

# Kent Academic Repository

## Full text document (pdf)

### Citation for published version

Postlethwaite, Verity and Kohe, Geoffery Z. and Molnar, Gyozo (2019) Inspiring a generation: an examination of stakeholder relations in the context of London 2012 Olympics and Paralympics educational programmes. *Managing Sport & Leisure*. ISSN 2375-0472.

### DOI

<https://doi.org/10.1080/23750472.2019.1591296>

### Link to record in KAR

<https://kar.kent.ac.uk/73273/>

### Document Version

Author's Accepted Manuscript

#### Copyright & reuse

Content in the Kent Academic Repository is made available for research purposes. Unless otherwise stated all content is protected by copyright and in the absence of an open licence (eg Creative Commons), permissions for further reuse of content should be sought from the publisher, author or other copyright holder.

#### Versions of research

The version in the Kent Academic Repository may differ from the final published version.

Users are advised to check <http://kar.kent.ac.uk> for the status of the paper. **Users should always cite the published version of record.**

#### Enquiries

For any further enquiries regarding the licence status of this document, please contact:

[researchsupport@kent.ac.uk](mailto:researchsupport@kent.ac.uk)

If you believe this document infringes copyright then please contact the KAR admin team with the take-down information provided at <http://kar.kent.ac.uk/contact.html>

**This is the accepted – pre-proof version. The paper appears here in lieu of the publisher’s version of record.**

**Title:** Inspiring a Generation: An examination of stakeholder relations in the context of London 2012 Olympics and Paralympics educational programmes

**Journal:** Managing Sport and Leisure Manuscript

ID RMLE-2018-0095

**Manuscript Type:** Special Issue Article

**Keywords:** Olympic, London, Stakeholder, Education, Legacy

**Abstract:**

**Rationale/Purpose:** The paper seeks to consider the intersection of discourses around the London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic legacy aim to inspire a generation.

**Design/methodology/approach:** This paper explores how the London 2012 educational legacy programmes, such as the Get Set programme, affected relations between stakeholders in the Olympic and Paralympic movement and the UK sport and education sectors. Utilising a stakeholder relations perspective, this paper analyses dialogue from a UK parliament based Inquiry through a critical discourse analysis.

**Findings:** From the analysis discourses emerged around the purpose of the educational programmes and London 2012 as a missed opportunity. Relating to the stakeholder relations perspective the findings highlighted tension between competitive sport based and values based education discourse. Furthermore, opportunities and tension created from fragmented accountability between organizing committee and the host city.

**Practical Implications:** This paper speaks to stakeholders connected to sport mega event organizing committees and/or those who have a stake in young people, sport and education. The findings encourage stakeholders to reflect on potential fragmented accountability and the purpose of sport based educational programmes.

**Research Contribution:** The paper contributes to research theoretically as it bridges debate around stakeholder relations from sport mega event and domestic sport policy based literature.

**This is the accepted – pre-proof version. The paper appears here in lieu of the publisher’s version of record.**

## **Introduction**

In 2013 the former London Organizing committee of the Olympic and Paralympic Games (LOCOG) chairman, Lord Sebastian Coe, spoke of “his regret that school sport became a political football during the Olympic Games” (Guardian, 2013). The apologetic sentiment about the politicisation of school sport is an example of the wider public and political discourses surrounding the London 2012 Olympics and Paralympics (London 2012) legacy promise of “inspiring a new generation of young people” (DCMS, 2008, p.6). The paper seeks to consider the intersection of discourses around the London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic legacy aim to inspire a generation.

The origins of the inspire a generation legacy aim had been influenced by domestic and international influences. Internationally, the aim was influenced by the gatekeeper to the Olympic movement, the International Olympic Committee’s (IOC), who have developed a philosophy around their movement referred to as Olympism. The principles explicitly connect sport and education, whereby:

blending sport with culture and education, Olympism seeks to create a way of life based on the joy of effort, the educational value of good example, social responsibility and respect for universal fundamental ethical principles (IOC, 2013a, p.15).

In recent decades bidding cities have systematically included the pillars of Olympism within tangible and intangible legacy aims (Tomlinson, 2014). In the context of London 2012, this use of Olympism was evident in the early stages of the bid by including children and young people and the emotive, mythic power of Olympism in the supporting narrative for the London bid (Lee, 2006). The pinnacle of this was in 2005 at the 112<sup>th</sup> IOC Session where the London bid delegation included a third of “East London school children from twenty-eight different ethnic backgrounds” (Lee, 2006, p.178). Leading the bid, Lord Coe strategically placed youth engagement and participation front and centre to convince IOC committee members to vote for London (Girginov, 2013).

Coe’s and his team’s efforts were successful, and the win precipitated Games delivery efforts that interacted with the UK’s domestic policy environment around youth and sport. In the area of domestic policies related to young people and sport the dominant site of delivery has been school sport and physical education (Houlihan & Green, 2006; Philpotts, 2013). The London 2012 promise to inspire a generation directly engaged with schools through the main programme, Get Set, where a series of resources were made available to schools around Olympic and Paralympic values (Kohe & Bowen-Jones, 2016; Kohe, 2017; Chen and Henry, 2017). In evaluations post London 2012 both LOCOG and the IOC deemed the Get Set programme a success, illustrating this claim with quantifiable figures, such as, the programme engaged “25,000 schools and 6.5million young people” (IOC, 2013b, p.6). The

**This is the accepted – pre-proof version. The paper appears here in lieu of the publisher’s version of record.**

impressive statistics juxtaposed with Coe’s ‘regret’ sentiment demonstrate differing views on the success of the London 2012 educational programme. Moreover, as noted in various academic studies around sport mega events, such as London 2012, and education programmes, such as Binder (2012) in the Olympic values education programmes context and Chen and Henry (2017) in the delivery of Get Set in a non-host city context, statistics do not show in full the intricacies, impacts or processes of a programme. The contribution of this article, therefore, is to examine the differing views of stakeholders and go beyond quantified evaluations to understand London 2012 educational programmes.

In order to develop the article’s contribution the aim is to use London 2012 and the Get Set programme as a case study to engage with wider academic debate around sport mega events, Olympic and Paralympic education programmes, and policies based on school sport and physical education. The research objective is to illuminate how conceiving and enacting educational legacy programmes, such as the Get Set, affected relations between stakeholders in the Olympic and Paralympic movement, and UK sport and education sectors. Theoretically, the article draws upon stakeholder relations scholarship (e.g. Friedman & Miles, 2002; Jensen, 2010; Viollet et al., 2017), and, specifically relevant to the paper, the use of a stakeholder approach within sport mega event literature (e.g. Parent, 2008; Leopkey & Parent, 2015) and sport policy literature (e.g. Lindsey, 2010; Lindsey 2018). Furthering this academic work and engaging with varying debates, this paper contributes theoretically to understanding stakeholder relations during a sport mega event, in particular, stakeholders connected to policy around young people and educational legacy programmes.

In examining stakeholder relations around the London 2012 educational programmes the paper will be structured as follows. The next section introduces the theoretical framework adopted, drawing on stakeholder relations approaches and sport mega event and policy literature. To complement the theoretical framework further contextual detail will be outlined in terms of the UK policy and education space. A brief review of the research methods will then be provided, including, documentary analysis and a critical discourse analytical framework. The findings and discussion section subsequently examines documentary materials from House of Commons Education Committee Inquiry (2013) titled ‘School sport following London 2012: No more political football.’ The two prominent discourses that emerged are around the purpose of the London 2012 educational programmes and London 2012 being a missed opportunity. Finally, conclusions are drawn for future academic research and education related sport policy.

### **Theoretical Standpoint**

The bidding and hosting of London 2012 cost around nine billion pounds of public sector funds and became a source of significant public and media based scrutiny (DCMS, 2010; Girginov, 2013). From formally bidding in 2002 to hosting in 2012, the preparation involved multiple governmental departments across numerous government terms and intersected with a variety of non-governmental stakeholders. Consequently, to capture this complex landscape of actors our considerations are underscored, in the first instance, by a theoretical interrogation of stakeholder relations (Friedman & Miles, 2002; Jensen, 2010; Viollet et al., 2017) in connection to sport mega event specific research (Parent, 2008; Leopkey & Parent, 2015).

Stakeholder critique, in essence, requires an examination of the interactions of entities and relationships in and across sectors, including, shared agenda setting and value creation. Friedman and Miles (2002) emphasise the range of stakeholder relations that can occur, and note that previous research has frequently ignored negative relations between stakeholders. Parent (2008) and Leopkey and Parent (2015) isolate sport mega event stakeholders to those connected to the local organising committee: staff and volunteers, host governments, the community, sport organisations, delegations, media, sponsors and other stakeholders (e.g., consultants). The authors emphasise the role of governance for an organizing committee to manage the multitude of stakeholders, however, do not explicitly consider this beyond the hosting period or into a domestic policy space. A useful discussion point from Leopkey and Parent (2015, p.542) is developed around the Rhodes (2000) “accountability fragmentation, that is, when being accountable to many entities, it can potentially provide the opportunity to play one or some stakeholders against others, creating ambiguities, and thereby reducing overall accountability with regard to the resulting legacy of the event.” This paper advances this body of research by considering stakeholder relations beyond the sport mega event, and questions whether London 2012 educational programmes demonstrated characteristics of negative stakeholder relations or accountability fragmentation.

In the context of London 2012 educational programmes the element of shared value creation among stakeholders is important. Namely, because of the Olympic and Paralympic values included Get Set the main London 2012 educational programme delivered through primary and secondary school.. Jensen (2010) suggested that adding the process of creating value to the framework of stakeholder relations is useful, as it involves balancing varying constituencies with a vision that can unite stakeholders. While connectivity of thought can create, consolidate and enhance stakeholder relations within the sport-education sector (Kohe & Collison, 2019), there can be no guarantees that

**This is the accepted – pre-proof version. The paper appears here in lieu of the publisher’s version of record.**

collaborative efforts may be mutually beneficial, sustainable, or, least of all, meaningful (both in an ideological or practical sense).

Regarding London 2012, two significant actors simultaneously, but not necessarily collaboratively, were creating value and relations around the inspire a generation legacy aim. Firstly, LOCOG, who drove the delivery of the London 2012 Games and were accountable to the IOC and UK government, plus worked alongside a range of other stakeholders, such as, schools and sponsors. The role of LOCOG is not permanent. As Agha et al. (2011) illustrated the organizing committee often commit and construct legacy aims yet disband when the event is over and have limited accountability to fulfilling long term legacy. The host city and national government, therefore, are often drivers of the long term value creation and sustainable legacy.

The other significant actor, therefore, is the UK Government and UK Parliament. The UK political landscape changed significantly in leadership over the life of bidding and hosting London 2012, due to changes through general elections (from a Labour majority, to a Conservative-Liberal Democrat coalition between the preparation and hosting up to 2012). In the post Games epoch, the UK Parliament changed again to a Conservative majority and at this time the Secretary of State for Education, Secretary of State for Culture, Media and Sport (plus, more minor ministerial roles) changed in terms of personnel. Consequently, the UK government in this context is not a fixed long term driver of legacy aims, instead it passed between the major political parties and changes in leadership position across departments connected to sport and education. It is an important element of the paper, therefore, to detail the UK policy in regard to sport and education space, furthermore, how this intersects with the Olympic and Paralympics values on education and sport. The section below builds on policy focused scholarship, such as, Viollet et al. (2017, p. 322) who have used stakeholder relations to explore sport policy “through an understanding of the dynamics of the relationships between the actors and their perceptions.” To articulate actors and known perceptions, the following section details the roles of stakeholders who in the context of 2012 engaged with the Olympic and Paralympic movement, and UK sport and education sectors.

### **UK Policy and Education Space**

Academic interest in UK sport policy has frequently commented on the intricate nature of stakeholder relations and a sustained critique of a crowded and fragmented policy space (Coalter, 2013; Lindsey, 2010; Houlihan, 2016). As Lindsey (2010) contends, moments, such as the creation of the National Lottery in 1994, have raised questions and debates around the governance of local partnerships by national programmes (i.e., the New Opportunities for PE and Sport programme). Drawing on Rhodes (2000), Lindsey (2010, p. 200) demonstrates the breadth of interpretations around governance at

**This is the accepted – pre-proof version. The paper appears here in lieu of the publisher’s version of record.**

macro policy level concluding that the changes in public policy contexts within the UK showed “fragmented” sport policy and sector governance in a “crowded policy space”. The use of broader governance literature by Lindsey links to aspects of sport mega event scholarship that consider governance issues. For instance, Leopkey and Parent (2015) utilize Rhodes (2000) to highlight potential accountability fragmentation when a local organizing committee attempts to manage a complex web of stakeholders connected to legacy. However, what has not been extensively considered previously are governance and accountability between an organizing committee and a national government around a non-sport department and policy, such as, the physical education and school sport policy space explored in this paper. The connection here bridges into the policy space of education and its connection to sport and sport mega events.

Focusing specifically on the education sector in the UK, seminal work by Houlihan and Green (2006) highlighted the importance of advocates and coalitions for increasing and sustaining national political interest in the UK around physical education. Yet, while adopting a multiple streams policy analysis was of value in articulating policy complexities, the evaluation did not explicitly take into consideration the role of London 2012 and the concurrent efforts around legacy programmes. Rather, the authors’ attention was on domestic policy space and actors, such as the Youth Sport Trust<sup>1</sup> and the Department for Education. Accordingly, to build on this work, this paper bridges and adds to articulating stakeholder relations around the Olympic and Paralympic movement and the role of LOCOG in developing educational programmes during preparing and hosting London 2012.

In regards to the education sector and connections to London 2012 a number of scholars have considered the intersections, such as, Jung et al. (2016) and Lindsey (2018). Jung et al. (2016) contend that an emerging Olympic discourse influenced the physical education space and National Curriculum, but nominally in comparison to the dominant discourse around competitive sport. Physical education during the 2000’s had been dominated by the traditional curriculum and community aims of increasing opportunities for young people to access and participate in competitive sport, through high quality physical education and school sport partnerships (Jung et. 2016; Mackintosh 2014). Lindsey (2018, 14) considers the physical education and school sport policy landscape beyond London 2012 and into the current Conservative Government and describes London 2012 as an example of a “policy window [that] can ‘open’ at both unpredictable and predictable times.” The analysis from Lindsey (2018) and Jung et al. (2016) is also reflected by Chen and Henry (2017) and Griggs and Ward (2013) who have respectively noted that the inspire a generation legacy aim was not substantively embraced alongside

---

<sup>1</sup> A British charity which aims to support education and development of young people through physical education, established in 1994.

**This is the accepted – pre-proof version. The paper appears here in lieu of the publisher’s version of record.**

changes to domestic policy or the historical functioning of actors (e.g., schools) who delivered in the area of school sport . It is, therefore, timely to coalesce discussions over educational spaces with sport mega event based literature to fully understand whether London 2012 and the inspire a generation legacy aim created tensions or opportunities for stakeholders engaging with the London 2012 educational programmes and the policy connected to UK sport and education sectors.

The prominent domestic policy changes around sport, education and young people during the preparation and hosting of London 2012 is the dramatic funding change in 2010 (Mackintosh 2014). The Secretary for Education in 2010, Michael Gove, announced the end to “the £162 million PE and sports strategy of the previous administration, to give schools the time and freedom to focus on providing competitive sport” (UK Gov, 2010). This decision two years before London 2012 called into question publicly the unity between the inspire a generation legacy aim of London 2012 and the UK government, for example, in the media headlines:

Teachers stunned after Michael Gove scraps 'sport for all' funding (Guardian, 2010)

Michael Gove forced into about-turn over scrapping School Sports Partnerships after outrage over cuts (Telegraph 2010).

Prior to 2010 the school sport partnerships were the focal point of the Labour led national structure that had evolved over 13 years into a wider ‘Physical Education, School Sport and Club Links’ (PESSCL) structure (Philpotts, 2013). The Labour PESSCL strategy had contributed to wider agendas of social inclusion, health promotion and education attainment (Houlihan & Green, 2006). The governmental change is not mentioned in the planning or evaluation of the London 2012 educational legacy programmes as LOCOG, IOC and IPC do not explicitly identify or function as policy actors. Yet, for the domestic stakeholders, such as, the Youth Sport Trust who prior to and beyond London 2012 contributed to the long term structures of sport and education, the 2010 policy changes had a significant impact. Stakeholder relations theory is useful here as it goes beyond traditional policy actors, instead considers a greater range of stakeholders connected to London 2012 that intersected with the domestic policy space and education legacy programmes.

In terms of the Olympic and Paralympic movement, London 2012 and education. The influence of the IOC and IPC is evident in the London 2012, Get Set programme, with the aim to:

give all young people the chance to learn about and live the Olympic Values of friendship, excellence and respect and the Paralympic Values of inspiration, determination, courage and equality (LOCOG, 2012, p. 1).



**This is the accepted – pre-proof version. The paper appears here in lieu of the publisher’s version of record.**

The Get Set programme is still an active resource under the remit of the British Olympic Association and British Paralympic Association (Get Set, 2018). While the resources enable schools and practitioners to draw down potentially useful content, a number of scholars have questioned the programme’s effectiveness. Kohe (2017), for example, uses memory techniques to explore how young people understood hosting London 2012. Both sets of studies highlight the complex circumstances around trying to educate young people and reach a national audience. Such findings relate to the broader sport policy and sport mega event stakeholder studies that discuss fragmentation and crowded spaces as hindering stakeholder relations and potential outcomes of policy or legacy programmes. Yet, unsurprisingly, IOC and IPC evaluations have not discussed such intricacies, instead have been wholly positive towards the Get Set programme, reporting that “an impressive 85 per cent of UK schools signed up to this programme” (IOC 2013b, 6). Going beyond the quantifiable reach of the programme to assess its actual efficacy for young people remains difficult and, in part, may explain why the effectiveness of the inspire a generation legacy aim was not systematically tracked by the IOC, IPC or LOCOG. The gap in knowledge of understanding and measuring the success of the legacy aim has been placed largely on local, regional and national domestic stakeholders.

As noted the key organisation is the IOC who use values based principles to promote Olympism. Such was evident in the London 2012 main education programme Get Set where the Olympic values were at the centre of the content. LOCOG, also, integrated Paralympic values into the Get Set programme showcasing the Paralympic Games that is governed separately to the Olympic Games through the International Paralympic Committee (IPC). The values approach taken by LOCOG, IOC and IPC contrasted to the UK’s pedagogic approach to physical education, which, as shown above, had been largely dominated by the discourse of competitive sport (Mackintosh, 2014; Jung et al., 2016). The vested interest in promoting the IOC and IPC movement to young people aligns to a broader aim from the international federations of making “young people... a key priority” in terms of audience and brand (Chatziefstathiou 2012, 31; for more on the IPC see Kerr, 2018).

The use of education and youth by the IOC (more so than the IPC) has come under significant academic scrutiny (e.g., Chatziefstathiou, 2012; Coburn & McCafferty, 2016; Lenskyj, 2012). Chatziefstathiou (2012) considers the evolution of Olympism in light of challenges around gender discrimination, commercialisation and Euro-centrism and notes that host cities continue to embrace the principles and this links to the increased (Western) governments’ domestic interest for youth and sport. The commercialisation and Western-centric critiques have been extensive around the role of the IOC and its educational programmes. Lenskyj (2012), for example, claims the idealistic tones of the resources overtly celebrate the Olympic movement and offer scant space for critique from other stakeholders, such as, schools. The role of the IOC, therefore, has been seen as an oppressive and problematic

**This is the accepted – pre-proof version. The paper appears here in lieu of the publisher’s version of record.**

stakeholder controlling the content and ethos of Olympic educational programmes. The London 2012 educational programmes, therefore, offer a useful case study for examining how UK based stakeholders engaged with the IOC influenced agenda and whether this created tension or opportunities with domestic stakeholders.

Beyond the IOC, critique has also extended towards sponsors and issues of corporate social responsibility. For example, Coburn and McCafferty (2016) problematize the role of Coca Cola in the sponsorship of the IOC activities around schools and broader discourse around health and childhood obesity. An under researched element of this debate is the role of the IPC and the growing Paralympic influence on Olympic education programmes. London 2012 combined systematically the Olympics and Paralympics. This combined approach encouraged conflation of the two movements in the delivery of ‘one’ Games (Brittain & Beacom, 2016; Kerr, 2018). Consequently, in the relation to the Get Set programme, the Paralympic aims and brand were given equal weighting to the elements of Olympism. A benefit of using stakeholder relations as the grounding concept for the paper is to allow for the inclusion of disability and Paralympic discourses as an influence on stakeholder relations during London 2012 and the educational legacy programmes, rather than simply focusing on the IOC – Olympism connections.

Moving into the post London 2012 landscape and beyond IOC, IPC and LOCOG evaluations, the political framing of measuring the success of the inspire a generation legacy aim was reduced to the domestic structures of school sport (not the Get Set programme). Lord Coe, stated in a national newspaper, “I’m sorry school sport became tribal, that’s probably the only thing we didn’t deliver in the same spirit as everything else was delivered” (Guardian 2013). This quote was captured around the same time that the UK Parliament Education Committee (2013) launched an Inquiry ‘School sport following London 2012: No more political football.’ The quote from Coe and title of the committee Inquiry counter the positive narrative from LOCOG, the IOC and IPC around the success of the Get Set programme. Plus, as shown below in detail, offer a great deal of stakeholder responses and understandings to the school sport and dialogue around London 2012 and the inspire a generation legacy aim.

### **Materials and Methodology**

A qualitative case study design for this project was adopted as it is “useful for exploring and describing elements of a problem in depth and detail, by examining situations with characteristics that may not be easily represented in numerical format” (Viollet et al., 2017, p.324). As noted, there have been statistical evaluations of London 2012 however, these do not outline the depth of stakeholder relations. The approach taken here is in line with the methodological articulations of Yin (2003) and Bryman (2016) who advocate using a case study to comprehend phenomena as a whole, whilst

**This is the accepted – pre-proof version. The paper appears here in lieu of the publisher’s version of record.**

detecting particular dynamics and changes. The methodological decisions of this paper are underpinned philosophically by an interpretive approach guided by a critical ontology. This philosophical standpoint is appropriate because the paper does not seek to identify stakeholders or their actions per se, but rather consider the relations between stakeholders in the context of London 2012 educational programmes.

To complement the aim of the paper and methodological approach, the materials selected capture a broad range of stakeholders in direct dialogue around London 2012 and school sport. The materials for this paper were official documents deriving from the state. Specifically, documents connected to the House of Commons Education Committee Inquiry (2013) ‘School sport following London 2012: No more political football’ and the submissions of evidence (outlined in Table 1). The use of documents in this paper was affective because of the relevance and extensive nature of the documents connected to the House of Commons Education Committee Inquiry (2013) this can be illustrated by the terms of reference of the Inquiry:

The impact and effectiveness of current Government policy and expenditure on increasing sport in schools;

The scope, appropriateness and likelihood of success of the Government’s plans for a school sport legacy from London 2012;

The impact so far of London 2012 on the take-up of competitive sport in schools; and

What further measures should be taken to ensure a sustainable and effective legacy in school sport following London 2012 (HoC Vol 1, 2013a, p.5).

The extensive range of evidence submitted to the Inquiry that is publicly accessible created a substantive set of documents which included transcribed dialogues, formal reports, and voices from stakeholders with a vested interest in the terms of reference quoted above (totalling 253 pages comprising of: 49 written submissions, three formal evidence sessions and engagement with visit/survey data from schools). Macdonald (2008) describes the advantages of using documents as data is to have the opportunity to study something where access to people or observation is not possible. Of value to this paper, the Inquiry represents voices from government, delivery agents, Olympic and Paralympic stakeholders and varying sport policy actors, who otherwise may not have been willing to contribute evidence.

The analytical approach taken to synthesise the data was based on Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), as advocated by a variety of scholars when considering political or policy based case studies, for example, van Dijk (1996), Bryman (2016), and Whigham and Bairner (2018). CDA allows the researcher

**This is the accepted – pre-proof version. The paper appears here in lieu of the publisher’s version of record.**

to account for dominant ideas (discourses) and social relations. As quoted in Whigham and Bairner (2018), van Dijk (1996, p. 84) highlights that:

one of the crucial tasks of Critical Discourse Analysis is to account for the relationships between discourse and social power. More specifically, such an analysis should describe and explain how power abuse is enacted, reproduced or legitimised by the text and talk of dominant groups or institutions.

CDA offered an appropriate framework of analysis for this paper as the dialogue documented in the Inquiry could be understood in terms of discourse and assumptions formed by dominant groups around London 2012 education programmes. Moreover, CDA emphasises going beyond identification and developing a critical stance on findings. In this paper, where dominant understandings between different stakeholders in the Inquiry created points of tension or opportunity, CDA allowed for this to be connected to a critical discussion of broader debates around the Olympic and Paralympic movement, and UK sport and education sectors. CDA balances the theoretical framework around stakeholders’ relations because it goes beyond identifying the stakeholder and process of interaction by using evidence to critically examine relations based on dominant discourses, such as competitive sport, health and funding, and identifying further discourses.

Limitations of this approach is linked to the use of publicly accessible and official documents, which engage with a particular type of conversation where stakeholders could be speaking in a performative manner (Bryman, 2016). Moreover, the Inquiry submissions are a snapshot of all national stakeholder voices, for example, the schools that submitted evidence could not be seen to be representative of the thousands of primary and secondary schools across the UK. However, for the purposes of this paper the Inquiry offered a substantive insight into the context of London 2012 educational programmes, this was understood based on the range of stakeholders Parent (2008) identified as relevant to an organizing committee and legacy, such as, host governments and sport organizations. Furthermore, in contrast to studies that use privately collected data (e.g., interviews), the data set for this paper is publicly accessible, encouraging further scholarly scrutiny of it (see Table 1 and publicly accessible links to the documents in the reference list).

The steps taken in the analytical element of the paper involved data identification (Inquiry documents, outlined in Table 1). Then an initial reading and grouping was based on any specific dialogue pertaining to the Get Set programme and the Olympic and Paralympic educational values within the Inquiry documents. Then a grouping of dominant discourse (as noted in previous literature above, such as, competitive sport) and reinterpretation of the data (in terms of the objective of this paper and theoretical framework around stakeholder relations, i.e. tensions and opportunities). The grouping

**This is the accepted – pre-proof version. The paper appears here in lieu of the publisher’s version of record.**

and reinterpretation of the data produced two overarching discourses around the stakeholder relations - purpose and missed opportunity. These discourses, supplemented by selected verbatim quotes from the Inquiry we discuss below.

## **Findings and Discussion**

### **Purpose**

In the Inquiry a number of stakeholders made the direct connection between London 2012 educational legacy programmes and the traditional domestic platform of school sport. The Department for Education, for instance, evidenced that “in 2012–13 the Department provided £500,000 to Get Set to support schools to develop and deliver activities to capitalise on the learning opportunities arising from the Games (with particular emphasis on the Paralympic Games) (HoC Vol II, 2013b, Ev 83). The use of the phrase ‘learning opportunities’ is vague and does not directly indicate whether this is through sport, wider curriculum, values, etc. Although it does state in brackets that there was an emphasis on the Paralympic Games, this is a learning opportunity that is not fully discussed in wider academic literature as the dominant discourse has been around the Olympics and Olympism. As noted by Binder (2012) and Chatziefsthaiou (2012), the values based education is commonly understood as Olympic values and IOC based principles. The UK government decision to emphasise the Paralympics, however, was not explicitly based on the values or engaging the IPC in substantive partnership. It was understood, instead, in the Inquiry report that “one of the most outstanding successes of London 2012 was in raising the profile of Paralympic sports” (HoC Vol I, 2013a, 27). This implies that the purpose of Get Set was about profile, not values which differs from the LOCOG, Olympic and Paralympic values-based understanding of the purpose of the programme.

Jackie Brock Doyle, Director of Communications and Public Affairs at the LOCOG submitted written evidence outlining that “the education strategy was built around the Get Set programme, which gave schools the tools to integrate the Games and the Olympic and Paralympic Values into their own activities” (HoC Vol III, 2013c, Ev w10). The ‘Values’ that Doyle refers to were not explicitly what the UK Government or other stakeholders contributing to the Inquiry saw as the purpose or outcome of Get Set and more broadly the inspire a generation legacy aim. The dominant conversation by non-LOCOG stakeholders was around competitive sport and the continued focus of domestic sport policy on the elements of winning and losing. Mike Diaper, then Director of Community Sport, Sport England commented: “School sport and also competition in schools can be about fun. It is definitely about winning and losing. It helps us to build team and leadership skills” (HoC Vol II, 2013b, Ev 2). Beyond the national policy perspective, Linda Cairns (HoC Vol II, 2013b, Ev 14), School Sport Co-ordinator, George Abbot School stated:

**This is the accepted – pre-proof version. The paper appears here in lieu of the publisher’s version of record.**

...if we put too much focus on competition, we are missing out on delivering sport, PE and physical activity to the large majority of our children and students. When you offer more and more competition, you are offering it to the same select, top, able athletes, so you have the same players in your hockey team, football team, rugby team and athletics.

The variation on the understanding of the purpose of school sport and the role of London 2012 is supported by Jung et al. (2016) noting competitive sport as being the dominant discourse in 2000s. The authors found that “sport discourse appeared to be the largest set of practices in the primary field of knowledge production and provided resources upon which other discourses such as health, citizenship and Olympic legacy drew” (Jung et al. 2016, p.508). The role of LOCOG as a stakeholder and Get Set here and elsewhere is a minor relation in the broader discourse around sport and competition. Yet, this minor role in the broader set of relations is not explicitly acknowledged by the LOCOG or Olympic and Paralympic based stakeholders implying a significant tension in the understanding of the relations and ability to build a values based outcome from a specific programme or legacy aim.

Stakeholders who have a knowledge of the Olympic movement and Olympism evidenced the tension between the dominant domestic discourse of competitive sport and the London 2012 values-based discourse in the Inquiry. For example, Jonathan Edwards former Olympic Gold medalist noted:

There is a real irony, in that the modern Olympic movement started because Pierre de Coubertin came over to this country to look at the education system and how it integrated sport—a healthy mind in a healthy body. Here we are, having just celebrated London 2012, and we still face this question about where sport fits in and how important it is (HoC Vol II, 2013b, Ev 17).

In contrast to the stakeholders who engaged from a national organisation or school setting and focused on sport and competition, Edwards connects the principle of Olympism to the IOC (not explicitly including the IPC). He speaks to the purpose and value of a ‘healthy mind in a healthy body’ rather than winning or losing, or specific sporting endeavours.

The dialogue from LOCOG, Department for Education, Sport England, school based and ex-Olympian stakeholders demonstrate tension around the agenda of London 2012 education programmes and the inspire a generation legacy aim more broadly. It aligns with the points raised by Lindsey (2010) and Leopkey and Parent (2015) where an organizing committee and, in this case, the educational programme have too many constituent stakeholders to manage in a short space of programme implementation, leading to accountability fragmentation. This is particularly evident in the tension

**This is the accepted – pre-proof version. The paper appears here in lieu of the publisher’s version of record.**

between the Olympic and Paralympic discourse of values based education with the domestic stakeholders’ dominant discourse of competitive school sport education. Get Set and LOCOG could have facilitated a higher level of understanding around who was accountable for the content of the Get Set in the context of domestic school structures and long term legacy outcomes beyond London 2012. In reality, however, this case study supports Agha et al.’s (2011) observation that the local organizing committee is void of long term accountability as it does not engage in stakeholder discussion beyond hosting an event.

### **Missed Opportunity**

In connection to tensions around purpose, another discourse manifested around London 2012 being a missed opportunity and implying from a variety of stakeholders that legacy outcomes within school sport were not immediately successful. This discourse was largely centered around the dialogue about domestic policy changes, especially, funding and power structures. For example, Andy Reed, then Chairman of the Sport and Recreation Alliance, commented that:

Part of the problem is that there has not been a definition of strategically who is leading all these things, and of course when there are new moneys around, there is a tendency to try to find out which part in which slice of the cake is relevant to each (HoC Vol II, 2013b, Ev 2).

As discussed by Mackintosh (2014) the decision by the Coalition government to bring a direct investment tool to ‘primary school sport premium’ in 2010 was a focus of debate. The prevalence of this discourse reduced the amount of dialogue around the significant investment made through London 2012 and Get Set programme by various stakeholders. Instead the focus was more on the domestic policy and political changes. For example, Dame Tessa Jowell, former Olympic Minister in the Labour Government stated:

policy has suffered to some degree through fragmentation across Government. That was a struggle that we had when we were in government—to achieve proper lockstep between DCMS [Department for Culture, Media and Sport] and DFE [Department of Education]. Also... there is an important role for the Department of Health (HoC Vol II, 2013b, Ev 35).

The comment here illustrates the tension within central government regarding who is the dominant governmental stakeholder in school sport and what that means for relations around London 2012 legacy and school sport. This supports wider scholarly discussion, in particular, from Houlihan and Green (2006), Lindsey (2010; 2018) and Phillpots (2013) that fragmentation within government hinders other stakeholder relations around broader sport policy and into the education and school sport landscape.

**This is the accepted – pre-proof version. The paper appears here in lieu of the publisher’s version of record.**

The evidence of continued fragmented governmental approaches during the preparation and hosting of London 2012 contributes to understanding that stakeholders utilizing the inspire a generation legacy aim and/or Get Set educational programmes independently interpreted the use and role in their own context. For example, Derek Peale, Head teacher Park House School, explicitly aligned the need for bottom up and local stakeholders understandings of the “wider impact on school improvement, including positive outcomes in relation to Social, Moral, Spiritual and Cultural Development... reflect creative approaches to the integration of sports-themed programmes such as Get Set.” (HoC Vol II 2013b, Ev 62). The understanding from a Head Teacher and school perspective here goes some way to being an opportunity discussed by Binder (2012) that the IOC and IPC brand can galvanize a stakeholder to create educational outcomes in their own setting. Such evidence supports Jensen (2010) suggestion that values based framework can be a useful way to enact a vision amongst stakeholders. However, Peale and Park House School appear to be the exception not the norm as the majority of school based evidence reported passive engagement rather than opportunity to translate it into the local context (HoC Vol I, 2013a).

In a non-school perspective, the Wellcome Trust contributed evidence from their ‘In the Zone’ initiative that used sport and physiology content in a touring exhibition and experiment kits for school. In terms of London 2012 the Trust summarised their contribution as:

Part of the practical learning strand of Get Set—the official London 2012 reward and recognition scheme for schools and colleges demonstrating a commitment to living the Olympic and Paralympic values—and was awarded the Inspire Mark by the London Organizing committee of the Olympic Games (HoC Vol III, 2013c, Ev w34).

The dialogue from the Wellcome Trust, similarly to the Head Teacher perspective above, demonstrates a more independent interpretation of the London 2012 educational agenda. Moreover, the ability to gain reward and recognition as an outcome for their own ends. The Inspire Mark referenced in the quote from the Wellcome Trust is a separate scheme to the Get Set programme. To date there has not been a significant amount of scholarship to how LOCOG brokered a deal with the IOC and IPC to use the London 2012 brand beyond hosting the Games’ as an incentive to “attract private sector finance... and reward other organisations” (DCMS 2008, p.15). The aim of Inspire Mark scheme and the interpretation of the Get Set programme links to the critique by Lenskyj (2012) and Coburn and McCafferty (2016) where further critical interrogation of the commercialised element of the Olympic and Paralympic Games approach to education and targeting young people is needed.

Finally, the independent interpretations of the Get Set programme and evidence of Governmental fragmentation raises the question about the role of LOCOG and an organizing committee beyond a



**This is the accepted – pre-proof version. The paper appears here in lieu of the publisher’s version of record.**

Games to facilitate long term legacy. As noted, current sport mega event literature views an organizing committee (Agha et al. 2011) and legacy outcomes (Leopkey and Parent, 2015; Tomlinson, 2014) to be time limited to hosting and the disbanding of the organizing committee. In this Inquiry dialogue, the use and effectiveness of a programme to contribute to long term outcomes is facilitated by individual stakeholder interpretation and their ability to translate it into their own circumstances. The discourse of missed opportunity, therefore, can be isolated to those stakeholders that based their relations on the fragmented governmental approach to London 2012 educational programmes, rather than a more nuanced reimagining of the programmes from a more bottom up approach.

The ability of LOCOG to recognize or articulate the nuances of political changes and varying stakeholder interpretations of legacy or educational programmes was not evident in the Inquiry. In contrast, Jackie Brock Doyle, Director of Communications and Public Affairs at the LOCOG commented about London 2012 educational programmes and political changes:

Thanks to the structure put in place and for the strong support of both the previous Labour Government and the incoming Coalition Government, our work was not hindered by the change in administration in 2010, and in a way that will continue to inspire change and enhance lives for years to come” (HoC Vol III, 2013c, Ev w11).

Yet, as noted, LOCOG and the IOC based a significant amount of their evaluation on numerical data and statistics that culminated in 2013 and did not measure beyond. Consequently, although LOCOG delivered a programme and could report on what success was, this could not be extended to long term outcomes without a more nuanced understanding of what other stakeholders deemed successful. An example of this comes from the written evidence submitted by the Association for School and College Leaders:

For many schools the notion of a London 2012 legacy has been an aspirational one rather than seeing evidence of a strategic plan for take-up of competitive sports in schools or developing links with local sports clubs and national governing bodies. It appears to depend on the enthusiasm and commitment of local teachers and coaches, rather than on a legacy strategy from government (HoC Vol III, 2013c, Ev w46).

Notably in this quote is the erasure of the role of stakeholders connected to the Olympic or Paralympic movement around London 2012. The ongoing national stakeholders of the British Olympic Association and the British Paralympic Association (although maintaining the Get Set website beyond London 2012) did not participate in the Inquiry or submit evidence. The abstention is based on the self-identified role of the organisations as being “independent, privately funded and receives no

**This is the accepted – pre-proof version. The paper appears here in lieu of the publisher’s version of record.**

annual funding from the lottery or government and has no political interests” (BOA, 2018). In terms of stakeholder relations, this poses tensions rather than opportunities to connect with stakeholders in the domestic education sector as the Olympic and Paralympic organisations are functioning in a self-regulating space. The missed opportunity discourse, therefore, is perpetuated by Olympic and Paralympic based stakeholders. Who beyond hosting do not proactively engage with policy in a way that fosters sustained understanding of the role the Get Set programme and inspire a generation legacy aim can play within the existing and evolving domestic policy around sport, youth and education.

### **Conclusion**

The aim of this article was to use London 2012 and the Get Set as a case study to engage with wider academic debates around stakeholder relations in the context of sport mega events, Olympic and Paralympic education programmes, and ongoing policy based on school sport and physical education. It is noted that as a qualitative case study this paper does not seek to achieve generalizable principles that are representative of other sport mega events or hosts. The conclusion demonstrates implications and lessons for future organizing committee members, policy makers and then academics that engage in legacy, policy or sport educational based debates. The objective of this paper, specifically, was to illuminate how conceiving and enacting educational legacy programmes, such as the Get Set programme, created tensions or opportunities between stakeholders in the Olympic and Paralympic movement, and UK sport and education sectors. To articulate stakeholder tensions and incongruity (Friedman and Miles, 2002; Jensen 2010), the paper’s focus considered both negative and positive elements of the relations between stakeholders. Drawing on the Inquiry data, the paper advances current London 2012 legacy debates by illuminating policy developments and stakeholder relations in the post Games landscape.

From a CDA framework, two main discourses emerged. Firstly, the purpose of the London 2012 educational programmes lacked clarity and clear relations between LOCOG and the UK Government. The implication of such onstakeholders relations was demonstrated by contrasting dialogue in the Inquiry around whether the outcomes of school sport and Get Set is based on competitive sport or values. Stakeholders influenced by the international perspective of the IOC and IPC, in contradistinction, focused on the values element of the London 2012 opportunity. The different understanding of the purpose of the London 2012 educational programmes and how they could complement to existing relations in the competitive sport driven domestic space is a source of tension between how the different stakeholders related to each other. This supports broader scholarship

**This is the accepted – pre-proof version. The paper appears here in lieu of the publisher’s version of record.**

around school sport and sport policy in the UK where the sectors demonstrate fragmented and contested spaces (Houlihan and Green, 2006; Lindsey, 2010; 2018; Mackintosh, 2014).

Secondly, the discourse of missed opportunity dominated the Inquiry dialogue around the educational programmes and broader legacy aim to inspire a generation. Tension was evident between stakeholders who included domestic policy and funding changes as part of the landscape of London 2012 legacy and school sport, whereas representatives of LOCOG contributed overtly positive dialogue to government support (largely as a consequence of not being impacted by changes in domestic policy). The British Olympic Association and British Paralympic Association did not contribute evidence to the Inquiry and sustained this viewpoint from LOCOG further as there was no explicit engagement at a policy level with domestic circumstances. The findings here contribute to the wider debate around the Olympic and Paralympic value based education programmes (Binder, 2012; Chatziefstathiou, 2012; Lenskyj, 2012; Coburn & McCafferty, 2016), and support that although the programmes provide opportunities in the domestic setting, for sustainable legacy outcomes these must translated to the messy context of existing school sport policies. Future hosts of the Olympics and Paralympics, plus future UK sport mega event organizing committees, would need to be more effective if the relations with stakeholders were to go beyond accessing the programme and instead resulted in translating the vision and programme into their local context for sustainable long term outcomes.

The position of Olympic and Paralympic based stakeholders to not publicly comment on or relate to domestic policy around school sport hindered the relations to stakeholders who actively had to consider the domestic policy landscape (e.g. the Youth Sport Trust). A contrast to this was where stakeholders connected in the delivery of the programmes recognised the value of the Olympic and Paralympic brand/values to their own outcomes (e.g., the Wellcome Trust). In this dialogue, there was recognition of the opportunity London 2012 presented and how in their localised setting the educational programmes could contribute via a bottom up approach. Here the stakeholders did not actively seek relations with the Olympic and Paralympic stakeholders, but utilised the value based outputs from such sources to further their own means and ends, which was not necessarily to inspire a generation. In line with the value creation component of stakeholder relations highlighted by Jensen (2010), the inspire a generation legacy did not unite stakeholders but galvanized opportunities for some who built the values into their existing visions. Moving forward, if an organizing committee aims to impact the values of a host city, in particular, around educational programmes they must consider how they can unite the constituent stakeholders and not generate fragmented accountability. Academically, more needs to be done to bridge sport mega event literature and literature around domestic policy and youth sport to further examine and critically reflect on the role of educational

**This is the accepted – pre-proof version. The paper appears here in lieu of the publisher’s version of record.**

legacy programmes and impacts of Games on young people, such as, the London 2012 aim to inspire a generation.

## **References**

Agha, N., Fairley, S., and Gibson, H. 2011. Considering legacy as a multi-dimensional construct: the legacy of the Olympic games. *Sport management review*, 15(1), 125–139.

Binder, D. (2012). Olympic values education: evolution of a pedagogy. *Educational Review*, 64(3), 275-302.

British Olympic Association. (2018). ‘About Us.’ Retrieved from <https://www.teamgb.com/about-boa>

Brittain, Ian, and Aaron Beacom. (2016). Leveraging the London 2012 Paralympic Games: what legacy for disabled people?. *Journal of sport and social issues* 40(6), 499-521.

Bryman, A. (2016). *Social research methods*. Oxford: Oxford university press.

Chatziefstathiou, D. (2012). Olympic education and beyond: Olympism and value legacies from the Olympic and Paralympic Games. *Educational Review*, 64(3), 385-400.

Chen, S., & Henry, I. (2017). Schools’ engagement with the Get Set London 2012 Olympic education programme: Empirical insights from schools in a non-hosting region. *European Physical Education Review*, Online First, 1356336 × 17721437.

Coalter, F. (2010) The politics of sport-for-development: Limited focus programmes and broad gauge problems?. *International review for the sociology of sport*, 45 (3) 295-314.

Coburn, A. & McCafferty, P. (2016). The real Olympic Games: Sponsorship, schools and the Olympics – the case of Coca-Cola. *Taboo: The Journal of Culture and Education*, 15 (1), 23- 40.

Department for Culture, Media and Sport (2008) *Before, During and After the Games: Legacy Action Plan*. London: The Stationary Office Limited.

Department of Culture, Media and Sport. (2010) *London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games Annual Report*. London: The Stationary Office Limited.

Friedman, A. L., & Miles, S. (2002) Developing stakeholder theory. *Journal of management studies*, 39 (1) 1-21.

**This is the accepted – pre-proof version. The paper appears here in lieu of the publisher’s version of record.**

Get Set. (2018). ‘Home Page.’ Retrieved from <https://www.getset.co.uk/> Girginov, V. (2013). Handbook of the London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games. Volume One: Making the Games. London: Routledge.

Girginov, V. 2016. Has the London 2012 Olympic Inspire programme inspired a generation? A realist view. *European Physical Education Review* 22(4), 490-505.

Griggs, G., & Ward, G. (2013). The London 2012 Legacy for Primary Physical Education: Policy by the Way?. *Sociological research online*, 18(3), 1-7.

Houlihan, B. (2016) Sport Policy Making. In A. Bairner, J. Kelly and J.W. Lee (Eds.), *Routledge Handbook of Sport and Politics*. (pp. 16-27). London: Routledge

Houlihan, B., & Green, M. (2006). The changing status of school sport and physical education: explaining policy change. *Sport, education and society*, 11(1), 73-92.

House of Commons Education Committee. (2013a). Volume 1: School sport following London 2012: No more political football. London: The Stationary Office Limited.

House of Commons Education Committee. (2013b). Volume II: School sport following London 2012: No more political football. London: The Stationary Office Limited.

House of Commons Education Committee. (2013c). Volume III: School sport following London 2012: No more political football. London: The Stationary Office Limited.

House of Commons Education Committee. (2013d). Appendix: School sport following London 2012: No more political football: Government Response to the Committee’s Third Report of Session 2013-14. London: The Stationary Office Limited.

IOC. (2013a). Olympic Charter. Retrieved from [https://stillmed.olympic.org/Documents/olympic\\_charter\\_en.pdf](https://stillmed.olympic.org/Documents/olympic_charter_en.pdf) IOC. (2013b).

Factsheet London 2012 Facts and Figures. Retrieved from [https://stillmed.olympic.org/media/Document%20Library/OlympicOrg/IOC/Olympic\\_Games/Olympic\\_Legacy/London\\_2012/Legacy/EN\\_London\\_2012\\_Facts\\_and\\_Figures.pdf](https://stillmed.olympic.org/media/Document%20Library/OlympicOrg/IOC/Olympic_Games/Olympic_Legacy/London_2012/Legacy/EN_London_2012_Facts_and_Figures.pdf)

Jensen, M. C. (2010). Value maximization, stakeholder theory, and the corporate objective function. *Journal of applied corporate finance*, 22 (1) 32-42.

Jung, H., Pope, S., & Kirk, D. (2016). Policy for physical education and school sport in England, 2003–2010: vested interests and dominant discourses. *Physical education and sport pedagogy*, 21(5), 501-516.

**This is the accepted – pre-proof version. The paper appears here in lieu of the publisher’s version of record.**

Kerr, S. (2018). The London 2012 Paralympic Games. In Brittain, I., & Beacom, A (Eds.) *The Palgrave Handbook of Paralympic Studies*. (pp. 481-505). Palgrave Macmillan, London.

Kohe, G. Z. & Collison, H. (2019). *Sport, Education, Corporatisation: Spaces of connection, contestation and creativity*. Oxon: Routledge.

Kohe, G. Z. 2017. London 2012 (Re) calling: Youth memories and Olympic ‘legacy’ in the hinterland. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*. 52(1), 24-44.

Kohe, G. Z., and W. Bowen-Jones. 2016. Rhetoric and realities of London 2012 Olympic education and participation ‘legacies’: Voices from the core and periphery. *Sport, Education and Society*, 21(8), 1213-1229.

Lee, M. (2006). *The race for the 2012 Olympics: The inside story of how London won the bid*. Random House.

Lenskyj, H. J. (2012). Olympic education and Olympism: still colonizing children’s minds. *Educational Review*, 64(3), 265-274.

Leopkey, B., & Parent, M. M. (2015). Stakeholder perspectives regarding the governance of legacy at the Olympic Games. *Annals of Leisure Research*, 18(4), 528-548.

Lindsey, I. (2010). Governance of lottery sport programmes: national direction of local partnerships in the New Opportunities for PE and Sport programme. *Managing leisure*, 15(3), 198-213.

Lindsey, I. (2018). Analysing policy change and continuity: physical education and school sport policy in England since 2010. *Sport, Education and Society*

LOCOG. (2012). *Learning Legacy: Lessons learned from planning and staging the London 2012 Games*. London: Author.

Mackintosh, C. (2014). Dismantling the school sport partnership infrastructure: findings from a survey of physical education and school sport practitioners. *Education 3-13*, 42(4), 432-449.

Parent, M. M. (2008). Evolution and issue patterns for major-sport-event organizing committees and their stakeholders. *Journal of Sport Management*, 22(2), 135-164.

Phillpots, L. (2013). An Analysis of the Policy Process for Physical Education and School Sport: The Rise and Demise of School Sport Partnerships. *International Journal of Sport Policy and Politics*, 5(2), 193–211.

Rhodes, R. A. W. 2000. *Debating Governance*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

**This is the accepted – pre-proof version. The paper appears here in lieu of the publisher’s version of record.**

The Guardian. (2010). ‘Teachers stunned after Michael Gove scraps ‘sport for all’ funding.’ Retrieved from <https://www.theguardian.com/education/2010/nov/20/schools-sports-fundingcuts-gove>

The Guardian. (2013). ‘Lord Coe: I’m quitting to make sure Olympic legacy is delivered.’ Retrieved from <https://www.theguardian.com/sport/2013/jul/19/lord-coe-quits-ambassadorolympic-legacy>

The Telegraph. (2010). ‘Michael Gove forced into about-turn over scrapping School Sports Partnerships after outrage over cuts’. Retrieved from <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/sport/othersports/schoolsports/8215108/Michael-Gove-forcedinto-about-turn-over-scrapping-School-Sports-Partnerships-after-outrage-over-cuts.html>

Tomlinson, A. (2014). Olympic legacies: Recurrent rhetoric and harsh realities. *Contemporary Social Science*, 9(2), 137-158.

UK Government. (2010). Letter to the Youth Sport Trust. Retrieved from <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/refocusing-sport-in-schools-to-build-a-lastinglegacy-of-the-2012-games>

Van Dijk, T. A. (1996). *Discourse, racism and ideology*. La Laguna.

Viollet, B., B. Minikin, N. Scelles, and A. Ferrand. 2016. Perceptions of key stakeholders regarding national federation sport policy: The case of the French rugby union. *Managing Sport and Leisure* 21(5), 319-337.

Whigham, S., and Bairner, A. (2018). Analysing sport policy and politics: the promises and challenges of synthesising methodological approaches. *International Journal of Sport Policy and Politics*, 10(4), 721-740.

Yin, R. K. (2003). *Case study research: Design and methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

**Table 1. Description of Data**

Title of Document	Description of Data	Contributing Stakeholders
Volume I (HoC Vol I, 2013a)	Report, together with formal minutes	House of Commons, the Education Committee (membership includes Conservative, Labour and Liberal Democrat Members of Parliament).
Volume II (HoC Vol II, 2013b)	Oral and written evidence	Representatives from national sporting bodies, representatives of regional sporting bodies, former Olympic competitors, representatives of a range of schools, Olympic and Paralympic legacy “visionaries” and, the responsible Minister (Edward Timpson MP, Parliamentary Under Secretary of State for Children and Families).
Volume III (HoC Vol III, 2013c)	Additional written evidence	Schools, school sport co-ordinators, National Governing Bodies of various sports, national sport delivery bodies,



**This is the accepted – pre-proof version. The paper appears here in lieu of the publisher’s version of record.**

		local government, academics in the field, and the Departments of Health and for Education.
Appendix (HoC Appendix, 2013d)	Government Response	Central government representatives.