community-minded and very volunteer-oriented and kind of amateur sport-oriented . . . I think there is a lot of pride in the community.

Despite these positive comments, other regime members, including one Board Member of EEDC, had more difficulty articulating what a sense of community implied. Others also questioned the presence of a general sense of community, despite what the reputation appeared to be outside of the city. The Manager of Sport Services with the Alberta Community Services Department also raised concern about the real ability of the city to tie its sense of community to big international events that the city hosts for economic and political reasons.

Table 1 Summary of Results

	Rationale for Sport-Centered Strategy	Perception of Community	Perceived Centrality of Community Values	Examples of Community Development
Edmonton	- Economic development - Symbolic Reimaging	- City as a whole - Civic pride, economic development and reputation demonstrate tacit community support	- Community development not central to event strategy	- Volunteer support
Manchester	- Urban redevelopment and revitalization - Economic development	- Neighborhoods, communities of interest, and city as a whole	- Community and grass-roots focus play integral role in sport strategy	- Partnerships with community focused organizations - Volunteer support
Melbourne	- Urban redevelopment and revitalization - Economic development	- Groups who share a common sense of belonging and where there is trust between members - Localized, geographical, interest oriented	- Community and community development integral to planning processes surrounding events strategy	- Fair pricing and access policies - Community partnerships and local provider involvement - Volunteer support

Regime members also seemed unaware of—or less concerned about—opposition to events and development in Edmonton, despite that there has been opposition to large events such as the IAAF Track and Field Championships (MacDonald, 2001), and the Champ Car Grand Prix (Kuzma, 2004). Many interviewees perceived that all Edmontonians endorsed the events strategy and felt strongly that there were corresponding social benefits inherent in event hosting. When questioned about whether community members spoke out about the disturbances or the lack of perceived benefits for local communities, a Business Unit Manager from Northlands Park, Inc., responded, "We have that [opposition], you know, [during events] when we have curfews and those kind of things, but they never stop an event, they're just too important." Generally, regime members felt that opposition to events was relatively minor and saw this as a direct consequence of the city's sense of community spirit. "My opinion would be more a sense of community, you've got people here who don't have a lot of tolerance or just get in the way for the sake of getting in the way, [but overall] I think that we have a generally more business-oriented approach" (Vice-President, Edmonton Tourism, Events & Motion Pictures). However, the former Executive Director of the Edmonton Federation of Community Leagues pointed to political principles undergirding the lack of community-centered values in the city,

> In terms of that bigger stuff, sort of the 'social conscience NIMBY[5]-ism,' if you want to call it that, that's definitely not here. I mean, it's sort of the nature of the beast in Alberta; I don't think they're at the same level of social awareness and responsibility that you get in certain other cities.

One area that regime members felt very strongly about was in the strong volunteer support local citizens had for the sporting events in Edmonton. The former Edmonton Mayor commented on the "tremendous volunteer support" which was the driver of events in the city. While other regime members did not necessarily link volunteer support to community development activities surrounding an event, many interviewees did comment on the ease of obtaining volunteer backing for events, acknowledging that the extensive volunteer network that appears to exist in Edmonton is integral to perpetuating the events agenda.

Several members of the regime perceived a shift in the way that community and event legacy would be treated in the future. To some regime members, the events agenda seemed far from being linked to issues of community and community development in the city, and some acknowledged that there were new attempts to push this agenda. The Sport Services Manager with Alberta Community Services identified a growing expectation of legacy: "People have to understand that legacy isn't just about bricks and mortar; there are lots of other things. And certainly, the hope would be that the legacy would include something that would improve access after the event has left." The recently created Edmonton Events International (EEI), whose goal is to increase the strategic positioning of the city through a successful events portfolio, has also begun to recognize the need for more community benefit. The Sales Manager for Meetings and Business Travel for Edmonton Tourism is a board member of EEI. He acknowledged that one of the EEI board members constantly reminded him that:

> Community needs to be looked after, and there's a legacy concern, and legacy goes far beyond economic. A formal structure for us to deal with that I don't think it is in place at this stage, but I believe it's something that we're already aware of, in trying to make sure that it's in our strategic planning.

Thus, while regime members perceived that there has been little attention paid to community development and benefit linked to events in the past, some are at least beginning to recognize the importance of this issue.

Manchester—"Original Modern"

Manchester's use of a sporting events strategy is tied to the redevelopment and revitalization of the city as a whole, and more specifically to areas of the city that are of particular concern. Notions of community and community development, for members of Manchester's urban regime, centered upon localized areas of neighborhoods, communities of interest, as well as a general sense of community well-being for the city as a whole. Many of the members of Manchester's regime held a progressive and optimistic view that sporting events offer the potential to contribute to the numerous community development agendas throughout the city, and in particular to areas targeted by events initiatives. One such area is that of East Manchester, a region that has witnessed significant post industrial decline, and was the focus of the major regeneration efforts surrounding the hosting of the 2002 Commonwealth Games. Hence, most of the discussion with members of the regime tended to focus on these efforts and the developments surrounding the communities of East Manchester.

Generally, members of the urban regime felt very strongly about the ties between the city's events agenda and local community development interests. "Manchester's agenda has [focused on] grassroots community benefit rather than just simply the event" (Deputy Head of Manchester Leisure). Regeneration initiatives have been at the heart of community programming in and around Manchester and thus it is not surprising that regime members focused on issues of regeneration in their discussion of communities and community development. The Manchester City Council Chief Executive summed up the general feeling of the links between the community regeneration strategy and the hosting of the 2002 Commonwealth Games:

> . . . we were only interested in hosting these Games because of the wider regeneration impact, because there was an agency there which had no other purpose – it had nothing to do with the organization of the Games, but everything to do with making sure that beyond the Games, they were actually putting in place a sustainable program of social and economic improvement.

The inclusion of New East Manchester Ltd.[6] as an integral and ongoing partner in the events strategy was seen by numerous regime members as demonstrative of the efforts toward social inclusion. East Manchester's New Deal for Communities Coordinator argued that the inclusion of local people in the decision-making process throughout the lead up to the Commonwealth Games was a distinctive way of ensuring local community involvement. "We resource them, we support them, we

help them, we train them, we work with them, we make sure the structures are in place, with residents' groups involved in every single level of decision-making."

One of the central perceived benefits of hosting events in the city was the legacy of infrastructure that is provided for later use by the local community. Manchester's regime members reinforced the notion that meeting the interests of the local communities was a driver of infrastructure developments made in the city for events. The Head of Manchester Leisure described the belief that the model Manchester uses is considered relatively unique in that facilities are designed for much more than the events:

> In terms of community benefit, I would argue that Manchester's model is pretty well set up. Because what we did at the very beginning is recognize what the sports policy of the city would be, what the actual interest needed to be, the facilities for the games had to be—and we merged them all together. So we started early on in designing the buildings for community use and for major events as opposed to only for major event and wondering how we would do it the other way (Head of Manchester Leisure).

In this sense, regime members felt strongly about the ties between the events and ensuring that local community members had access to the facilities. In some cases, specific agreements were set up with Manchester Leisure and the local schools to ensure that members of the local community were accessing the facilities. "You go to SportCity[7] and you'll see schools using the facilities, and stuff like that, as well as the elite athletes. There is not one facility I can think of that's a white elephant" (Marketing Manchester Marketing Campaigns Manager).

In addition to the perceived assurance that local communities had access to the facilities, other regime members commented on the ways that interest groups played an important role in facility development. "So, lots of that work was done in the years prior to the stadium being built. And one of the country's lobbying organizations, the Federation of Stadium Communities, we worked quite closely with them; they actually used us a bit as a model for practice for being involved in community development" (East Manchester Sport Action Zone Manager). Thus, not only did regime members feel that the formidable ties between the infrastructure and community development were an integral part of their success, but they also believed that other organizations had adopted their successful practices for community development.

One example of an attempt to ensure community contribution cited by regime members was the development of the car park and parking scheme around Sport-City, including the stadium built for the Commonwealth Games now used by Manchester City Football Club. Local community groups and residents who would be directly affected by the new stadium were involved in designing of the car park and parking area. When initial concern was raised about this issue, the Head of Manchester Leisure recalled,

> I think we reacted very quickly to anybody saying it's not working or what will happen, and we reacted positively. It wasn't just consultation – for example the car parking scheme in and around the stadium, driven by local east Manchester, was designed by residents.

Thus, while to a certain extent, it appears that these types of activities and consultation were reactionary, urban regime members believed strongly in attempting to ensure that local residents had input into the activities and developments in their area. They perceived these activities as being key links to capacity building, development of social capital, and community relations.

Volunteer support surrounding the events strategy emerged prominently in the interviews with Manchester regime members as a way to connect to community members. Many regime members viewed efforts surrounding the Commonwealth Games, such as the Pre-Volunteer Program, as a unique way to tie the interests of community members to the event. This program targeted local communities with a specific interest in providing training and skills relevant to job training (See Jones & Stokes, 2003 for an analysis of this program). Chief Executive of New East Manchester explained the perceived importance of these links,

> We worked very hard in making the Games and the facilities that hosted them relevant to the people in the City; and a lot of time and effort from going into the large-scale volunteer program, the notion that people could actually get involved directly, in a small way participate in the process, and we were overwhelmed by the response to that.

The support of volunteers for the ongoing events strategy has been perceived as a legacy demonstrative of the city's ability to tie into the interests of communities and connect local people to the development strategies.

Despite the generally positive feeling about the regime's ability to link events to the interests and needs of the local community, there were some interviewees who did express concern about the true ability of event hosting to connect to community development concerns. One of the central concerns expressed in the interviews was the ability to convince games organizers, event managers, and the international sporting community of the need to ensure locally relevant activities during sporting events. "They don't make the connection. What they do is make the economic development connection, the facility development connection, and they're happy with generally the PR and the profile of the event" (Deputy Head of Manchester Leisure). Thus, while members often believed that there were greater opportunities to ensure local community development benefits, they struggled with event specialists who came in from outside the city to run events. Some felt that there was an inherent tension between the job of running a successful event and the goals of contributing to community development and local development.

> I had the task within the [Commonwealth] Games to try and bring the balance back, and I understand that that is their job, they go from games to games to games, but if those people and the organizations are going to make our business and our industry better, they should leave some of it behind (Head, Manchester Leisure).

Some secondary regime members—such as neighborhood coalition members, and community development officers—expressed that there were ongoing concerns from the local community about disruptions in the neighborhood, the outsourcing of jobs and industry, and inequitable development activities surround-

ing events in the city (Community Development Worker and Social Enterprise Catalyst, East Manchester Community Forum; Marketing Manager for New East Manchester Ltd). However, they generally believed that these problems were superficial and the regime was working toward a better model of community development and consultation. The Head of Manchester Leisure explained:

> We had all of these consultation problems and our resolution to that was an inclusive approach. So from the very beginning we included local community consultation, [the] national government body, local club consultation of sports, activities, and then as you move towards the actual games making sure it's not just participation, but it's access to events, it's jobs, it's making sure local people have the training to get the jobs. So that strategy was an absolute key to Manchester's success. And the only reason we wanted the games were all those reasons. It wasn't the sporting event per se; it was about all the benefits it could bring.

Thus, while there are likely some problems associated with community involvement and development, regime members believed that there were definite ways of ensuring positive ties between community development and sporting events. Further, they believed that they had implemented many positive activities, while also acknowledging that they still had a long way to go. "The jigsaw puzzle is to make sure a major event, major venue, community benefit, long-term benefit, community capacity building, you get all those together" (Chief Executive of New East Manchester Ltd).

Members of Manchester's urban regime interviewed for this study clearly believed that hosting sporting events could serve as a source of community development. They felt strongly that they had made concerted efforts to tie event activities in the city to a community building agenda through the inclusion of local community members in decision-making, consultation practices, and direct involvement in games activities. Most importantly, they perceived the ties between the community-based organization, New East Manchester, and the development activities surrounding the Commonwealth Games as a key strategy to meet the interests of community members. Interestingly, regime members saw Melbourne as a model of events and community development to aspire to: "[It's] going to take a few years to get that up to the Melbourne level. We're not there, but we are a sporting city" (Head, Manchester Leisure).

Melbourne—"The Sporting Capital"

Melbourne considers itself to be the "Sporting Capital" with an illustrious record of hosting events and sporting activities. In addition to its distinction as a well-established city for successfully hosting sporting events, the urban regime members interviewed in Melbourne felt very strongly about the connections between events and community development activities. In particular, they perceived their strategies and examples of ties to local community interests to be unique and a model to be adopted by other cities. Similar to Manchester, notions of community centered upon localized areas of neighborhoods, communities of interest, as well as a general sense of community well being for the city as a whole. More specifi-

cally some—including a Group Manager—Industry Development, Sport and Recreation Victoria and a General Manager of Major Events, Sport and Recreation Victoria—referred to the definition of community offered by the Department for Victorian Communities, "By communities we mean groups of Victorians who share a common sense of belonging and where there is trust between members" where commonalities can refer to geographical location, interest, and/or identity (2006, p. 2).

Many members of the urban regime interviewed suggested that their interest and focus on linking sporting events to community development issues has not always been so strong. Problems with previous sporting development initiatives in the city have been well documented (Lowes, 2004; Mules, 1998) and there continues to be some opposition to event activities in the city. The current state Labor government was highly critical of the previous Liberal government's "failure to make the events have a community benefit, and in some ways this criticism was that events were really to the detriment of community" (Group Manager—Industry Development, Sport and Recreation Victoria, Department for Victorian Communities). Thus, the shift to a Labor government at the state level was a key indicator for regime members that events needed to make a greater contribution to community and community development. Sport and Recreation Victoria used to be in an economic development department—State and Regional Development. The Labor government decided that "sport is about community and there are important sport and community benefits" (Group Manager—Industry Development, Sport and Recreation Victoria, Department for Victorian Communities). Subsequently, the responsibility for sport and the events agenda was shifted to the Department for Victorian Communities, signaling, "a recognition that sport, but also events, are fundamental to our way of life in communities" (General Manager of Major Events, Sport and Recreation Victoria, Department for Victorian Communities).

In addition to the State government, which is a major player in ensuring that the regime is being attentive to community development initiatives, local government officials also indicated the need to ensure that events are tied to the concerns of community members and are used for capacity building. The Mayor of Melbourne indicated that,

> Every single expenditure, it doesn't matter where the money is allocated, there is always room for a very public type scrutiny, and also consultation. We engage the broader community, to ensure that there is a passionate debate, and of course when funding is allocated, it is about ensuring the best interests of the city, to serve the interests of Melbourne.

While to a certain extent this may serve as political lip service regarding the role and duties of the local government, all regime members interviewed cited the intensive consultation process that came along with hosting events. This suggests a strong perception among regime members that public scrutiny and consultation in the event process is key to engaging the local community and ensuring active participation.

In addition to the perception that community consultation was part of the process of events, one Melbourne City Councillor pointed to the city's six strate-

gic objectives, one of which is to be "inclusive and engaging." "We want to be an inclusive and engaging city. And I see sport as playing a tremendous role in that. To me sport is the ground level" (Melbourne City Councillor). Regime members felt very strongly that sporting events—regardless of the size and scale—could play an important role in achieving this objective. While there was a distinct acknowledgment that the city was not at the point of completely fulfilling these objectives and there were still problems with the way some of the events and planning are structured—particularly with the ties to community level development—many discussed working toward that goal.

> I think that both ends of the scale and everything in between are important, and can be inclusive and engaging. My concern with the bigger events is that often times they do become elitist with the deals, the way they are run, the price of tickets (Melbourne City Councillor).

The method in which the infrastructure for sporting events has developed and continues to be an integral part of the events process was viewed by regime members as a key factor in the engagement of communities. Melbourne Olympic Trust, owned by the people of Victoria, runs the sporting precinct. Regime members perceived the fact that the site is run by a Trust, as key to ensuring that citizens benefit from the facilities. As the Chief Executive Officer of Melbourne Olympic Trust explained, "The Trust has to examine every time what is good for the people of Victoria, and how do they maintain and live up to their charter." The Group Manager—Industry Development, Sport and Recreation Victoria, Department for Victorian Communities, extended upon this by explaining "the model of building infrastructure here is that it's basically a community infrastructure first, that can be used for major events." While there is some variation between facilities in the city of Melbourne, all regime members felt very strongly about the public access policies for the facilities that meant that not only were the facilities used for the events, but also almost all are 'reasonably' priced public access facilities. "It's certainly an important factor that you and your kids can pretty much go down and play on Margaret Court Arena, which is the third court for the Australian Open, and people really get a kick out of that" (Manager, Sport and Recreation Victoria).

In addition to the public access rhetoric that surrounded the infrastructure developments in Melbourne, regime members felt very strongly about their event ticketing policy as a way to ensure ties to local community members. The Sports Event Ticketing (Fair Access) Act (2002) was designed to regulate the sale and distribution of tickets to sporting events to ensure fair access, control ticketing scalping, and improve major event ticketing practices. Regime members discussed the ticketing policy as a crucial way to ensure that events did not become overly elitist and that local communities continued to have access to participate in the events. Many constituents also discussed specific practices such as giving away tickets to local community groups, volunteers, and service organizations as part of the attempts to make major events feel more a part of the community and development activities.

A key feature for regime members in ensuring local community interests and needs are met through the events, is the engagement of various organizations in

the process of development. As a result, not only does the regime consist of the typical public and private groups such as local and state government, marketing organizations, and tourism industry professionals, but also periphery members, which include local neighborhood coalitions and grassroots organizations such as Melbourne Development Board. The Executive Officer of Melbourne Development Board explained the role of this organization as an economic and community development agency, with the central responsibility "to be an advocate for our individual regions, to look at our labor market, at community issues, the business issues, and say what's missing, what can we do to improve this situation?" In this sense, when large events are hosted by the city, they play a role in ensuring the local communities benefit from the event. As an example, he described his organization's role in relation to the Commonwealth Games (held in 2006),

> [We worked] to increase the uptake of local providers to the games, the people who do the catering and the security, so there were thousands of those jobs available. What we were trying to do is to improve the access of unemployed people. Instead of those jobs just going to the usual suspects all the time, when this company gets a contract, and they want a whole lot of food prepared, or whatever it is that they need; we were working with Centrelink[8] to improve the access of unemployed people to those jobs (Executive Officer of Melbourne Development Board).

Once again the overwhelming support of volunteers was perceived to be evidence of Melbourne's ability to connect with local people and ensure capacity building. The city adopted a similar program of volunteer recruitment and training as Manchester's Pre-Volunteer program. The Chief Executive Officer of Victoria Major Events Company explained the significance to ensuring these links are made: "I think a lot of the [volunteer support] has been quite good and really has moved in a strong way, and been quite successful. Treat volunteers well, give them respect, and give them the right justification … Melbournians love their major events." In addition to the perceived support and respect for volunteerism by regime members, many also discussed the role of sport volunteerism in contributing to social interaction and community development. "The other thing is with community development and notions of social capital that go along with that is the avenues sport provides for giving, volunteerism" (Industry Manager, Sport and Recreation Victoria). Within this context, there was also a high level of self-awareness regarding some of the problems that do come along with sport such as commercialism, elitism, and overemphasis on competitive outcomes. Regime members from Sport and Recreation Victoria perceived that one of their central roles was to minimize these negative aspects of sport and events, and maximize the positive opportunities for sport organizations and volunteers. "I think [volunteerism] is a key indicator of how sport develops community capacity and community strength … so we spend quite a bit of time on that" (General Manager of Major Events, Sport and Recreation Victoria, Department for Victorian Communities). Thus, not only were many members of the regime attentive to the need to connect with local communities, but were also aware of some of the underlying problems of relying on sporting events for development.

Discussion

Stone (2004) argued the majority of members of a given regime favor economic development over community development. The results of the current study do not dispute this; however some regime members perceived a need to be attentive to community development issues as well. There are two central areas worthy of discussion here that relate to both the perceptions of regime members regarding community development issues, and the character of regimes in so far as fulfilling an agenda of community-centered activities. These have been summarized in Table 2. The following discussion will address these two areas as related to the literature on sport and community development.

Table 2   Regime Philosophy and Perceived Strategies

	Edmonton	Manchester	Melbourne
Regime type*	Progressive Symbolic Regime	Urban Revitalization Symbolic Regime	Urban Revitalization Symbolic Regime
Regime philosophy	Neoliberal regime principles; support primarily business & commercial interests	Urban renewal; strategic repositioning; market reorientation	Community involves time and social commitment; investment of social capital
Strategy outcomes	Disconnect between staging events and local communities	Neoliberal top-down philosophy of community development	Government policy agenda guiding perceptions

* Regime types from Misener & Mason, 2008.

Regime Perceptions

A regime represents an accommodation between the potentially conflicting principles of the popular control of government and the private ownership of business enterprises. It appears that the regime in Edmonton has adopted neoliberal regime principles which support primarily business and commercial interests. Based on the evidence gathered for this study, the regime seems to have paid less attention to the potential for connections between issues of community development and the sporting events strategy as has occurred in Manchester and Melbourne. Elites were focused primarily on the economic and symbolic reimaging of the city, rather than seeing events as a way to address local community interests. In addition, those interviewed for this study seemed largely unaware of any opposition or problems with the events strategy, despite the fact that grassroots coalition members indicated a disconnect between the staging of events and local communities. While some members indicated an awareness of the need to address the interests of local communities in the future, there has been no evidence in the documentation collected for this study that this has become a prominent part of the events strategy.

Smith and Ingham (2003) have argued that elites are physically, psychologically, and culturally distanced from every day practices of community and thus

are unlikely to feel connected to the practices of community building. Members of the regime in Edmonton seem to exemplify this disconnect in their lack of attentiveness to the connections that already exist between the events and the local community. They tended to invoke ambiguous notions of community in seeking to confirm the support that local citizens seem to have in the activities in Edmonton. Further, the regime appears relatively unaware of the ways in which sporting events also tend to act as kind of badge of social exclusivity and cultural distinctiveness (Schimmel, 2006), which means typically meeting the interests of the elite while excluding the concerns of local citizens. Despite the regime's current lack of attentiveness to issues of community, the concept that events should leave a legacy for communities and address local development concerns is at least on the radar of some regime members. Perhaps it is not surprising that legacy concerns are drawing greater attention given that the Canadian Federal Policy for Hosting International Sport Events includes a section specifically requiring cities to address legacy. Perhaps the regime in Edmonton needs to develop a more critical and sensitive awareness of how policies and events strategies are received at the grassroots level (Hall & Hubbard, 1998).

In the other two cities, Manchester and Melbourne, the regimes perceived their sporting events agenda as integrally tied to issues of community development. In both cases, regime members perceived community to be both a localized notion of groupings, networks, and capital, as well as an overall public good for the city as a whole. Both cities' regimes provided examples about how the city had used both symbolic and real attempts to foster community development as part of the sporting events agenda. For the most part, the regimes indicated they saw the community agenda as being very important to a sport-centered strategy. Interestingly, Manchester looked to Melbourne as an example of what they wanted to achieve with their events strategy and the ties to local community.

In Manchester and Melbourne, the development of the regime agenda is set against a neoliberal philosophy of development, which structures ideas about, and the objectives set for, community development and definitions of public good (Lowes, 2004). In Manchester, this agenda is influenced by a state agenda of urban renewal, strategic repositioning, and market reorientation. This postindustrial city is attempting to reinvent itself on the national and global stage, as well as meet the needs of a central government philosophy of regeneration and social integration. This political ideology has brought a market-oriented approach to the agenda of community development, similar to many cities around the world attempting to use sport for development (Whitson & Horne, 2006). While perceived by interviewees as unique, giving away tickets to local community members, acquiring volunteer support from local citizens, and the establishment of a legacy organization are not necessarily distinctive strategies. Rather they reflect a neoliberal top-down philosophy of community development that attempts to appease the 'interests' of local community members rather than engage in the grassroots mobilization of community needs (Gilchrist, 2004).

While the hosting of events was perceived by Manchester's regime as being tied to concerns for community development and capacity building, this ideology may stem from a need by urban elites to counteract the perceived loss of the community and social capital stemming from degeneration (Black & van der Westhuizen, 2004). This is likely why much of the events and the discussion of commu-

nity and development have centered on the area of East Manchester, where severe social and economic problems have existed in the recent past. Nonetheless, the mere fact that regime members in Manchester were attentive to issues of community and made concerted efforts to develop social capital signifies that the regime agenda is structured in a way that issues of community could be addressed. There exists a tension between the agenda of community development and the successful running of events that likely stems from the lack of prioritization of a community strategy. The mobilization of a community strategy around the sporting events agenda would not necessarily require a complete ideological shift, but rather establishing a commitment by all regime members and those on the periphery to put community development interests at the center of the agenda.

Melbourne presents an interesting case where the regime members interviewed felt very strongly that the sporting events agenda played an important role in community development and capacity building. In referring to community or a sense of community, regime members indicated a feeling of closeness and camaraderie with a group of other people as well as referring to community as a city-wide grouping. There seemed to be a deeper understanding that community involves time and social commitment, and the investment of social capital (Ingham & MacDonald, 2003). In this way, members believed that the symbolic and genuine attempts to foster community through the use of events were distinctive and continually developing. Even periphery regime members involved in community development perceived the regime to be making a concerted effort to foster social capital and community through their strategies.

The previous policy agenda in Melbourne was seen by the current Labor government as detrimental to community development, and thus the new agenda has refocused efforts to ensure local communities benefit from the sports strategy. Given this refocusing on issues of community and the centrality of grassroots legacy programming, it is not surprising that regime members perceived the city's agenda as positively influencing communities. Despite this generally positive attitude about the ways in which the Melbourne regime has been tying together the sporting events agenda with community development, Collins (2004) has argued that persistent social inequities are structurally resistant to reticent efforts of regimes. True social change and community development requires major efforts, resources, know-how, and matching persistence; most of which are lacking in the neoliberal policy agenda of supporting events for marketing and reimaging the city.

Regime Character

Perhaps one way of understanding regime perceptions of the sporting events agenda as they relate to issues of community development is to return to the nature of the regimes in each of the cities. It has been argued that the regimes in each of these cities represent symbolic regimes (Misener & Mason, 2008). Given that symbolic regimes are present to change the fundamental image of the city, the focus is similar to corporate branding (Smith, 2005); thus it would not be surprising that the regime agenda did not focus on community-centered values. This sort of prescriptive top-down politics or the rhetoric of 'community as a whole' is often appropriated for political and commercial ends within the city (Horne & Manzenreiter, 2006). Given that Edmonton represents a progressive symbolic

regime, where the use of sporting events is about creating a positive image of the city and attracting tourists and more investment, it is perhaps to be expected that the regime does not perceive community development issues as strongly linked to this agenda. The invocation of community-centered values by regime members offers a way to promote not only to visitors, but also to local citizens alike, that Edmonton is a vibrant, interconnected, and thriving city. Focus is clearly on economic and symbolic outcomes rather than attention to social capital and community development.

Manchester and Melbourne represent urban revitalization symbolic regimes. This type of regime attempts to transform a city's image to attract capital and investment, with the ultimate goal of facilitating economic development. Thus, in terms of the type of regime that exists in each city, it is perhaps somewhat unanticipated that regime members felt so strongly that the regime agenda was integral to issues of community development. The key to understanding this perception is perhaps the focus of urban revitalization. In Manchester, the events strategy has been linked to federal government policies of urban regeneration and renewal. Thus, as discussed above, the perceived focus on community development issues by regime members is likely related to the specific urban regeneration program of East Manchester. The facilitation of this urban renewal program served as a catalyst, not only to secure events in the area, but also to secure Federal government funding for the events. This would help to explain why the regime members interviewed focused their discussion on the related regeneration issues in the area, as examples of community development. Hence, the progressive community efforts are symbolically present, but little is known about the impact or the capacity to capture the essence of public engagement and social capital building (Blackshaw & Long, 2005). Perhaps the test will be to see if this focus persists and continues to grow as the sporting events strategy moves to areas where regeneration is not as prominent an issue.

In Melbourne's case, the urban revitalization agenda has shifted focus. With the Labor government in power at the state level, and due to successes in the past, the previous agenda of physical regeneration has diminished in importance. Thus, issues of social investment and community development have come to the forefront of the revitalization agenda (Cheshire & Lawrence, 2005). This is perhaps the reason that regime members perceived the sporting events agenda as so prominently tied to community development. In this way, the urban revitalization focus has encouraged the integration of local community needs/interests and ensuring that benefits of events accrue to local citizens. Not only did regime members believe that a community agenda was central to the sports strategy, but they were also able to provide numerous examples of such efforts, such as improving public access to facilities, community engagement programs, and links to local neighborhood development opportunities. The case of Melbourne would appear to uphold what Maloney, Smith, and Stoker (2000) have reasoned—that social capital and community capacity can be actively generated and promoted by regimes through the establishment of consultative forums, outreach work and funding schemes. Thus, although it was outside the scope of this study to explore the extent to which these strategies are actually tied to efforts of community, it is nonetheless encouraging to see that regime members perceive there to be significant ties between the sports strategy and the community development agenda.

Conclusions and Future Research

The intent of this article was to examine the perceptions of members of regimes in Edmonton, Manchester, and Melbourne regarding the use of sporting events for broad-based community outcomes; more specifically, the symbolic attempts to foster benefits for groups outside the urban regime. Two cases, Manchester and Melbourne, demonstrate that the regimes are at least attentive to issues of community development and have made some symbolic attempts to address these concerns. In particular, Melbourne's regime has refocused its revitalization efforts on social outcomes with specific concerns for community development. Thus, while perhaps it is still some way off that communities reach outcomes such as more widespread social inclusion, community cohesion, and increased social and human capital, it is encouraging to see attempts—even if only symbolic—to meets the needs/interests of community.

Typically, sport related developments such as facility construction and event hosting have been justified from an economic development perspective. While economic development and community development may strategically overlap, Stone (1993) has suggested that the privileging of economic development stems from the problems of coordinating community development. For economic development, consensus between a few key organization representatives is required, whereas for community development, grassroots mobilization is also needed. This involves a substantial commitment and often a complete change in regime agenda (Stone, 2004). Furthermore, Smart and Smart (2003) argued that knowledge of how to nurture the social and cultural conditions for cohesion and prosperity in an era of intensifying neoliberal policies and economic deregulation is still in its infancy. It is perhaps in this area that future research is most needed. Cities continue to host sporting events as part of development strategies, and while some such as Kidd (1992) and Hall (2001) have recommended that sport organizations such as the International Olympic Committee require cities to perform complete social impact assessments and full public consultations, more work needs to be done to understand the ways in which sport events can fulfill the needs of local communities. It will be through this type of research that changes can be made to develop and market sport events in ways that foster community and build social capital.

This study has explored the views of urban regime members regarding the links between hosting sporting events and community development initiatives. In Edmonton, members of the urban regime interviewed did not perceive the sporting events strategy to be directly tied to community development objectives. In Manchester and Melbourne, regime members believed that the use of events for development was linked to communities and community development goals. In addition, regimes members in those cities provided examples of symbolic attempts to foster community around the sporting events strategies. Data collection was limited to perceptions of urban regime members, so there was no intrinsic measurement that would state that community development goals have been achieved. Thus, while this study could not reveal whether attempts to meets the needs of local communities were being met through the sporting events strategies, it is at least encouraging to note that those who control resources and conceive of, oversee, and implement growth strategies within cities view community development as important to these strategies.

Future research could use economic and noneconomic measures to evaluate the impact of community development initiatives. In addition, research could examine if cities with certain characteristics (e.g., employment, economic base, cultural amenities, perceived competitors) are more likely to pursue sporting events strategies than others. While the three cities—Manchester, Melbourne, and Edmonton—studied here have been linked to a specific regime type, does this mean that progressive regimes "think" the same way about sport and the way it can be leveraged for community and economic development? A comparison of cities with symbolic regimes that have used a sports strategy with those that have not may shed new insights into why certain cities choose sport to pursue their progrowth strategies and further reveal how sporting events may contribute to community development.

Notes

1. A version of this article received the NASSM Student Paper Award at the 2007 North American Society for Sport Management Conference.
2. The authors would like to acknowledge the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada for research funding for this project.
3. Several interviews involved multiple participants.
4. The organization was originally named Economic Development Edmonton (EDE). It underwent restructuring in 2003–2004 and emerged as EEDC in May 2004.
5. The acronym NIMBY refers to "not in my backyard."
6. New East Manchester Ltd is a partnership initiative between Manchester City Council, English Partnerships, the North West Development Agency and the communities of East Manchester. Its mandate is to lead the physical and social regeneration of East Manchester, recognized as one of the most deprived areas in the country.
7. SportCity is the sporting precinct including the English Institute of Sport, the National Squash Centre, the Regional Tennis Centre, the National Cycling Centre, and the, Manchester City Stadium.
8. Centrelink is an Australian Government statutory agency that delivers a range of services to help people become self-sufficient and support those in need (Centrelink, 2007).

References

Andranovich, G., Burbank, M.J., & Heying, C.H. (2001). Olympic cities: Lessons learned from mega-event politics. *Journal of Urban Affairs, 23,* 113–131.

Babiak, K., & Wolfe, R. (2006). More than just a game? Corporate social responsibility and Super Bowl XL. *Sport Marketing Quarterly, 15,* 214–222.

Black, D. (2008). Dreaming big: The pursuit of 'second order' games as a strategic response to Globalization. *Sport and Society, 11,* 467–480.

Black, D.R., & van der Westhuizen, J. (2004). The allure of global games for 'semi-peripheral' polities and spaces: a research agenda. *Third World Quarterly, 25,* 1195–1214.

Blackshaw, T., & Long, J. (2005). What's the Big Idea? A critical exploration of the concept of social capital and its incorporation into leisure policy discourse. *Leisure Studies, 24,* 239–258.

Centrelink. (2007). *About us*. Retrieved February 11, 2007, from http://www.centrelink.gov.au/index.htm

Chavis, D.M., & Wandersman, A. (1990). Sense of community in the urban environment: A catalyst for participation and community development. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 18,* 55–81.

Cheshire, L., & Lawrence, G. (2005). Neoliberalism, individualisation and community: Regional restructuring in Australia. *Social Identities, 11,* 435–445.

Collins, M. (2004). Sport, physical activity and social exclusion. *Journal of Sports Sciences, 22,* 727–740.

Craig, G. (1998). Community development in a global context. *Community Development Journal, 33,* 2–17.

Creswell, J.W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Creswell, J.W. (1994). *Research design. Qualitative and quantitative approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Department of Victorian Communities. (2006). *What is community strengthening?* Retrieved on November 10, 2006, from http://www.dvc.vic.gov.au/

Diamond, J. (2008). Capacity building in the voluntary and community sectors. *Public Policy and Administration, 23,* 153–166.

Diamond, J. (2007). Civic organisations and local governance: Learning from the experience of community networks. In D. Purdue (Ed.), *Civil societies and social movements* (pp. 53–68). London: Routledge.

DiGaetano, A., & Klemanski, J. (1999). *Power and city governance: Comparative perspectives on urban development*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Gilchrist, A. (2004). *The well-connected community. A network approach to community development*. Bristol, UK: Polity Press.

Glaser, B., & Strauss, A.L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.

Green, B.C. (2001). Leveraging subculture and identity to promote sport events. *Sport Management Review, 4,* 1–19.

Hall, C.M. (2006). Urban entrepreneurship, corporate interests and sports mega-events: the thin policies of competitiveness within the hard outcomes of neoliberalism. In J. Horne & W. Manzenreiter (Eds.), *Sport mega-events: Social scientific perspectives of a global phenomenon* (pp. 59–70). Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing.

Hall, C.M. (2004). Sports tourism and urban regeneration. In B. Ritchie & D. Adair (Eds.), *Sports tourism. Interrelationships, impacts and issues* (pp. 192–205). Toronto, ON: Channelview Publications.

Hall, C.M. (2001). Imaging, tourism and sports event fever: the Sydney Olympics and the need for a social character for mega-events. In C. Gratton & I. Henry (Eds.), *Sport in the city. The role of sport in economic and social regeneration* (pp. 166–183). London: Routledge.

Hall, T., & Hubbard, P. (1998). *The entrepreneurial city: Geographies of politics, regime and representation*. Chicester, UK: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.

Harvey, D. (1989). From managerialism to entrepreneurialism: The transformation in urban governance in late capitalism. *Geografiska Annaler, 71B,* 3–17.

Henry, I., & Paramio-Salcines, J.L. (1999). Sport and the analysis of symbolic regimes: A case study of the city of Sheffield. *Urban Affairs Review, 34,* 641–666.

Hiller, H.H. (2000). Mega-events, urban boosterism and growth strategies: An analysis of the objectives and legitimations of the Cape Town 2004 Olympic bid. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research, 24,* 439–458.

Horne, J., & Manzenreiter, W. (2006). *Sport mega-events: Social scientific perspectives of a global phenomenon*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing.

Ingham, A.G., & McDonald, M.G. (2003). Sport and community/communitas. In R.W. Wilcox, D.L. Andrews, R. Pitter, & R.I. Irwin (Eds.), *Sport dystopias. The making and meanings of urban sport cultures* (pp. 17–34). Albany, NY: State University Press of New York.

Jessop, B. (2002). Liberalism, neoliberalism, and urban governance: A state-theoretical perspective. *Antipode, 34,* 452–472.

Jones, M., & Stokes, T. (2003). The Commonwealth Games and urban regeneration: an investigation into training initiatives and partnerships and their effects on disadvantaged groups in East Manchester. *Managing Leisure, 8,* 198–212.

Kearns, G., & Philo, C. (1993). *Selling places: The city as cultural capital, past and present*. Oxford, UK: Pergamon Press.

Kidd, B. (1992). The Toronto Olympic commitment: towards a social contract for the Olympic Games. *Olympika, 1,* 154–167.

Kuzma, B. (2004, October 7). Group moves to bring Champ Car to Edmonton: Offer on the table. *National Post,* p. S4.

Lowes, M. (2004). Neoliberal power politics and the controversial siting of the Australian Grand Prix Motorsport event in an urban park. *Loisir et Société. Society and Leisure, 27,* 69–88.

MacDonald, J. (2001, March 31). World's shielded from firm's cash woes: Event will proceed despite ills of ISMM Group Agrio says. *Edmonton Journal,* p. B1.

Maloney, W., Smith, G., & Stoker, G. (2000). Social capital and urban governance: Adding a more contextualized top-down perspective. *Political Studies, 48,* 802–820.

McMillan, D.W., & Chavis, D.M. (1986). Sense of community: A definition and theory. *Journal of Community Psychology, 14,* 6–23.

Misener, L., & Mason, D.S. (2008). Urban regimes and the sporting events agenda: A cross-national comparison of civic development strategies. *Journal of Sport Management, 22,* 603–627.

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

Mohan, G., & Stokke, K. (2000). Participatory development and empowerment: the dangers of localism. *Third World Quarterly, 21*(2), 247–268.

Mossberger, K., & Stoker, G. (2001). The evolution of urban regime theory: The challenge of conceptualization. *Urban Affairs Review, 36,* 810–835.

Mules, T. (1998). Events tourism and economic development in Australia. In D. Tyler, Y. Guerrier, & M. Robertson (Eds.), *Managing tourism in cities* (pp. 195–214). Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.

Peck, J., & Tickell, A. (2002). Neo-liberalising space. *Antipode, 34,* 380–404.

Pelissero, J.P., Henschen, B., & Sidlow, E.I. (1991). Urban regimes, sports stadiums, and the politics of economic development agendas in Chicago. *Policy Studies Review, 10,* 117–129.

Pierre, J. (2005). Comparative urban governance: Uncovering complex causalities. *Urban Affairs Review, 40,* 446–462.

Putnam, R. (2000). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Richards, L. (2005). *Handling qualitative data: A practical guide*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Sack, A., & Johnson, A. (1996). Politics, economic development, and the Volvo International Tennis Tournament. *Journal of Sport Management, 10,* 1–14.

Schimmel, K. (2006). Deep play: sports mega-events and urban social conditions in the USA. In J. Horne & W. Manzenreiter, *Sport mega-events: Social scientific perspectives of a global phenomenon* (pp. 160-174). Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing.

Schimmel, K.S. (2001). Sport matters: Urban regime theory and urban regeneration in the late-capitalist era. In C. Gratton & I.P. Henry (Eds.), *Sport in the city: The role of sport in the economic and social regeneration* (pp. 259–277). London: Routledge.

Shoval, N. (2002). A new phase in the competition for the Olympic gold: The London and New York bids for the 2012 games. *Journal of Urban Affairs, 24,* 583–599.

Smart, A., & Smart, J. (2003). Urbanization and the global perspective. *Annual Review of Anthropology, 32,* 263–285.

Smith, A. (2005). Conceptualizing city image change: The 're-imaging' of Barcelona. *Tourism Geographies, 7*(4), 398–423.

Smith, J.M., & Ingham, A.G. (2003). On the waterfront: Retrospectives on the relationship between sport and communities. *Sociology of Sport Journal, 20,* 252–274.

Smith, M.P., & Keller, M. (1986). 'Managed growth' and the politics of uneven development in New Orleans. In S. Fainstein, N.I. Fainstein, R.C. Hill, D. Judd, & M.P. Smith (Eds.), *Restructuring the city: The political economy of urban redevelopment* (pp. 126–166). New York: Longman.

Stake, R. (1995). *The art of case research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Stoker, G., & Mossberger, K. (1994). Urban regime theory in comparative perspective. *Environment and Planning. C, Government & Policy, 12,* 195–212.

Stone, C.N. (2004). It's more than the economy after all: Continuing the debate about urban regimes. *Journal of Urban Affairs, 26,* 1–19.

Stone, C.N. (1993). Urban regimes and the capacity to govern. *Journal of Urban Affairs, 15,* 1–28.

Stone, C. (1989). *Regime politics: Governing Atlanta, 1946-1988*. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas.

Whitson, D., & Horne, J. (2006). Underestimated costs and overestimated benefits? Comparing the outcomes of sports mega-events in Canada and Japan. In J. Horne & W. Manzenreiter, *Sport mega-events: Social scientific perspectives of a global phenomenon* (pp. 73-89). Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing.