NORWEGIAN SCHOOL OF SPORT SCIENCES

Ingrid Eikestøl Lægreid

Legacy management of “a new generation of leaders” – post-games

The case of the 2016 Lillehammer Winter Youth Olympic games

Master thesis in Sport Sciences
Department of Cultural and Social Studies
Norwegian School of Sport Sciences, 2017

Abstract

Research question: While sport politicians form ambitious legacies to justify the hosting of a large a sporting event, the legacy implementers often experience difficulty achieving this stated legacy due to the institutionalisation of the concept and the processes behind it. This study will examine the post-event phase of the 2016 Lillehammer Winter Youth Olympic Games (YOG2016), and discover what hinders the stated legacy "new generation of leaders" to be achieved through the conduction of interviews with legacy implementers. The research question is; What institutional processes may hinder the achievement of the formulated legacy "new generation of leaders" examining YOG2016 post-games?

Research methods: Qualitative data were generated from semi-structured interviews with employees from the administration of seven different regional confederations under the the Norwegian Olympic and Paralympic Committee and Confederation of Sports (NIF). The participants included in this study had responsibilities within the arena of youth sports.

Results and findings: By capturing the participants' interpretation of the legacy management post-event, and their actions aiming towards a legacy achievement, this study found great implications for a legacy achievement through the use of a neo-institutional framework. The legacy management was greatly impacted of institutional processes. Even though there was no great coercive pressure on the regional confederations to implement the young leader legacy, they experienced high degree of pressure to adopt similar courses of action due to uncertainty on how to get more young people into organized sports, which lead to inefficient legacy implementation. This study provides a greater insight into implications for the legacy implementers, and confirms previous research concerning strategic planning and managing of sport event legacies.

KEY WORDS: *Sport event legacies, legacy management, strategic planning, Youth Olympic Games, post-event phase, volunteerism.*

Table of contents

Acknowledgements

I am proud to finally hand in my master´s thesis! I have to thank my supervisor, Anna-Maria Strittmatter, for always being encouraging, enthusiastic and motivating, and available to share of her knowledge whenever I was in need. I am also very grateful to have had Dag Vidar Hanstad on my team who provided me with practical advice, observations, set me up with participants, and went through my final draft. The quality of my thesis strongly depended on their help and great knowledge of the topic.

NSSS and the Department for Culture and Social Studies have provided me with great opportunities to higher the quality of my thesis. I have been able to go on exchange, and I have also been lucky to attend a sport management workshop that gave me "special treatment" with top quality feedback on my thesis from knowledgeable researchers within the field of sport management.

My thesis also depended on my family for welcoming me home and feeding me whenever I needed "major focus time", especially after my ankle surgery. Thank you for always cheering for me and providing me with positive thoughts.

Thanks to classmates and office buddies for fun and motivation during this process. Some office days have been rough, but it has also been a blast surrounded by these people.

Lastly, this study would not have been possible to do without the help from my participants. Thank you for openly sharing your views and experiences, and for saying eagerly yes to participate in my study.

I am so very grateful for all the years as a student at this institution, who provided me with knowledge, exchanges, valuable experiences, #superawesomefuntime, and strong friendships. I am now ready to take on new challenges.

Ingrid Lægreid, May 2017

1. Introduction

One of the main interests of the International Olympic Committee (IOC) is a positive legacy that will remain after the Olympic event (Gratton & Preuss, 2008). Preuss (2007) defines *legacy* as "all planned and unplanned, positive and negative, intangible and tangible structures created by and for a sport event that remains for a longer time than the event itself" (p. 87). Intangible legacies can include national pride, whereas tangible legacies can include infrastructure or venues. A positive legacy is considered as a significant motivator for cities and nations that want to make a bid for the games (Veal, Toohey & Frawley, 2012) and it is seen as an attempt to win the rights to host the event. The concept has been developed as a key argument in the bidding process for bidding cities that want to be the host of larger sporting events (Getz, 2002).

The Lillehammer Winter Youth Olympic Games 2016 (YOG2016) was described as a big success. The event received great praise for the way it was hosted, and for the significant number of young people who were included as volunteers during the event (Strittmatter, 2016). However, one of the stated legacies for the Lillehammer 2016 Youth Olympic Games (YOG2016) was that the event would be used as a platform to obtain "a new generation of leaders" (NIF, 2011). These volunteer leaders will in the future years contribute with their workforce within the Norwegian sport system (NIF, 2011). The bidding committee of YOG2016 together with the Norwegian Olympic and Paralympic Committee and Confederation of Sports (NIF) promised to make the legacy come true in their application received by the IOC (NIF, 2011). However, as previous research to a great extent indicates, a stated legacy in relation to an Olympic event is difficult to achieve (Cashman, 2005; Preuss, 2007).

Literature on event legacy indicates that it is often unrealistic to create huge sport events and at the same time as creating big significant positive social outcomes (Strittmatter, 2017). The literature describes sport event legacy as a highly institutionalized concept (Leopkey & Parent, 2012), and it has been argued that implementing legacy goals is influenced by institutional processes, structures, and practices (Strittmatter, 2017). Literature on legacy implementation specifically indicates that challenges in creating a sustainable sport event outcome in the shape of a legacy are strongly influenced by institutional processes. These processes include pressure from authorities, purpose

actions, and rules and regulations in a working process within an organization (Leopkey & Parent, 2012; Strittmatter & Skille 2017; Strittmatter, 2017).

In this study a closer look will be directed towards these institutional processes in relation to the management of the YOG2016 legacy post-event.

1.1 Research question

The focus on the present research was on the stated legacy of young, volunteer leaders in relation to the YOG2016. The research question is: What institutional processes may hinder the achievement of the formulated legacy "new generation of leaders" examining YOG2016 post-games?

This issue was examined by conducting interviews with representatives from the regional sport confederations, which are organizational units under the NIF administration. This study demonstrates that legacy management post-games is influenced by institutional processes, which have proven organizations to value legitimacy over efficiency. When looking at legacy management in this given context, the post-event phase of the YOG2016 cannot be separated from the institutional processes that happened pre-event. The legacy management process as a whole has to be taken into consideration as it greatly impacts the post-event phase (Leopkey & Parent, 2012); thus, several studies conducted prior to the YOG2016 will also be referred to.

The top management of NIF as sport politicians and legacy owners, cannot accomplish the stated legacy on their own; they have to involve their organizational units, which include the national sport federations, regional confederations, and clubs. However, the main focus of the present research was to get the perspective of the regional confederations. As such, data was collected from the organizational units in Oppland, Hedmark, Oslo, Buskerud, Akershus, Sør-Trøndelag, and Vest-Agder.

Norwegian organized sport is organised as separate and politically independent organisation, and it is the biggest voluntary organization in Norway. The Norwegian sport system is based upon volunteerism. In this present thesis, the young leaders will be referred to as volunteers, as most of them are only leaders on a volunteer basis. Thus,

the findings of the present study also connect to literature on volunteerism. From this point forward, all references to NIF are in regards to the NIF administration, not the organization as a whole.

In the first chapter of this master´s thesis, the context regarding the case of the YOG2016 will be explained. This will be followed by the literature review, then, an explanation of the theoretical framework. Next, the research approach will be explained, along with a justification for the use of qualitative methods, followed by the main chapter of this thesis, which consists of the results and discussion. Finally, the conclusion will be presented, where the research question is answered, along with suggestions for future research.

2. Context

This chapter will briefly explain some background knowledge related to this particular case of the YOG2016 post games and the managing of the desired legacy in order to create a better understanding of the phenomena. First, the Youth Olympic Games (YOG) as a concept will be further clarified, followed by an explanation of why there is such an emphasized focus on young leaders. Lastly, the role of the regional confederations when speaking of legacy management in the context of the YOG2016 post-games will be explained.

2.1 The Youth Olympic Games

The YOG came to light in 2007 under the initiative of the former IOC president, Jacques Rogge. The event has now been hosted four times. It started out with the summer games in Singapore in 2010, followed by the winter games in Innsbruck 2012 (IOC, 2014). The last event prior to Lillehammer was held in Nanjing in 2014 with summer games (IOC, 2014). The YOG´s vision is to motivate young people all around the world to participate in sports, and pay attention to and encourage them to adopt the Olympic values. In this way the message of the Olympic movement is supposed to be passed on (IOC, 2014). This vision also applies to the many volunteers who are contributing to the implementation of the games (Hanstad, 2014). The goal is that the YOG shall shape and affect the athletes and other young participants to become ambassadors for the Olympism, sports and a healthy lifestyle. In this way they have the ability to contribute by taking part in their local community and strengthening these values (IOC, 2014). The intention is that the event should be "good for youth". Scholars also claim that the YOG is closer to the Olympic values than the original games (Hanstad & Parent, 2013).

In the recent years there have been rising voices of criticism about the increasing costs of hosting an Olympic event. The YOG proves that an Olympic event can be hosted at a rather "low cost". The size of the YOG events are considerable smaller than the original Olympic Games. The IOC has made it clear that the focus is drawn away from "expensive", tangible legacies to reduce the chances of constructing the so-called "white elephants". This leads to less costs for hosting this event, rather than focusing the attention on providing additional venues and infrastructure. Considering the YOG2016,

there was only a strengthening of existing venues from the Lillehammer games in 1994 (NIF, 2011); thus, it cannot particularly boast of any tangible legacies. Instead, NIF constructed an ambitious legacy regarding young, volunteer leaders.

2.2 The value of increased number of young, volunteer leaders

NIF has stated that the youth is the most important target group within organized sports in Norway. Still, it is one of the organization´s biggest challenges, as youths tend to leave organized sports (NIF, 2011). "A new generation of young leaders" is also a part of NIF´s 10 year plan in the development of Norwegian sports, and this is called the "Youth lift". An increase in volunteering is also highly underlined in the application for the state guarantee (NIF, 2010). The organization claims that a new generation of volunteers is important for Norwegian sports as the the biggest amount of volunteers consist of middle-aged men with membership in sport clubs and previous experiences with sport events. Thus, NIF has stated that there is a need to increase and rejuvenate the volunteers within Norwegian sports (NIF, 2011).

At the same time, younger volunteers have other objectives to do volunteer work. Volunteerism has to a large extent become an arena for personal growth and development, and also an arena for gaining human and social capital. It is decreasingly an arena for the expression of collective identity and belonging (Hustinx and Lammertyn, 2003). In modern society, young people generally prefer gaining something in return for the work they put down into the activity. These gains are described as material things, education, networking, or gaining new skills and work experience (Hanstad, 2014). As such, young people will not stay volunteers on a long term basis; rather they will leave their position as volunteers as soon as they have achieved their objectives from the activity (Hustinx and Lammertyn, 2003). Looking at this perspective, we cannot take for granted that NIF will achieve a new generation of volunteer leaders from YOG2016.

2.3 The regional sport confederations as implementers of the stated legacy

There are 19 regional confederations split up on all the counties in the country. A regional confederation act as the administration for all sports in its´ county. They are in

contact with the sport clubs, sport councils, and regional federations within their region and try to strengthen the cooperation between them, in addition to county municipalities and actors. In addition, the regional confederations guide the sports clubs regarding economical, administrative and organizational matters. Every confederation serves as a geographical representation of NIF, working to strengthen the conditions for sports in its´ area. It could be said that a regional confederation works as NIF in its´ respective county. They have to follow NIFs laws and decisions made, and as an organizational unit below NIF, they are expected to follow the overall organizational strategies (NIF, n.d).

The desired legacy is stated as a promise in the bid application. As an organizational goal, it means that the regional confederations are implementers of the desired legacy in their area. The stated legacy was said to be advantageous for sports in the whole country (NIF, 2011), rather than just for the region that hosted the games. The regional confederations at Hedmark and Oppland were closely involved with the main event at Lillehammer. If NIF wants their promised legacy to come true, they have to involve their respective organizational units to implement strategies within their regions.

The following section compromises the literature review. The knowledge and ideas that have previously been published will be conveyed. This will help in understanding the planning and managing of sport event legacies, in addition to the strengths and weaknesses of the existing literature.

3. Literature review

"Sport event legacy" has been a concept of growing interest since the 1980s, and has resulted in an increased understanding of the potential positive and negative outcomes of large scale- and mega sporting events (Thomson et al, 2013). Since 2000 the notion of planning for reaching the desired outcomes has come through the legacy definitions (Thomson et al, 2013). From a management perspective, the topic of strategic planning and management is increasingly important as the issues of return of investment (ROI) from hosting a sporting event and the ability to gain sustainable benefits play a major role in a city´s decision to host (Chappelet, 2012). However, sport event legacies are often viewed in a manner that assumes that positive aspects will occur automatically from the event (Smith, 2009), but maximising the desired legacy will only be achieved if an efficient planning to leverage these ideas happens (Parent & Leopkey, 2012).

Despite of the growing interest in sport event legacies, the concept is controversial (Girginoc & Hills, 2009; Preuss, 2007). While the term legacy is often used, and a number of studies on the topic have been produced, a clear definition is still missing. Many authors have tried to define legacy, and they have all made different definitions that contain a variety of different elements. There is a lack of agreement on what the term actually means. This is further complicated by he fact that legacy has different meanings in other languages. Leopkey and Parent (2012) point out the confusion with the related term *heritage*, which has another meaning in English, but is missing another translation for legacy in the French language. The concept has also been confused with "leveraging", "impact" and "sustainability" (Leopkey & Parent, 2012). There was even held a conference arranged by the IOC with the attempt to locate a shared understanding of legacy. Despite of the effort, the gathering resulted in an increased notion that the term is hard to simply put into *one* definition, as there were too many perceptions and different meanings that the participants related to legacy (Gratton & Preuss, 2008). In addition, the term legacy in itself is problematic; it presents a one-sided view of positive effects, without adequate consideration of the potential downsides or risks in bidding (Stewert & Rayner, 2016). Chappelet (2012) believes that rather than a certainty to be obtained, legacy is fundamentally a dream.

This provides an understanding of the difficulties with legacies, and why there exists such a vast amount of different types. Cashman (2005) mentions economic, physical infrastructure, education, public life, politics, culture, sport, symbols, memory and history. Modern trends now also include new legacy themes such as environmental, informational and educational (Leopkey & Parent, 2012), and after the London Games, social legacies have become particularly strong (Chappelet, 2012). However, Chappelet (2012) says that we can almost add infinity to the legacy categorisations, which makes the topic extremely broad. The legacy that will be explored in the present thesis is NIFs stated and desired legacy; "a new generation of young leaders". For the purpose of this thesis, it will then be natural to turn to previous research of *human resources*, including similar types of legacies.

There are now a many studies focusing on volunteer motivations at sporting events from a management perspective (Maclean & Hamm, 2010; Twynam, Farrell & Johnston, 2010; Allen & Bartle, 2013). However, few are related to their motivations for volunteering in organizational work following the event, but rather focusing on future event volunteering. A previous study was done on the legacy of increased volunteering after the "Commonwealth Games" in Manchester in 2002 (Nichols & Ralston, 2010). The study revealed that the local environment played a significant role in achieving an increased number of volunteers that would also contribute as valuable resources in the community in the years to follow. However, the planning of the legacy was limited by the hosting of the event, but the organizing committee responded to the local needs and involved stakeholders in the planning of the legacy. A new committee in charge of obtaining the legacy was founded. In this way, the main responsibility of the legacy was passed on. It was the local authority who made sure that a volunteering legacy was achieved, as the implementers of the sport event had their hands full with hosting of the event (Nichols & Ralston, 2010). When looking at the case of YOG2016, there was no such committee or organization claiming responsibility for reaching the planned legacy of young leaders, which means that a legacy achievement could be problematic in this case.

High hopes can also be seen when examining the 2012 London Games. Despite the controversial concept of the nature of legacy, there was significant investment put into the planning of the legacy. The event is claimed to be the most ambitious project in the

history of the Olympic Games, as it sets out to target the whole population in terms of promoting sports participation. However, a study done by Girginov and Hills (2008) highlights that Olympic legacies are constructed, and not given. Despite of this, the 2012 London Games is regarded as the Olympic event with the most intensive legacy planning in the history. Leopkey and Parent (2012) claim this to be a shift of thinking and planning of legacies. They refer to it as one of the most "significant evolutional adaptions in the governance of legacy within the modern Olympic Games" (p. 937). There was a strategic plan all the way from the bid phase to the post-event. Leopkey and Parent (2012) suggest that development of a legacy plan should begin as early as the initial bid, rather than focusing only on the post-Games. As mentioned earlier in this chapter, the promised legacy for the YOG2016 lacked a plan when the legacy was constructed. With this in mind, it is not unreseanable to think that the "young leader legacy" may be degraded to just a nicely put statement on a piece of paper received by the IOC. If there is still a lack of a plan post-event, the literature indicates that a legacy achievement is unlikely. As such, it is not suprising that a young leader legacy is problematic in the case of the YOG2016.

YOG2016 aimed to have positive impacts outside the host region; however, there are few studies that focus on how to reach desired legacies outside the host city. A study done in connection with the London 2012 games examined the efficiency of legacy leveraging in selected sub-regions, concerning the legacy of increased sport participation (Bell & Gallimore, 2015). The study showed that although there was a strategic plan prior to the event, the ones responsible for carrying out these plans experienced difficulty in leveraging the legacy post-games. This demonstrates the importance of communication between the different actors involved in the legacy process in order to accomplish a desired legacy outside the host city (Bell & Gallimore, 2015).

3.1 Legacy research in the context of the Youth Olympic Games

Despite scholars´ increased curiosity and interest in f the YOG as a sporting event, there is still a lack of literature on its relation to legacy. Leng, Kuo, Baysa-Pee, and Tay (2012) conducted a study on the first YOG in Singapore 2010, which investigated if the games led to increased national pride among the population. They found evidence that

this was actually the case. Still, it is too early in the process to be sure of the planned and unplanned legacies that have come out of the event, as it can take up to 15 to 30 years before the outcomes of an event can be spotted (Parent & Smith-Swan, 2013). The first YOG also represented a growing interest in the value of volunteers among the population (Wong, 2012 in Hanstad, 2014). Despite this, volunteerism was not even mentioned as a possible legacy in the bidding process for the 2012 games in Innsbruck (Hanstad, 2014). This stands in stark contrast to the bidding process for YOG2016, where young people were seen as a long-term investment for the future of Norwegian Sports (NIF 2011).

Hanstad (2014) has performed a wide range of studies on sport events, including several studies related to the YOG, which praise the way the organizing committee of the 2012 Innsbruck games included young volunteers in the planning stage of the event (p. 103). The Youth Olympic Games in Innsbruck 2012 used as many as 1,357 volunteers, and over half of them were students. The young volunteers were described as a homogeneous group with little or no prior experience with volunteering (IYOGOC, 2012). Even though the volunteers were not mentioned as a possible legacy for the games in Innsbruck, the organizing committee managed to inspire young volunteers and use their skills. The committee tested a long term volunteer project that was described as a success. They involved young volunteers one year prior to the games (Hanstad, 2014). The volunteers were integrated and educated to take care of their own projects; thus, they possessed a key role in the planning- and implementing stage of the games. By being involved on a long term basis, the volunteers expressed that they also received a great deal of return for the work they gave. Patterns that are a common motivator for being a volunteer include gaining new skills, experience and networking for future work. These have become incentives for young volunteers (Hanstad, 2014). Hanstad (2014) notes how this can apply to the legacy of YOG2016, yet the study does not say anything about the chances of young volunteers' contribution to organizational work following the event.

In the context of sport management, the uptake for strategic planning in regards to legacy of sporting events has recently gained increased attention (Thomson, Schlenker & Schulenkorf, 2013); however, several Norwegian scholars have taken a critical eye on the YOG2016 in regards to the desired legacy of youth sport development. Strittmatter

and Skille (2016) state that there is a reason to doubt the achievement of the planned legacy of YOG2016 in the area of youth sports development. Their recent study reveals that there was non-existent involvement of sport federations and clubs prior to the event, including the complexity of administration layers. This caused a lack of efficient implementation.

Strittmatter (2016) also found that NIF used the argument of youth sports development to gain acceptance to bid for the event in order to secure legitimacy in the eyes of IOC and the Norwegian government - the two most important stakeholders. This study argues that rather than solving the problem of the development of Norwegian youth sports, it was simply used to increase the probability of being awarded the right to host the event. There was no plan implemented for how the legacy was to be accomplished once the desired legacy was formulated.

Both studies on the YOG2016 were conducted prior to the event. They reveal that there was no strategic plan to secure the stated legacy. A report on the YOG2016 was recently published, and also questions the achievement of a volunteer leader legacy. It reveals that the organizing committee successfully managed to engage many young volunteers during the event, as many as 51,4 % were under the age of 29. Furthermore, one out of four reported that they did not have any previous experiences as volunteers (Hanstad, Kristiansen, Sand, Skirstad & Strittmatter, 2016). Still, the authors question whether it is possible to talk about a legacy for the whole country, as promised in the bidding application, when less then 8 % of the volunteers reported that they came from other parts of the country, with most of the volunteers living inside the host region (Hanstad, et al, 2016). Despite the high rates of positive experiences working as a volunteer during the event, the work of Wollebæk and Sivesind (2010) gives us a reason to question if the youth volunteering during the games are willing to commit to organizational work following the YOG2016. Despite Norway´s high rate internationally in terms of volunteerism, young people are nowadays loosely connected to organizations, and are more willing to volunteer at events. As such, young people can be said to primarily resemble reflexive volunteerism. Building qualifications and work related experience are the greatest motivators for first-time and unaffiliated volunteers, in contrast to the more intrinsically motivated group who are event regulars and affiliated with organized sports (Wollebæk, Skirstad & Hanstad, 2012).

The present study has the ability to contribute to emphasize the important aspects of legacy planning and management related to sporting events. It can help discover factors that are relevant for sport organizations and organizing committees and their environment to pay attention to. This will give researchers a further understanding of the difficulties related to this particular issue and why many planned legacies fail to be achieved. In addition, it will provide useful information on how to better implement strategies for a legacy to occur in the years that follow the event. This information can be used by sport organizations to understand how they can benefit and make the most out of a sporting event.

Sport event legacies are now a well-known concept considering the vast amount of literature concerning this topic. However, limited consideration is given to smaller and medium sized events, such as the YOG, which is considerably smaller than mega events like the FIFA world cup and the original Olympic summer games. Considering event volunteering versus organizational volunteering, studies have been conducted on young volunteers and their motivation to volunteer at future events, yet there is a lack of literature with a focus on making young volunteers commit to organizational work following the event. More importantly, researchers have called out the need for further investigations of the governance of sporting event legacies, especially post-event (Leopkey & Parent, 2012). There is a need to move away from the basic discussion of sport event legacy, and take a dive into the little emphasized topic concerning strategic managing of legacies, and what is happening post-event. The present study on the planning and management of the desired young leader legacy in the case of the YOG2016 has the ability to provide additional knowledge to this field of research.

In the following section the theoretical framework for this research will be presented with a focus on providing an understanding of the theories and concepts of neo-institutional theory that relates to organizational theory. The theory has a strong link to the concept of sport event legacy (Leopkey & Parent, 2012). In recent years, legacy has increased in importance within the Olympic movement; thus, it has become a re-occurring overall mission for the organising committee of the games. The IOC, previous bidders, games candidates, and other stakeholders have all been agents for the institutionalisation of legacy within the modern Olympic movement (Leopkey & Parent, 2012).

4. Theoretical framework

In order to answer the research question of the current study, neo-institutional theory will be employed as a theoretical framework. This perspective is popular among sports scholars who seek to understand issues related to the organization of sports, as all sport organizations are embedded in organizational fields, and are subject to pressure from a number of stakeholders (Washington & Patterson, 2010). Norwegian sports are far from an exception, as their sports policy is traditionally a very institutionalized field (Strittmatter & Skille, 2016). In the present thesis, the theory will draw on the work from Meyer and Rowan (1977), DiMaggio and Powel (1983), and Washington and Patterson (2011).

A previous study showed that the development of the main arguments of the bidding of being the host of the YOG2016, is a cause of institutional processes led by NIF who seeks legitimacy from public authorities and the IOC instead of considering a strategy (Strittmatter, 2016). NIF used its own goal, in relation to the development of youth sports, as a rational solution to bid for hosting the YOG2016. Like this, legitimacy was established in the eyes of both the IOC and the state (Strittmatter, 2016).

Institutional theory explains why organizations act in the way they do. By using this theory as guidance, this thesis seeks to understand what institutional processes may hinder the achievement of the formulated legacy "new generation of leaders" examining YOG2016 post-games. In the following section, a comprehensive understanding of neo-institutional theory will be provided.

4.1 Neo-institutional theory

Neo-institutional theory is dominant within social sciences, including within the scope of sports (Skille & Bodemar, 2014). Early studies on institutional theory focus on why there is such a noticeable similarity among multiple organizations, and how they buffer themselves from the demands of their environment (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983). "Institutionalism is the process by which events and structures become established habits of social behavior within organizations over time" (Berger & Luckmann, 1967, in Leopkey & Parent, 2012, p. 438). This process includes the notion that events, practices, and structures become widely adopted and implemented by organizations within the

field. The organizations then serve to legitimate these practices over time (Berger & Luckemann, 1967; DiMaggio & Powell; Washington & Patterson, 2011).

Neo-institutional theory tries to categorize how and why specific parts of the environment affect anorganization´s actions. It explores how institutions creates strategies and structures (Washinton & Patterson, 2011). The theory takes into consideration why organizations and other actors do things that may not directly lead to maximum profit (Washington & Patterson, 2010). Furthermore, Washington and Patterson (2011) highlight five views of institutional theory: organizations operate within an institutional context, institutional pressure affects organizations with unclear goals, organizations become isomorphic with their environment in order to gain legitimacy, the practices that aim to gain legitimacy are often decoupled from practices that work more efficiently, and a practice that has already become institutionalized is difficult to change.

Neo-institutional theorists state that organizations that operate with undefined goals, will, as a consequence of this, adapt to the environment in order to gain legitimacy (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983). According to classic neo-institutionalism, external pressure will be prioritized at the expense of the organization´s own strategies. The result is that legitimacy within the environment comes before the organization´s efficiency in achieving its goals. Institutionalizing then becomes a process in order to attain legitimacy. "The fact that organizations develop practices and processes for legitimacy reasons is one of the core insights to institutional theory" (Scott, 1995; Tolbert & Zucker, 1983; Washington & Patterson, 2011, p. 5). The pressure that acts upon the organization within the environment makes the organization within the institutional field increasingly similar to each other; thus, the theory seeks to explain homogeneity, not variation. Once a field becomes well established, there is a push towards similarity (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983).

4.2 Institutional myths and ceremony

Institutionalized services, techniques, policies and programs function as powerful myths (Meyer & Rowan, 1977). Organizations are driven to incorporate these practices since they are defined as rationalized concepts. They reflect a widespread understanding of social reality. Hence, many organizations adopt them ceremonially to act in accordance

with these deeply integrated structures of organizational work; however, one cannot take for granted that this formal structure will reach efficiency towards the organization´s goals. Conformity to institutional rules as myths often conflicts sharply with the efficiency criteria, as efficiency is not determined by the true production, but by ceremonial definition. It can be unclear what is actually being produced according to the organizations´ formal goals, yet it creates a ceremonial production which legitimizes the organisation. These can be ceremonial awards, or assigning value to particular organizations on the basis of their contribution. The organization embedded in an institutional field needs to do this to create its own ceremonial production by conforming to these myths (Meyer & Rowan, 1977); however, the organization also needs to show that the myths actually work. Conformity is enforced through inspection, but monitoring is minimized since institutional organizations´ actions rarely goes public when it comes to inefficiency. The inspection and evaluation then get ceremonialized, which is a way of protecting their formal structures and will help them avoid illegitimacy (Meyer & Rowan, 1977).

4.3 Institutional change

A *norm* or a *rule* that has already been *institutionalized* will be taken for granted and accepted. It will be reproduced and exists in everyday life, resulting in organizations within an institutional environment looking at certain practises as the only way to behave as an organization. In order for a practice to become institutionalized, it must also obtain a broad acceptance among the stakeholders that surround the focal organization (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983). With respect to the YOG2016, the costs for the event were split between public authorities, the host city and the IOC (Strittmatter & Skille, 2016). Mangan (2008) claims that a positive legacy is a proof of a successful event and justifies the use of public funds (p. 1869-1870). There lies a promise in achieving the planned legacy, and NIF is responsible to prove that their actions are aiming to make this happen. The event depended on a big number of stakeholders, in addition to public funding.

4.3.1 Entrepreneurship

When it comes to institutional change, *institutional entrepreneurship* is a concept that has received great attention in institutional analysis. It stands in contrast to traditional research on institutions that tends to highlight how organizations are shaped through

institutional forces that reinforce continuity and conformity (Hardy & Maguire, 2008). The concept of entrepreneurship emphasizes how entrepreneurs themselves contribute to change in organizational processes and even institutions. The literature describes institutional entrepreneurs as those who can encourage members within the field towards the same understandings and beneficial institutional arrangements (Washington & Patterson, 2011). Institutional entrepreneurship requires actors to free existing practises and introduce new ones. The new practice has to become widely adopted and taken for granted by other actors in the field (Hardy & Maguire, 2008). This is how institutional entrepreneurs bring about change. The creative institutional entrepreneur starts by offering a competing logic of organization if there is a need for structure within the emerging field. Later, after the field becomes established, they are often actors who either try to preserve or fight the status quo. This group exerts major influence on its peers within the field, with their impact being based on power position, influence, resources, and opportunity. Other actors can greatly benefit from their guidance if they are successful (Washington & Patterson, 2011).

4.3.2 Isomorphism

Isomorphism is the concept that best captures the process of homogenization. It has now become a well-known concept and it explains how institutions pressure organizations in a similar institutional context. Isomorphism is essentially a process where organizations look to their environment for clues to understand appropriate courses of action. The term states that organizations adapt practises and strategies because it helps them in achieving or maintaining legitimacy within the environment or the institutional context. Organizations will become isomorphic with their environment in order to obtain legitimacy. Their chances of survival will then increase (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983). The organization does not necessarily do this because it helps them achieve its own objectives; their main goal is to achieve legitimacy. In such a case, the organization´s efficiency might decrease at the expense of legitimacy (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983). This element within institutional analyzes takes this perception seriously.

According to Hawley (1968), isomorphism is "a constraining process that forces one unit in a population to resemble other units that face the same set of environmental conditions" (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983, p. 149). DiMaggio and Powell (1983) outline three types of pressure explaining similarity among organizations within the same field:

coercive, mimetic, and *normative* pressure. Coercive pressure results from power relations and political structure. It comes from any organization that has the potential to sanction organizations if they do not act according to their expectations or demands. Mimetic pressure says that organizations respond to uncertainties. They will often copy other successful or legitimate organizations within the field in an effort to gain legitimacy. Lastly, normative pressure relates to the impacts of professionalization (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983).

In the current study the theory of neo-institutionalism provides an understanding of how institutional pressure affects the regional confederations within the institutionalized field of Norwegian sports, including how these organizations act post-games to achieve a legacy of a new generations of leaders (Leopkey & Parent, 2012). It allows an investigation of how and why the institutional pressure within the field of Norwegian sports are affecting the regional confederations in their planning and management of the volunteer leader legacy. It also provides with an understanding of why the regional confederations act the way they do post-games. Looking at these aspects from neo-institutional theory when investigating this particular case provides the ability to answer the research question; what institutional processes may hinder the achievement of the formulated legacy "new generation of leaders" examining YOG2016 post-games?

The next part of this thesis will provide a justification for the selected approach to this type of research.

5. Research approach, design, methodology and methods

This chapter will provide an explanation for the choice of using qualitative methods, as well as a description of the methodology and a justification of its selection. It will also explain how the particular methodology and methods allow different questions to be addressed, with the aim of answering the overall research question. To begin, the positioning of the study will be explained.

5.1 Research paradigm

Interpretivism is the paradigm and research perspective that formed the present study. A research paradigm is defined as a "basic belief system that guides the investigator" (Guba & Lincoln, 1994, p. 105). This belief system guides the way the researcher establishes their practices, ranging from thought patterns to actions (Guba, 1990). Interpretivists aim to look at the interpretations within the social world. They also aim to view social life through the participants' context and see it from their perspective in order to better grasp their views, opinions, and feelings. Meanings are constructed depending on the individuals´ context and personal frames of reference as they are engaging within the world that they are interpreting (Crotty, 1998).

In order to answer the research question, this research aimed to understand the different views related to NIF´s desired legacy of young leaders. What are the interpretations about the stated legacy, and the plan for it to be achieved among the participants? The research participants from the regional confederations could possibly see the planning and managing of the legacy in different ways, which would impact how each of them perceive the stated legacy in relation to the YOG2016, and how they work towards achieving the desired legacy.

The regional confederations that were studied, may not have seen the planning of the legacy in the same way as NIF or the organizing committee. They all have their own organizational culture and their own goals that they are striving to achieve as an organization. The main goal of the organizing committee was first and foremost to host a successful sporting event, while NIF may have been more concerned with how the event would contribute to achieve its own goals. Also, as previously stated in the

literature review, NIF was more concerned pre-games with how the stated legacy could ensure Lillehammer to become the host of the games. It is important to keep this in mind in order to better understand how this affected the planning and management of the legacy in the post-event phase.

The next section of this thesis will provide an explanation for methodology and methods that were used.

5.2 Research Design

There is a wide range of possible methods available to conduct research in order to find answers to the desired research question. That is why early in the research process one must decide what exactly is going to be studied, and in what manned it will be studied. Within the world of research, this is called the research design. It is essential to decide on an appropriate design that fits the type of research being performed (Singleton & Straits, 1999).

The aim of the current research was to discover what institutional processes that may hinder the achievement of the formulated legacy "new generation of leaders" examining YOG2016 post-games, focusing on the regional confederations as legacy implementers. To answer the research question it was necessary to gain a holistic view of the phenomena. It was then appropriate to use the design of qualitative methods (Bryman, 2008), which provides a richness and holism that quantitative research would not be able to provide.

The research project corresponds with social science that exists within the hermeneutic view. Hermeneutics derives from Greek, and means "to interpret" or "to understand". The texts are viewed as abstract, at the same time as they are a means of transmitting meaning. Researchers in hermeneutics see a link that can make it possible to understand these experiences, beliefs and values that lies within the text. The theory also includes the view that the researcher can gain an understanding that is deeper and goes further than the participants own understanding. This is achieved by adding an interpretive element that has the potential to uncover meanings and intentions that can be hidden in the participants´ tacit practice knowledge, and can be drawn on the researchers own theoretical or personal knowledge (Crotty, 1998). Many authors focus on the

"hermeneutic circle", which is a form that claims that in order to understand something, one has to start with ideas, and the use of terms, that imply a basic understanding of what is attempting to understand. Hermeneutics offers a way of understanding such human experiences captured through language in its context. In the present research, hermeneutics was used as a mode of analysis, with the aim of making sense of the data so that evidence could be obtained to answer my research question.

This research on the planning and management of the legacy of the YOG2016 aimed to understand the phenomenon through the conduction of interviews with participants from several regional confederations. This provided an explanation for their actions towards the aim of achieving the planned legacy post-event. NIF´s way of communicating the desired young leader legacy, and the regional confederations way of receiving and understanding this information, can provide an explanation for the regional confederations decisions and actions in regards to achieving the planned legacy of YOG2016. The discourse used by the regional confederations provides a deeper understanding of their experience of the phenomenon, together with observations and document analysis. Combined with theoretical knowledge, these experiences and beliefs can be put into context to answer the research question; what institutional processes may hinder the achievement of the formulated legacy "new generation of leaders" examining YOG2016 post-games. As such, case study has been chosen as the main approach.

5.3 The post-event phase of the YOG2016 as a case study

In order to answer the research question, case study was chosen as the research methodology. This is one of the most used methodological approaches within the sport management research (Andrew, Pedersen & McEvoy, 2011). Case studies can be used in a wide range of situations that consist of rare, single or complex phenomenon. This type of study investigates the details of one or more organizations, or groups within organizations. The aim is to provide an analyses of the context and the process involved with the phenomenon being studied (Meyer, 2001). Case studies allow the researcher to examine and focus on only one particular case. The purpose is to represent the case, not the world that the case is a part of. The case can be a part of an organization, decisions, bargaining, an event, actions, or procedures. In the present study, employing a case study provided the opportunity to go into the details of the planning and managing of

the volunteer leader legacy, and examine it carefully through the conduction of interviews with the participants from several regional confederations. Case studies are particularly suitable when it comes to understanding processes and behaviours that are not well understood. Case studies allow researchers and the reading audience to understand the complexity of the particular case (Stake, 2005). The use of case studies is not recommended for mapping the empirical scope of a phenomenon, but their strength lies in the understanding and explanations of the actions and processes (Yin, 1989).

Researchers can use case study as a methodology to confirm a theory. It can also be used to study the details of a unique situation in order to compare it to other situations, as well to do research in a field that has not been studied in order to discover new features (Ghauri & Gronhaug, 2005 in Edwards & Skinner, 2009). In the present study of legacy management, using a case study provided the ability to test existing theoretical concepts, and afforded the potential to contribute to new theory building.

Case studies are suitable for examining a phenomenon within its real life context, and address a situation in which the border between the phenomenon and the context is not clear. The case as a research entity must not be confused with the place where the research was conducted (Yin, 1989). In the study of the YOG2016, the case concerns the processes and the actions by several regional confederations towards the desired legacy, while the context is the environment in which the organizations acted out their plans. Here there exists powerful stakeholders, such as NIF, the Ministry of Culture, and the local government, who were crucial for the event, and are putting pressure on the organizations to act according to the stated legacy. The interpretations and the explanations that are found in the research process build on existing theory.

When using a case study, the researcher can tailor the study as the design is rather loose. In contrast to other approaches, there are virtually no specific requirements in using a case study. They are open to the idea of being guided by a theoretical framework that will help with the conduction of the research and the analysis of data, as opposed to grounded theory and ethnography where the researcher collects first hand data. The description for the case of the YOG2016 post-games was provided with guidance from neo-institutional theory and other relevant legacy theories and literature (Hartley, 1994).

There also exists a common understanding among researchers conducting case studies that they have limited utility when the purpose is to generalise (Andersen, 2013). The challenge is to show how the single case can be generalized and be representative of wide range of phenomenon. However, the goal in this specific case was not to be able to generalize, but to give an intense description of a social system, and develop a better understanding of the case of the legacy management of the regional confederations in relation to the promised legacy of the YOG2016 post-event.

5.4 Generating qualitative data

Qualitative research methods are suitable for examining topics where little research is done, and where transparency and flexibility are required (Richards & Morse, 2007). Due to the previously mentioned gaps in the literature with regards to the legacy of sporting events of a smaller scale, as well as strategic planning and management of event legacies post-event, this type of research fits within the description of qualitative research. This research method is frequently used when the researcher wants to know what is happening, such as in a community, in an organization or another situation or area (Richards & Morse, 2007). The purpose of the research is to make sense of a situation that is complex and dynamic. Once the data has been collected, a method for simplifying and managing the data without losing consideration of the context is highly essential when looking at a specific case. As mentioned previously, the post-event phase cannot be separated from what happened pre-event when aiming to answer the present research question. Qualitative methods are suited for answering questions when researchers want to avoid eliminating too much superficial data to the point where see specific trends cannot be seen (Richards & Morse, 2007).

The current study goes in depth on the topic of the YOG2016 and the management of its legacy post-event by conducting interviews. Many actors within the sports system, including NIF, national federations, regional confederations and clubs, are involved to varying degrees the legacy management post-event. The focus of this study was on several regional confederations, which were chosen as it is the regional confederations´ task to act out NIF´s plans regionally. As such, it was expected that they would be involved in some way in the legacy implementation following the YOG2016.

The present research takes place within a process that can be understood in the light of the context in which it operates, and the aim was to find specific information about the case. The benefit of using a qualitative approach was that it does not put limitations on the research participants' answers, which opens a door for the uniqueness of each and every participant (Jacobsen, 2005). It also provides a good platform to understand a phenomenon or situation; thus, this was seen as the best suited method for this specific case.

5.5 Qualitative methods

At the time data collection started, it was approximately nine months since the event had been hosted. The data was generated by using three qualitative methods. The main method consisted of conducting interviews, but it was also necessary to do observations and document analysis to get a broader understanding of the case in its context.

5.5.1 Interviews

Data collection consisted of seven semi-structured interviews with individuals from seven different regional confederations. This was a strategic sample as all of the individuals chosen had a key role in the area of youth sports implementation within their respective organisations. The participants worked in the administration in their respective organizations, specifically within club development and as sports consultants, including an interview with one organization manager. These people were chosen as they were seen as the obvious choice to talk to regarding this particular case.

Since the legacy stated that the "new generation of volunteers" would apply to the whole country (NIF, 2011), it was necessary to move outside the "YOG2016 region", by including organizations other than just the regional confederations of Oppland and Hedmark, as the event was hosted within their regions. Prior to the data collection, it was expected that these two organizations felt closer and more involved in the legacy process than the other regional confederations that are more geographically distant from the region. This sample was chosen in order to get a broader understanding of the case within its context. According to the literature, it is also for the best interest of the study. In addition, a good case should raise the question of validity and reliability (Halvorsen, 2008).

The interviews lasted approximately one hour, with the shortest interview being 25 minutes and the longest being 1 hour and 15 minutes. All of the interviews were conducted through a one-on-one conversation, in a room where no disturbance occurred. One of the interviews was conducted with data from two participants from the same organization as their roles were overlapping during the process leading up to and after the YOG2016. As such, it was natural to talk with both of them in order for no crucial information to be missed. It was also helpful to get both views on the case, and the participants would fill in or agree with each other´s thoughts.

The people participating in the study had different roles at different levels within their organizations. It was found that the different organizations' work towards youth policies and their view on the issue depended to a large extent on their personality and position within the organisation, amongst other factors. Some had more and/or longer experience working with youths, and some were more practically involved in youth strategy implementation than others. This cannot be seen as a limitation of the study, but rather as a reflection of Norwegian organized sports, as only a few people work with various tasks and contribute to central implementation of strategies at the administrative level.

For this kind of study, it was not possible to reach complete data saturation. Different aspects will always come up that would be interesting examine further into if more organizations were to be included. However, the participants in the present study responded more or less the same to the crucial questions regarding legacy planning in their relationship with NIF. Their perception regarding this issue was quite similar to each other. This provided a greater ability and more "proof" to draw conclusions based on their answers. Time and budget where also key factors in not interviewing participants from all the 19 regional confederations.

Prior to conducting the interviews, the researcher read the regional confederation´s web pages, to gain a preliminary understanding of their programs and strategies towards youths, which allowed more specific questions to be asked. However, it was found that a lot of the organizations´ projects and programs could not to be found on their website or were deficient, and were something to be discovered during the interviews.

5.5.2 Interview guide

Many of the questions asked from the interview guide were based on neo-institutional theory (see Appendix 3). They where formulated in such a way that theory could guide the data analysis. Notes were made concerning the meaning behind each and every question, and what parts of neo-institutional theory that could possibly be discovered in each given case. This made it easier to see what questions to focus on in various interview situations. Each interview was guided by open-ended questions, such as; "What dialog do you have with NIF concerning young leaders? Has it been made clear what your organization is supposed to do in order to reach the stated legacy? What is your interpretation of the stated legacy of YOG2016?" Further, the participants were asked if NIF had put pressure on the regional confederation to act in a certain way (coercive pressure), if NIF monitored them for their actions concerning young leaders (ceremonial acceptance), and if they had been copying other regional confederations concerning their youth strategies (mimetic isomorphism). They were also asked questions concerning the organization´s strategies to get insight into their youth projects and programs.

Prior to the interviews, the participants were not well informed about the questions to be asked, as a reflection of this beforehand could have been a limitation to the current study and would not reflect the reality of the case. For example, the participants were not informed of the question of the interpretation of the stated legacy "new generation of leaders", as it was desirable to test in the interview situation if the participants new about this formulation or not in regards to their legacy implementation strategies.

In order to check the quality of questions, a test interview was put together prior to the data collection. This was performed with an individual from a sport federation working with youth strategies. This gave the ability to test the quality of the questions, and if they were appropriate or offending. Corrections were then made to the interview guide. The analysis could have been significantly more difficult without this kind of advance preparation, and the theory would not have been able to be used to its full potential.

5.5.3 Observations

Observation were taken during a meeting in June 2016 at Ullevål Stadion, in Oslo, which were held on the initiative of the Norwegian School of Sport Sciences. NIF and

some selected regional confederations were gathered to talk about the YOG2016 and the strategy forward.

The researcher also attended the Youth Sport Conference in Trondheim in December 2016. The conference was on the initiative of NIF, who invited regional confederations, national federations and sport clubs. The researcher wanted to be present in order to investigate the status quo and the management of the legacy regarding young leaders. The conference was held approximately a year after the games were held. The researcher paid attention to the discourse about the legacy and the planning of it to be achieved, which provided a better understanding for drawing conclusions based on the research question. After attending these forums where both sport politicians and legacy implementers were present, the researcher felt a much stronger understanding of the case within its context.

Prior to these observations, the researcher had taken notes about what aspects to be particularly conscious of and what to observe. In this way, the researcher was then able to make sure not to miss anything essential to the research project. The researcher´s notes largely related to institutional theory, and thoughts and ideas that came up during observation were later matched up with previous notes, with several pages of pages of experience being matched up with theory. The researcher was then able to draw conclusions based on observations related to theory.

5.5.4 Document analysis

The research method also consisted of analysing documents. Analysis included looking at strategic plans, applications, bid documents, youth sport events- and conference invitations, as well as organizational web pages. The researcher looked at how the statements regarding the young leader legacy were formulated, and tried to examine if there were any legacy definitions, implementation strategies or any defined tasks and responsibilities coming from NIF. The statements were also analyzed to determine if there was any information regarding the regional confederations´ task to implement youth leader strategies, as this could have affected the regional confederations´ task to implement youth leader strategies. This method was also used in order to make up the interview guide. The researcher could then find answers to questions that were not to be found in the documents.

5.6 Data analysis

Notes of the interviews were taken shortly after they were made. The researcher wrote down the experience of the interview, in addition to things that were said before and after the audio recorder was being used. It was found that many crucial things were often said in the "causal" talk, and it was important to get this down in writing before it was forgotten.

The transcription consisted of listening to the tapes over and over again, going back and forth in order to get everything down in the transcripts. The researcher also listened to the tapes multiple times in order to get a holistic view of the case. The interviews were transcribed word for word, but in some parts of the documents, the transcripts were structured in a way that made them better suited for later analysis, but making sure that the meaning would remained the same. The interviews were all held in Norwegian; thus it was necessary to translate the quotes used in the text of the thesis. All measures were taken to protect and reflect the true meaning of these quotes.

The first step in the analysis process was to read over the transcript several times in order to get intimate and familiar with the data. Thoughts and ideas were then written down throughout this process. Every time the researcher went through a transcript again, more information, thoughts and corrections occurred, which lead to adjustments in the notes. At this stage the research supervisor provided assistance by going through the transcripts to ensure that the meaning of the interviews was interpreted in the same way, which increased the reliability of the study.

In order to cite the data, MaxQda software was used, which was helpful as it helped with organizing and labeling the different types of data quickly and easily. While some researchers believe that coding is merely technical, Miles, Huberman and Saldana (2014) believe that coding is in fact a form of data analysis. How the data were organized and how different labels were put on the text´s meaning, was the researcher´s own reflection and interpretation of what the data actually meant to the research. This was a time consuming process as the researcher´s perspective changed over time. In the beginning the researcher worked with loosely held chunks of meaning, to be ready to unfreeze and rearrange. One of the traps with coding, explained by Miles et al (2014), is getting locked too quickly into naming a pattern (p. 87). In the present study, the

researcher tried to avoid this by initially spending more time on this important step, instead of going back and changing a great deal of work.

The interview guide helped with labeling the different codes, which stemmed from neo-institutional theory, into different themes based on the theoretical framework. This worked as a defense against "overload", as it is often argued that the researcher cannot have it all (Miles, et al, 2014). While it felt brutal at times, the process needed to be selective. Using this process also saved the researcher a great del of "unnecessary" time, as it significantly guided the research. The researcher continuously looked back at the interview guide as a reminder of what was being examined in each and every question. This worked as a tool for guidance when feeling unsure. The researcher already made up some of the different themes during the construction of the interview guide, a process called *deductive coding* (Miles et al, 2014). This worked simply as a start list, and more themes appeared during the process as also other features were discovered. These emerged during data collection, and this process is called *inductive coding* (Miles et al, 2014). These labels are better grounded empirically, and helped the researcher discover local, important factors that were not considered prior to data collection (Miles, et al, 2014).

During data coding, the researcher wrote down memos to help make sense of the data. These consisted of ideas and thoughts that came up concerning explanations and various other notions. These were written down directly in the transcript, and also in another file. This was found to be extremely helpful when analysing the data at a later date. It has also been argued that this will support the researcher in the maximization of the validity and reliability of the modes of analysis process (Edwards & Skinner, 2009).

While the process of analysing takes time to process, the researcher made sure to take a significant amount of notes throughout the whole process. If a good idea came to mind, it would be put down in words right away in order for it not to be missed. The researcher carried a notebook, where all thoughts were sorted. If thoughts and ideas changed over time, these notes helped make the researcher more conscious of why the statements had been changed, which turned out to be a great analysis tool.

5.7 Quality assessments

It is essential that the study generates answers that are trustworthy. In this section, the credibility and transferability of the research will be discussed.

5.7.1 Credibility

For a study to possess high credibility, other researchers have to be able to find the same answers using the same theoretical framework (Thaagard, 2009). However, from a hermeneutic perspective, it is a common knowledge that the researcher´s presuppositions affect the gathering of the data since the questions asked in the interview situation are already determined by what is going to be studied. In significant ways, the analysis affects the data, as well as the other way around (Crotty, 1998). During the interviews, the researcher sometimes repeated the participants´ answers in order to check if their opinion had been interpreted correctly. To improve credibility, the researcher also tried to remain open during analysis, rather than trying to force fit the data to fit into already determined labels, while at the same time remaining skeptical. The researcher constantly asked: would the same results be found if someone else where to do the research using the same framework? To help answer this questions, the researcher spoke regularly to the research supervisor, who provided a great deal of guidance. The researcher would express thoughts about a certain situation, and the supervisors indicated if it had been interpreted correctly, of if there could possibly be other views involved. Classmates also provided help, and worked as good reliability check.

5.7.2 Transferability

Transferability concerns the extent to which the knowledge produced in the interview situation is transferable to other relevant situations (Kvale & Brinkman, 2015). As previously mentioned, this is often seen as one of the weaknesses of case studies; however, according to Yin (2009) the research can be generalizable in certain situations. In order for this to happen, already existing theories have to be used and compared to empirical findings in the case study. As such, the assumptions drawn in the present research were all closely linked to neo-institutional theory.

5.8 Ethical considerations

A qualitative researcher has many guidelines and ethical questions to address before beginning the research process (Morse & Richards, 2008). Many ethical issues could have been raised and they were something that had to be considered. A representative´s statement from one of the regional confederations could possibly result in negative consequences for the individual. All the individuals´ names were held anonymous in this study, and they were also not named in any of the research documents, or files. All participants were simply given a number so that no one would be able to recognise a name and trace it back to the data material. Each participant received a consent form, which they all approved by signing (see Appendix 2). The research participants were also told that he or she had the ability to pull out from the interview at any time with no consequences.

Due to the considerations that most qualitative research projects have to pay attention to, it was necessary to get an approval from the "Data protection Official for Research" before starting this research (see Appendix 1). However, all of the participants seemed to have no problem with the data collection and most of them made it clear that they did not consider the data collected to be sensitive information. All the participants were positive about taking part in the study. The Norwegian sport system has been described as relatively small. There are only a few people working with youth matters within each regional confederation. As such, the participants might be identifiable by people familiar to Norwegian sports; however, the participants all expressed that they had no problem with speaking up as they did not see the research topic as a personal matter. All participants seemed relaxed, and some also said that they had spoken out loud about their perspective regarding the issue several times at various events.

6. Results and discussion

In this chapter, the results emanating from the present study will be presented. These will be discussed in light of elements from neo-institutional theory and already existing literature. Participants´ quotes and documents will be pointed to as as examples and "evidence" in order to justify all theoretical assumptions. Observational results will also be described in order to draw a broader picture of the case in its´ context. All of the results will be structured in a manner appropriate for the research question; What institutional processes may hinder the achievement of the formulated legacy "new generation of leaders" examining YOG2016 post-games?

In the first part of this chapter, participants' interpretation of the legacy planning post-games will be examined. Since previous research has stated that there was no plan prior to the event (Strittmatter, 2016), it was interesting to investigate if this was still the case.

6.1 Still in lack of a legacy plan post-games?

The section will present the regional confederations´ perception of the relationship with NIF concerning the planning and management of the stated legacy; "new generation of leaders". The following data will be presented: (1) requirements from NIF concerning legacy strategy implementation, (2) evaluation and monitoring of legacy, and (3) legacy funding. These questions reveal if there exists a legacy strategy at this stage and if the conditions for the regional confederations are being appropriately facilitated or not. If there is still a lack of a plan at this stage, previous research say that a legacy is very difficult to achieve (Leopkey & Parent, 2012). Hence, the participants´ perceptions on these questions were needed in order to answer the research question.

6.1.1 Legacy implementation requirements from NIF: coercive pressure or a matter of voluntary adoption?

Despite the lack of open information regarding legacy management, do the regional confederations still know what to do at this stage in order to work towards the goal of a legacy of a new generation of leaders? Have they received the necessary information from NIF in order to work towards the young leader legacy? This was one of the main interests during the data collection. If they regional confederations do not know what to

do, how can the desired legacy ever be reached, as they work as the regional implementers of the organization´s goals?

If NIF wanted their stated legacy to be reached, it would be natural to assume that the regional confederations would have to fulfill a set of requirements or at least follow some NIF stated guidelines to efficiently achieve the promised legacy, as the legacy literature highly emphasizes the need of a strategic plan (Girginov & Hills; Nichols & Ralston, 2010; Leopkey & Parent, 2012; Thomson, et al, 2013). When analyzing related documents and NIF´s web page prior to participant interviews, there was no information regarding legacy strategies, or the tasks of the regional confederations or any other NIF organizational unit. No new information had been published publicly regarding this matter post-games. NIF also did not bring up any strategies or guidelines considering the young leader legacy achievement at any of the events where observations were completed for the present experiment. As such, it was necessary to find answers through the conduction of interviews with members of the regional confederations.

When respondents were asked how the legacy was communicated to them, they provided differing answers. One respondent said that what was expected from them had been communicated well and repeatedly. The participant reported that the legacy was communicated to them through different meetings and seminars that were held prior to the event, yet no strategy or requirements for achieving the stated legacy were mentioned.

> *There has sort of been a red string through the two last years on the gatherings we´ve attended. We´re mostly at these development seminars. There has often been a focus regarding for example poor families, and yeah, different topics. And I feel that the Youth Olympics and that part have been a topic for each session we´ve attended. (Vest-Agder)*

In contrast, most of the participants expressed that they had barely heard any talk of the young leader legacy from NIF, or what they had heard was communicated weakly and in a confusing manner.

> *I´m not exactly sure what the legacy... I remember we received information saying that now there´s a lot of youths here. Now we have to like "embrace them" and take them to us and.. but then it´s like, yeah okay. How are we gonna make sure that this knowledge is being passed on? What do they know? How are*

we gonna communicate this out to the units that should involve them? (Akershus)

I can´t say that it really has been communicated. […] It is likely that it has been communicated at the org. manager level, but it has never reached us who works with development. (Oslo)

All the confederations reported that they had adopted NIF´s "young leader´s course". This is a course constructed by NIF, and NIF provides the regional confederations with funding for this program, which the confederations run twice a year. All the regional confederations in the present study had chosen to adopt this course; however, the participants stated that this was not a requirement from NIF. The adoption of the course was entirely voluntary on the part of the confederations.

When the participants from the regional confederations were asked about any possible requirements from NIF regarding the desired young leader legacy, they all reported that this was not the case. Rather, there seemed to be no requirements for the confederations to adopt any program to support youths in their role as leaders for Norwegian sports, nor would they have met any sort of "punishment" if they did not act in a manner attempting to reach the stated legacy.

If we didn´t implement the "young leaders course" for example? Well, no. That´s the thing, that you have the opportunity to implement the young leaders course, and we report this. We report who participated, but if we didn´t do that one year.. I don´t think that anyone would´ve asked. (Oslo)

The only thing reported that would have been noticed, would have been lack of financial support for this specific program. Another participant also indicates that it would have been experienced as strange if they did not have any programs aiming to reach out to youth as leaders.

Confusion was also found related to the Legacy center, a new center established at Lillehammer in relation the YOG2016. Nothing was found during the document analysis about what the purpose of this initiative was supposed to be, other than passing on competence internationally with regards to winter sports (Lillehammer commune, n.d). Both participants from Hedmark and Oppland did not know exactly at the time of

being interviewed what the Legacy center was supposed to facilitate with. This made it difficult to assist the center and incorporate it into their legacy management process.

The participant from Akershus also questioned "the youths´ sports year", as the year 2016 was named by NIF. The meaning behind it and what was special about it was not communicated.

Linking these results to neo-institutional theory, it could be said that there was certainly a lack of coercive pressure. NIF, as the dominant organizational unit and head of the movement, were not forcing youth strategies on the regional confederations in any way; thus, they cannot be punished for the lack of youth strategies with the aim to tackle the lack of youths as leaders. NIF has expressed that it is voluntary to adopt the course; it is up to each regional confederation to decide if they want to adopt the program or not. All of the regional confederations ran the course, but they could just as well have not to receive the offer, and it would not have resulted in any noticeable consequences for the confederation. From the present results, the leader´s course also seems to be the only noticeable initiative at the time being regarding young leaders coming from NIF; however, this again has nothing to do with the YOG2016 and the event legacy achievement, but started on the initiative of the Youth lift. Although one could argue that the young leader´s course can facilitate both cases as they are working for the same cause, it is strange that additional plans and programs were non-existent and were not required in relation to the YOG2016. It seems odd that such an ambitiously stated legacy does not have any specific requirements for the legacy implementers to adopt. The participant from Akershus also pointed to the lack of clear strategies as a weakness regarding their legacy management.

> *But I miss sort of a, kind of a strategic plan… That this is how we wish to do this. This is what we expect the regional confederations to carry out. Clear distribution of responsibilities. (Akershus)*

The lack of guidelines and requirements present a problem in regards to achieving a leader legacy. How is the legacy expected to be achieved when it is not mandatory to implement youth strategies? There is a lack of coercive pressure and the regional confederations are free to implement strategies considering youths as they wish. The results of the present study indicate that it was not reported how the regional

confederations were supposed to tackle the issue of the lack of young leaders. This makes the legacy achievement problematic.

Although youth leader strategies are not stated as a requirement, all of the confederations reported that they have other initiatives aiming to target youths as leaders in addition to the leader´s course. Is NIF facilitating them and helping them fund these programs, or not? Are there financial resources put aside to facilitate a legacy achievement? These questions will be investigated in the chapter below.

6.1.2 Financing the legacy management

Previous research states that finance places a major role when it comes to legacy management (Bell & Gallimore, 2015; Strittmatter & Skille, 2016). This has been confirmed in the findings as well. In fact, finance was in fact an element that was being repeatedly brought up by most of the participants. Apart from the young leader´s course, it was reported from all of the participants that at the time of the interviews their confederation received no additional funding at the time being for their respective youth programs and strategies. As a result, most of the regional confederations stated that they had to depend on other stakeholders in order to finance their strategies towards incorporating youths as leaders. Most of the confederations depend on their county to get the additional support to implement their strategies; thus, the county is an important stakeholder when it comes to their youth strategy implementation. This can again cause problems for implementation, as many of the respondents where not certain about the plan forward concerning one of their projects at the time they were interviewed.

> *Yeah, in Oppland the funding will be gone from 2017. What´s happening next, I don´t know. We might continue to apply, but right now I´m a little unsure for what´s gonna happen there. Hedmark is also not sure for that plan. (Oppland)*

Five out of the seven regional confederations reported that they wanted to apply for additional funding through the" Gjensidige Foundation" in order to implement their strategies towards youth leaders. The Gjensidige Foundation supports various beneficial causes, with a focus on health and safety (Gjensidigestiftelsen, n.d). The foundation was said to be an important stakeholder for these confederations in order to finance their strategies towards youth as leaders, as they do not get any additional funding from the NIF administration.

And now the case is that one applies for funding through the "Gjensidige Foundation" in order to follow this further, because there are very many.. Well. Everyone within Norwegian sports is waiting for more action to happen. (Hedmark)

But then we also have other stakeholders.. We have the Gjensidige Foundation which has been giving us huge opportunities. We got 2,7 million a couple of years back. That has been giving us great opportunities. And they have.. Well, they are more adaptable. We can tell them; now we have experienced this, and we need to change the entire project. A short mail to explain what we do. If they think it´s good, we´ll just start. (Buskerud)

The issue of funding was also brought up by the confederation in Nordland at the conference in Trondheim, who indicated that their youth leader sport project´s future was uncertain at the time. They expressed that they wished for the regional confederations to come together to apply for funding for youth strategy implementation, and to raise awareness concerning the matter. A representative´s statement clearly express the issue with this kind of solution concerning legacy management;

But it´s also like, okay. Then we have to apply for funding outside our own organization. But if.. It´s then allowed to ask if it was like this we wanted it to be anyway, then we maybe should´ve been thinking that we could find money within our own organization, right? (Akershus)

The regional confederations do not consider NIF as a good aid to help them implement youth strategies. They have to turn elsewhere in order to fund their courses of action when it comes to a strengthening of youth leaders within Norwegian sports. Financing was reported as the core to the issue by most of the respondents, as well as a big frustration when interviewing the participants.

There are no extra resources after the Youth Olympics to do anything. In the case of Young Active, we´ve been saving money from different places and managed to collect what we know is needed to train young leaders. We´ve done that at our own initiative. We thought it was sad to just have a single event like the torch relay. But there has not been any extra money to do so, and then it is hard for confederations to prioritize this. (Akershus)

These results show that NIF did not put of any extra finances into reaching the stated legacy post-games. NIF cannot expect the regional confederations to fulfill their wishes of an ambitious legacy when funding is not put forward to do so. This is a tough challenge for the regional confederations to be dealing with. It can be said that the

legacy management is not being appropriately facilitated; however, it has been argued that funding is not the most important factor to consider, as it would not be efficiently utilised without a clear vision (Kellett, Hede & Chalip, 2008). Based on this, one has a good reason to question if NIF is being serious when it comes to a legacy achievement. This brings us to the next chapter of legacy evaluation and monitoring.

6.1.3 Legacy evaluation and monitoring as an institutional myth

Questions asked at the interviews also aimed to know if the regional confederations were being evaluated for their work towards youth as leaders. If they were not being evaluated, how could the legacy then be monitored, or ever be known to be fulfilled? This should be a part of the plan of reaching a stated legacy (Leopkey & Parent, 2012). Efficiency is also an important key term when it comes to evaluation and working towards the achievement of a desired legacy (Leopkey & Parent, 2012). Despite of existing literature´s advices on strategic legacy management, the present results show that the confederations are not being monitored for their youth strategy implementations.

> *Not specifically for youths I think. That I don´t know. So then I guess we don´t do it since I work with this! No, we report things, like things we do regarding our club development though. We also report the courses we do, and tell that we´ve had leaders course and follow-up gatherings. Things like that. And we get recourses depending on what we do, so it´s kind of a reporting, but it´s not like, if you do this, then you get this. If you do everything else, then you get nothing. We report on things in general in order to get the money we´re supposed to get, but it hasn´t been anything specific regarding youths. (Akershus)*

The only thing that was being said is that the regional confederations report about NIF funded courses, such as the young leader´s course. Still, this is not being done in detail. NIF is being informed of the courses that where held and number of people participating. The regional confederations´ other initiatives targeting youths as leaders are not being paid attention to in terms of evaluation.

> *No. But they can´t really do that either when they´re not providing this with funding. So it´s like, how are we supposed to do this? (Akershus)*

One of the respondents also stated that he experienced that the evaluations consisted of what was being said when presenting their work at various events where NIF was present. This can however not be considered as a real evaluation based on the

researcher´s observations, as NIF did not question or evaluate their work when it was being presented. Instead, this seemed to be more a situation for praising the regional confederation´s success.

None of the participants said that they were being evaluated by NIF about their outcomes regarding youth leaders, or were familiar with any such case. Even though the regional confederations are aiming to tackle the issue of youth leaders within Norwegian sports, their own strategies were not being reported or evaluated by NIF.

> *That mentor project has been going on outside of NIF. As confederations in Hedmark and Oppland, we applied for funding from the county. Then, we have been reporting in that direction instead, where we got recourses. But we sold our project to the NIF-system, to the administration who works with these things, and told them what we were doing and how we handled it and so on. But we have not really been reporting about it, and I can´t see any reporting about the youth legacy in general. That I can really not remember. I can´t say that I have seen anything now. (Hedmark)*

When looking at previous research on legacy management, it would have been desirable that NIF as the legacy owner and head of the organisation, would facilitate the regional confederations and guide them in reaching of the desired legacy. NIF as legacy owners should communicate to the confederations what to do, how to do it, evaluate the legacy progression, and facilitate proper strategies in terms of funding. Communication between the actors in this process is extremely important when it comes to legacy management (Kellett, et al, 2008); however, the results from the present data collection do not agree with these terms. There is a considerable lack of evaluation of the regional confederations´ youth implementations; thus, the researcher argues that there is a ceremonial acceptance from NIF concerning this matter. NIF minimizes inspection to avoid the claim that they are inefficient towards in striving for a young leader legacy. The work the regional confederations put down concerning youth leaders are simply approved by NIF without having to be specified in any way. In practice, NIF essentially only wanted to know that actions had been taken; whether or not the regional confederations had succeeded or not was of no concern. Here, NIF ignores a critical evaluation of the organization´s legacy status in order to avoid illegitimacy. When investigating the issue of the lack of legacy monitoring in this case, the researcher claims that NIF was not serious about reaching what they promised in their bid application. The same can be said for the establishment of the Legacy center at

Lillehammer, and the naming of 2016 as the "Youths´ sports year". These are simply institutional myths constructed to celebrate success without explaining progress or purpose. This is a considerable great problem when speaking of a legacy fulfillment in this given case, and these institutional processes hinder this considerably.

The results found that the regional confederations were not certain about their task in terms of working towards the desired legacy post-event, nor were they being properly facilitated by NIF to reach the desired legacy. However, this is of no surprise as previous research say that there where no plan from the initial bid (Strittmatter & Skille, 2016; Strittmatter, 2016).

> *It is a tough challenge of NIF, and how to follow this further..? And we are a little unsure about this, I must say. We think that NIF could´ve been more involved in how we can understand this. It has been some models here and there, that have been done. And the experience from this, and NIF says so too, it is not too much to build on. Like, some models worked okay, and some worked badly. So it´s a good idea to put this into a system that lasts. I don´t feel we have reached this stage within Norwegian sports. (Hedmark)*

There is no doubt that NIF´s lack of legacy facilitation hinders the legacy fulfillment, as this is highly emphasized in previous literature. The results show that post-games – approximately one year after the event, there was still no plan for legacy fulfillment, which supports previous research on YOG2016 conducted pre-event (Strittmatter & Skille, 2016; Strittmatter, 2016). This indicates that NIF is not serious about achieving the promised legacy, but accepts the legacy management ceremonially.

NIF provides the regional confederations no clues or help to improve their strategies in a collective direction towards the target. However, the results show that the regional confederations have all implemented additional strategies when it comes to target young leaders, even tough it is not a requirement from NIF. Further on, it will be examined why this is the case, and if their motives can further hinder the legacy fulfillment. Are they also striving for legitimacy? Will the results show that they are performing lip service for NIF? Before examining this further, some practical challenges regarding legacy management that came out of the data will be presented.

6.2 A young volunteer leader legacy as a problematic issue to tackle

In this chapter, some results that are interesting to look at considering the management of the stated legacy will be presented. Apart from the things discussed so far, the results also found practical factors that can greatly hinder the desired legacy becoming a reality. Together, the participants named three factors, that will be referred to as main challenges, that they feel make their task difficult when it comes to ensuring a young leader legacy after the YOG2016. These were: (1) Creating awareness of youth leaders as a valuable resource within sport clubs, (2) The lack of capacity of the regional confederations, and (3) Youths as a problematic target group when it comes to volunteering in sports on a daily basis. The issue with sports clubs will be discussed first.

6.2.1 The sport clubs´ lack of awareness of youth as a powerful resource

It is stated that the young leaders are needed in the sport organizations daily activities, and NIF sees them as a valuable resource to help run the sport clubs (NIF, 2011). Most of the participants mentioned that it is challenging to make the clubs aware of the importance of recruiting young leaders. The regional confederations also expressed that they possess little knowledge about how the sports club use young leaders to benefit their activities.

> *But we have sort of a lack of knowledge of what´s going on with.. like, how are they being taken care of, how are the club appreciating youths as a resource. What tasks are the youths being assigned to? (Akershus)*

The respondents said that the motivation of the clubs they have been in contact with varied greatly. Some clubs were seen as being very motivated to involve youths in their activities and routines, while others were not interested. Sport clubs are essentially being run on a volunteer basis, and it can be hard for club leaders and coaches to make youths a priority, as many of them do not get paid for their job as coaches. It is then hard for them to consider young leaders in addition to their volunteer tasks in the club.

> *The challenge lies within the volunteer sports club. They have to take on an extra task. We have seen that it is unproblematic in some clubs, but in other clubs it can be very problematic. So we haven´t managed to make an appropriate system yet. (Buskerud)*

The respondents agreed and stated that they still need to do an effort to create awareness on how the clubs can benefit from the young leaders' contribution to organizational work in the clubs.

> *Part of the challenge is that the clubs don´t see the opportunity of the youths that are here now and can do really good jobs. We have experienced this at the young leaders courses. There are amazing youths out there. No doubt about that. It is important to take advantage of this, and I feel that this is a job for the confederations to communicate, at least a job for the two regions that had so many. (Oppland)*

The way NIF as a volunteer sports organization is structured seems to be working against the regional confederations task of implementing strategies for a young leader legacy to be achieved. NIFs overall goals and strategies cannot simply be forced onto coaches and leaders to be taken care of. As a non-profit organization it can only be encouraged. Looking at this perspective, we cannot take for granted that a young leader legacy is going to be achieved.

6.2.2 The capacity of the regional confederations

It was also expressed that the capacity of the regional confederations was limited when considering youths as leaders. Some participants expressed that their confederation was not ready for this to be a part of their routine as the date of the games rapidly came closer. Some felt like they did not have enough resources to tackle the huge expectations that seemed to have been placed upon them, and the same time as expectations seemed to be unclear. The regional confederation in Vest-Agder expressed that their youth strategies and visions had suffered from a lack of capacity and new replacements in the staff. They did not feel ready to use the opportunity to boost youths in sports to its full potential as the date of the games rapidly progressed.

> *It would´ve been different now I think, if it would´ve been in two years. We have a better capacity to tackle it now. (Vest-Agder)*

The participants within the regional confederations described their day to day life at work as hectic. When there were no communicated strategies to tackle the issue of the lack of youth leaders, it cannot be expected from the employees in the regional confederations that a young leader legacy is going to be a priority, as the quote below expresses:

> *I´m thinking that it could´ve been as easy as receiving an e-mail: "Here are those who were working at the YOG. This is what they did. This is the sports club they belong to". Then we could´ve gone straight to the club and asked them how they take care of the person. But.. to simply think that things are to happen, that is not the case in a hectic day to day life. This is sort of in addition to, it is.. The way it´s being done right now. (Akershus)*

It is of no secret that the organization also have other needs that need to be fulfilled. The sport organization has a lot of things on the agenda that the regional confederations have to take into consideration; thus, it is not just youth sports that take the spotlight in their daily work within the confederation. This was also made clear at the conference in Trondheim. It was not just the issue of youths in sports that was being discussed and brought into light, but also the issue of sport as an expensive activity, sports as an integration arena, as well as training methods for top athletes, among other topics.

There seem to have been too many things on the agenda within the Norwegian sport system to boost the youth leader legacy to its full potential and reap the benefits of the event. The regional confederations were expected to perform on many levels. One of the participants expressed that youths in sports have gotten a lot of attention recently. There has been a lot of focus and debate on this matter after the games were declared closed. However, the issue of the lack of youth leaders might still fade into the chaos of everything else that is characterized as important as well. This is supported by the quote below;

> *But my experience is that NIF also think this is important, but there is also so much else that is important. We have had refugees, a debate about transparency, doping, and there has been so many things in the picture. But if there had been a strategy behind, and also the funding put aside, then we could´ve gone the distance despite of all the disturbance. I think that that is what we´re missing. It could be because of the lack of money, but then we cannot say that there will be a great legacy. Then one has to be realistic. (Akershus)*

When talking to the participants, youth as leaders was not experienced as a top priority within the sport organization following the YOG2016. Hence, in terms of resources, time and capacity, the regional confederations priority of youth sports and leaders, all seemed to depend on the employees working with youths inside the confederation. Some of the participants were more on the inside, motivated and closer to the debate than others. In fact, some regional confederations had had youth strategies on their own for a long time; thus, they were more "in the game" due to having more experience in

this area. It is then natural for these confederations to have more resources and capacity than other regional confederations. This makes the issue of the lack of young leaders more of an individual problem that varies from one confederation to the next.

> *There are 19 regional confederations and there are 19 different ways to work, despite having a common goal. It is clear that it depends to a certain extent on personalities. (Oslo)*

This makes it difficult to make the youth leader legacy a full priority among all the other topics of importance. The promised legacy can then be a problematic task, even if the regional confederations try and do their best in achieving the legacy. Things would likely have looked significantly differently if the achievement of the legacy had been planned out before the games (Leopkey & Parent, 2012). With no overall plan for all of the implementers to follow, it seemed that actions towards the legacy became more random. At the time being, it may just seem to drown in everything else that NIF has considered as important.

6.2.3 Youth as a problematic target group

Besides the problem with sport clubs and the capacity of the regional confederations, there is yet another difficult element when it comes to achieve the stated legacy. The regional confederations do all agree that it is important to tackle the issue of a lack of young leaders within Norwegian sports. Still, they express that youth is a complicated and difficult target group when it comes to turning them into volunteers within the Norwegian sport system on a daily basis (Hustinx & Lammertyn, 2003). All of the participants express that the age group is hard to deal with in terms of organizational volunteering.

One thing that was brought up as problematic regarding youth volunteering was their study situation; a lot of people travel away from their hometown to study elsewhere when they finish high school. It was also experienced that they would rather earn money than work as volunteers within sport clubs. In addition, most athletes want to use their time practising their sport instead of coaching or do other organizational tasks. It was also experienced that many quit sports, because they found other interests. The people who start to volunteer are also likely to quit as soon as they have gotten the incentives that they wanted from the work.

> *I think it has been fun and difficult to get people to work towards the same goal, considering the varieties in their agendas. (Vest-Agder)*

This supports the literature on volunteering, and the shift in incentives that makes it difficult to get youths to commit to commit to organizational work. Sport events are easier and fit into the youth's incentives. They are short term, strengthen their cv´s, provides them with perks (e.g clothing), and connections for future work. YOG2016 had no problem involving young people, and was described as a big in this regard. However, when it comes to organizational work in a sport club on a daily basis, the participants in the present study state that it is problematic. A big sport event is more of a festival, and has a different atmosphere than working within an organization on a daily basis. Here, the volunteers are free to leave and are not committed to additional work.

Some regional confederations have succeeded more than others with their youth strategies. Still, they all face the challenges that are described in the literature on youths as a problematic target group when it comes to engaging them in organizational work on a voluntary basis. From this perspective, the volunteer leader legacy is challenging, and Norwegian sports cannot lean on the success of the YOG2016 alone. Youths will not commit to daily sports activities if there is not a clear strategy. The regional confederations are all aware of this from their experience with youths in sports, and expressed this in the interviews. YOG2016 engaged many young volunteers, but one cannot expect that they will volunteer as easily in smaller events or organizational work, as these does not match up with their incentives according to the literature. This is supported by the participant´s views.

> *But it´s not the same for the smaller events. So there´s a need to get more... volunteer contribution. And now we´re in between... a lot of people get paid for their job in sports, and a lot of people work voluntarily. There´s a fine line. We wish for students, knowledgeable students and others to contribute with the education one possess to put a mark on the sport activities, other events and whatever it might be. But they need to get paid, they prioritize other stuff. We want them to put their knowledge and enthusiasm first, but they need to take money into consideration. That´s a challenge. (Hedmark)*

A sport event cannot be used to cure all problems that take place within an organization (Chappelet, 2012). It cannot be taken for granted that the stated legacy will automatically be achieved when there have not been any strategies put in place to do so. The problems with Norwegian sports will not be fixed simply because a large event has

been hosted in Lillehammer for ten days. These three main challenges highlight the importance of a strategic plan in this given case, and demonstrates why there is a for need of a strategic plan in order for a promised legacy to be achieved. If there was a strategic plan to begin with, these challenges could have been managed more efficiently. The legacy management could have worked out better with an overall plan for all of the regional confederations to follow.

Next, how the regional confederations have solved the issue of a lack of an overall, strategic legacy plan will be examined. First, it is important to look at their interpretation of the stated legacy of "a new generation of leaders", in order to better understand their courses of actions regarding the legacy management. Their understanding of the goal determines how an organization operates (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983), which will be discussed later.

6.3 Interpretation of the stated legacy; "new generation of leaders"

To answer the research question, it was necessary to get how the participants interpreted the stated legacy "new generations of leaders". Their interpretations of the legacy are crucial for goal obtaining, as the regional confederations are the implementers of the sport organizations strategies. Surprisingly, there were not many clear answers to this question, which necessitated a search for answers within the transcripts, and viewing the data from a hermeneutic point of view.

The reason for the lack of straight answers to the perception of the stated legacy could possibly be explained by the lack of communication from NIF, as the planning and management of the legacy were unclear to the participants to begin with. NIF´s focus on the phrase "new generation of leaders" may still only have been in the bid-application and the state guarantee (Strittmatter & Skille, 2016), and not taken into further consideration from this point. This is of no surprise, as the findings of the present research still indicate a lack of a legacy plan. As the representative for Oslo said when talking about how the stated legacy was communicated to them: "I can´t say that it has been communicated very well". The phrase "new generation of leaders" may not even have been something that the participants kept in mind. The legacy as it is formulated,

may not have been explained in detail. At least, this is not to be found from the data collection.

Most of the participants did not linger too much with answering the question specifically, with some participants not answering at all. These participants went straight on to accusing NIF for not having a good plan for how the legacy should have been achieved, and for the lack of good working conditions to do so. There were no disagreements on this among the regional confederations.

> *No. How honest should I be? Honestly, I think that everyone wishes for it to be a legacy, right? I think the biggest mistake was that one came up with things during the process, and after.. There was no strategy to begin with, when one started with the Youth Olympics´. Someone should´ve been working with a strategy. Like, how is this going to be passed on? What funds are we going to use? What kind of strategy should we follow to make this more than a single event. At least that part hasn´t been well communicated. (Akershus)*

Another possible reason for the lack of answers with regards to the legacy perception could be that the experience of the legacy was taken for granted. This is supported by the literature on the dangers of legacies. It is not necessary to say exactly what the term "a new generation of leaders" means, as it is viewed as self-explanatory (Cashman, 2005). One of the participants kept his respond with answering;

> *No. That was… very good. I have to say. That one has to talk about the "Youth lift" for Norwegian sports. (Hedmark)*

The legacy in itself was experienced as good, and the issue was seen as important to try to tackle. At the same time, the participant admitted that it is a challenge because there have not be any concrete messages from NIF to solve the problem.

Another participant showed great knowledge about the topic and drew a picture of the purpose behind it. Still, there was a lack of explanation for the real meaning of the term "new generation of leaders" and what it actually meant.

> *Yes, yes. Yes, yes. No, ´cause that one.. yeah, that one I get. And that was that all of this should be a project to develop, educate, and to achieve a new generation of leaders, coaches, trough the "Youth lift", for those ten years. And the Youth Olympics' were in the middle of this process, and it´s supposed to be taken further from here. And that´s sort of where we´re at now, to use what we have*

> *learned from the Youth Olympics, and also what NIF has said that it should bring in order to develop a new generation. (Oppland)*

The participant claimed to understand its meaning, yet failed to explain it words other than what the phrase itself consisted of. The stated legacy seemed to be something that did not need to be explained in detail. This again do not make sense, as a legacy should be seen as a specific objective from a management perspective (Leopkey & Parent, 2012). As the representative from Akershus said: "I think everyone wants to have a legacy". (Akershus) It is something good and desirable, which again is supported by the literature on dangers of legacies. They are often ambitiously formulated, in order to create support from the environment to host the event (Getz, 2002).

At the same time, one could ask the questions; who really are the young leaders? What age group are they? How many youth is a whole new generation? Answers to these questions would be ideal for the regional confederations to know in terms of legacy achievement. The age of the young leaders was not mentioned, except from the saying in this quote when the participant talked about a discussion with youths from their program;

> *We discuss with them what we mean when we say young leaders. Do you mean those who are 30 years old, or those who are 20 years old, or those who are 14? And then we´re a little vague. Because there are differences between a 14 year old, and someone who´s passed the age of 25. It´s two different worlds. Like someone who´s older, we think that we can place them in the same category. If we get too general, like.. we don´t know enough. But it´s a very good question, to ask them. And we try to do that. (Hedmark)*

It seems like the age group might not be specified concerning "leaders" in the stated legacy. As the participants mentioned, there is no doubt that there is a big difference between these age groups, and one would require different strategies to target them. This reveals that age has not been mentioned or communicated properly from NIF. The document analysis did not find any explanations or definitions to the stated legacy, with the only explanation being that it should apply for the whole country (NIF, 2012). Strittmatter (2016) argues in her paper that the lack of legacy planning and explanations to the stated legacy concerning young leaders might only suggest that it only involved the 200 leaders that participated in the young leaders course previous to the event. This study found this to be the only initiative aiming towards the accomplishment of the

promised legacy. 200 people seems to be a small number when thinking about a generation. The participant from Oppland seems to agree that this is still the case.

> *The new generation of leaders... like immediately, I would say that the new generation of leaders and the Youth Olympic´s focus concerned mostly the 200 leaders that took the "leader´s course" previous to the event. Yes. I think so. And that´s good, and in addition there was a certain legacy in the fact that so many people got hired for the event, and got jobs later who serves sports. Yes. So there was a certain legacy concerning that as well. I think that the youth part focused a lot on the 200 leaders we took the course with. And we heard this from the management both in the Youth Olympics and from NIF. (Oppland)*

Is "the new generation of leaders" even still in use? Is the phrase forgotten? In the observations made at the youth sport conference in Trondheim, it was found that the specific messages and talk about the legacy from NIF were rather vague. The invitation for the conference did not mention what was going to be discussed in detail. The promised legacy of "new generations of leaders" was not mentioned at the conference. The phrase was not used, and it has not been named in any of their documents since. Even if the focus on youths in Norwegian organized sports has grown, it could almost seem like NIF may have taken an even more general approach when referring to the desired legacy of YOG2016.

> *So no, I think that NIF has in connection to and post to the Olympics.. and I can see that the focus on youths has grown. I would say that the right word to use would be youth sports to the main legacy. But youth sports have got a lot of focus and attention. (Oppland)*

The legacy´s meaning and what NIF wish to achieve, should be clear for the regional confederations as implementers. However, in the case of the YOG2016 post-games, as with so many others when looking at sport event legacies, it is not clear what the legacy actually means (Preuss; 2007; Cashman, 2005). The implementers´ task to achieve this vague legacy then becomes challenging. A legacy is simply not given (Girginov & Hills, 2008), but need to be understood, planned out and actively worked towards to be achieved (Leopkey & Parent, 2012). Even if the regional confederations are ambitious and recruit many young leaders to Norwegian sports, it is difficult to tell when the legacy is achieved in this case.

The understanding of the formulated legacy, or in this case - the lack of understanding, has consequences for how the regional confederations choose to implement legacy strategies. Will this lead to legitimacy motives concerning the legacy managing as the theory suggests? This will be discussed in the chapter below with guidance from neo-institutional theory and its concepts of isomorphism and institutional pressure.

6.4 Legacy management: legitimacy at the expense of efficiency?

As this study demonstrates, the regional confederations have not been appropriately instructed on how to achieve the desired legacy, nor is the legacy clear to them on what it exactly means. Neo-institutional theory says that organisations that operates with undefined goals will as a consequence seek legitimacy at the expense of efficiency (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983). This theory helps explain why organizations act the way they do. It can then create an understanding to help explain why the desired legacy can be hard to achieve. According to the theory, it was expected that the regional confederations would have been acting in accordance with legitimacy when considering strategies towards an achievement of the young leader legacy. If the confederations acted in accordance to legitimacy in this area, the legacy achievement would not be the most important thing to consider, in fact it may not even be prioritized (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983). The theory supports that it is more important to make the impression that a young leader legacy is striving to be achieved, rather than working efficiently towards this target. This can greatly hinder an achievement of the stated legacy. The regional confederations would do this in order to gain acceptance from the environment; from NIF, other regional confederations, federations, and clubs; and importantly, from stakeholders that helped them fund their strategy implementations towards youths.

In this section the focus will be on the regional confederations and their strategies that aim to target youths as volunteer leaders. It was discovered that their strategies were being affected by each other. This match the theory, that says that within an institutional field organizations tend to become similar (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983). The same goes for the field of Norwegian sport. Do the confederations copy each other to gain legitimacy? Or do they do this in terms of efficiency towards the legacy achievement? These questions are important to answer in order to understand the issue of legacy

management. First, similarities in strategies between the regional confederations will be presented.

6.4.1 Isomorphic processes: Strategy similarities between the regional confederations

The results showed that there were some clear similarities within youth leader strategies among the regional confederations studied. Akershus started their "Young Active" program in connection to the YOG2016 torch relay. This program educated and challenged youth in their role as leaders focusing on sports clubs. The participant told that this program has a connection to a program with the same name in the regional confederation in Nordland. It was said that they have each been shaped by each others strategies. They have learned from each other and it was said that they have been in close contact regarding their strategies.

> *And Nordland was here to learn from YouMe. They took it and turned it back to Young Active. Then we stole that concept back. Like that, we started Young Active again, but this time we took it from Nordland. (Akershus)*

Akershus´ other related program "YouMe", that was said to target 10th graders in school through an education program, where they later would lead fellow student activities. They were also connected to a sports club through the school. This program was said to have roots to similar approaches from other regional confederations.

> *But it is clear that YouMe – Young Mentors, are based upon, for example Østfold has had something similar, or has something similar. Aktiv365 stems from here. We look to each other. That we do, but it is especially that part with Nordland and Young Active where there has been a closer cooperation. (Akershus)*

Buskerud had a program called Aktiv365, which has been going on for several years, and did not start in connection to the YOG2016. However, the participant here also agreed that the regional confederations strategies towards youths connect to each other and contains many similarities.

> *I think it started 10-11 years ago, and there has come a lot of varieties out of that. Akershus has what they call YouMe. Nordland has started Young Active, which comes from YouMe. Like, I´m not saying that it comes from Aktiv365 directly, but these things connect in some way to each other. (Buskerud)*

The representative for Oppland also stated that they wished to adopt new youth leader strategies at the time the interview took place. The "Young Active" initiative was one of the things that was being investigated.

> *And what is being done other places, that Oppland is going to implement now, is this Young Active initiative. (Oppland)*

Why do the regional confederations look to their peers and copy strategies towards young leaders? NIF has given them no guidelines, no additional funding to finance their own strategies, and they do not evaluate their success rate. Youth policy in the context of Norwegian sports has been stated as being vague (Strittmatter, 2016). The regional confederations have expressed that they are not certain on what they are supposed to do in terms of legacy management.

Neo-institutional theory supports that uncertainty is a powerful force that encourages imitation. This creates an understanding in regards to why the regional confederations look to each other; they are in need of guidance as they have not got assistance from NIF in this area. Their peers are thus seen as the best source for direction and guidance. "Organizations tend to model themselves after similar organizations in their field that they perceive to be more legitimate or successful" (DiMaggio & Powell, p. 152). This was also found within the interviews.

> *Cause it gets sort of natural that you want to take the best from those who have things that have succeeded. You get sort of guided voluntarily towards those things that has been working up to now, I think. (Vest-Agder)*

However, with what motives do the regional confederations copy each other? Are youth strategies being used as an excuse for legitimacy reasoning? And do the regional confederations back each other for creating alliances of support, as argued by Meyer and Rowan (1977)? This will be discussed further in the chapters below.

6.4.2 Young representatives: A youth alibi?

Another topic that was going to be discussed further in Oppland, was the start-up of a youth committee for the regional confederation. It was pointed out that this was something that had been working well elsewhere.

And the thing that is happening in Oppland now, is that we´re going to have a board meeting at Saturday in connection with the Sports Gala. One of the things that is on the plan, is a youth committee. That is something I know Telemark and Nordland have had. They have created youth committees. That is also something that Hedmark has done. It basically concerns the focus on youths and engage them through the creation of the youth committee. (Oppland)

However, the participants did not show any sign of legitimacy reasoning when they mimicked other strategies. The regional confederations seemed to agree on certain things, and with that showed resistance to using youths as an alibi and legitimizing the organisation. As NIF had spoken earlier in the process leading up to the YOG2016 about making youths board members within the sports clubs.

Earlier, it was more of getting youths to join the boards of the clubs, but then we have seen that that is not necessarily working out as efficient as the youth committee at ours, or that the youths have their own groups within the clubs. At least we have got that kind of feedback from some that have taken the [youth leader´s] course.. They joined the board, but there were just other experienced adults who did not let the youths participate. (Vest-Agder)

Well, to put a youngster directly into a board full of oldies... I think that´s the best way to get rid of them. Let the youths work with what they want, but in a controlled situation, maybe through different projects that can benefit the clubs. I believe that is necessary to make the youths participate. (Oppland)

The participants were critical, and showed resistance to things they did not think would work out based on their experience. They wanted to be efficient and create results. At least, putting youths in as board members to demonstrate the success of the organization was not the case. These institutional myths and ceremonial actions were not found from the interviews. Both the confederations of Oppland and Vest-Agder pointed to youth committees as a better way of dealing with the lack of youth leaders, as opposed to youths as board members within the clubs. This finding demonstrates the difference in thinking between the regional confederations as implementers, who have practical knowledge, and NIF as policy makers.

6.4.3 Collaborations with the aim of legitimization legacy implementation actions?

From the results of the present study, there seemed to be an overall wish for collaboration between the regional confederations when regarding the issue of youths as leaders. As mentioned above, the regional confederation in Akershus had a connection

to Nordland, regarding “Young Active”. It was said that they gave and took ideas from each other. “We sort of steal a little and cooperate” (Akershus).

Oslo and Akershus also had a connection were they for example ran the youth leaders course together twice a year, with the employees being in close contact regarding youths on the agenda. Collaboration was also found between Hedmark and Oppland regarding their “Mentor project” which they “invented” together. They were said to be in close contact regarding the involvement of youth leaders in sports. Vest-Agder also reported that they had an interaction with the regional confederation in Aust-Agder regarding young leaders, but had to minimize their cooperation due to lack of resources and geographical distance.

Nonetheless, all the participants clearly expressed a wish for more cooperation and interaction between the regional confederations.

> *Yes, a lot more. Yeah, yeah. But we also have these challenges within Norwegian sports. It is a danger that we have all these meetings, because there are so many things that we also need to discuss. It is difficult to find the right amount of times to meet, because we need to do things as well. But I´m thinking that regarding this, we should have something. If it´s not a physical meeting, then we should have some sort of electronic platform where we can put our plans and this is what we do. Do someone have any comments? Has someone done anything similar? (Buskerud)*

There seemed to be a lack of, as well as a wish for, a common communication system to discuss the issue of youth leaders among the regional confederations. Such a platform did not exist. The results show that there was a wish to share more experiences and have a closer collaboration among the regional confederations. They wanted to help others, and they were also ready to receive help.

> *After the project the plan was to make a youth committee-guide. Then we could send it to other confederations so that hey could see like “okay, that´s how they have been doing it”. But we don´t feel like we.. we don´t have enough points on what has been working yet for the guide be ready to send. So that´s what we´re working with. We have a draft. I feel that we need more success factors to be able to say that this is smart to do, and this is should be in place before starting. But we need more examples on what has been working well. (Vest-Agder)*

The theory states that support is guaranteed by agreements, and support is wanted in order to gain legitimacy in the environment (Meyer & Rowan, 1977). Legitimacy is

wanted to make the impression that the organization´s goals are being properly taken care of. However, is legitimacy really the main intention in this case?

One of the participants expressed frustration over the lack of knowledge of what the other regional confederations were doing in terms of young leaders and youth sports. The participant wished for a better communication system, as well as increased sharing of plans and experiences regarding this issue.

> *I think that is is very odd to be present at a NIF seminar or by someone else, and then I hear about Young Active, that it has been started on the initiative from that confederation, and that Akershus are doing it like that, and I haven´t even heard about it! I work with more or less the same courses within my confederation. So I have asked that the people working with the same responsibilities, we should meet up at least once every year. An also that we have a good system where I can share my experiences. What do you think? Do you have any experiences? and so on. (Buskerud)*

Another participant also pointed to the more practical aspect of communication that could benefit all confederations.

> *But there has been a wish that the regional confederations should be in closer contact with each other. Because, if she [a young leader] moves to Stavanger.. maybe they have a youth committee there too, so that the confederations can "share". (Vest-Agder)*

Earlier, this thesis mentioned that the conference in Trondheim had a lack of guidance from NIF in terms of legacy management. Still, both of the participants that were interviewed after the conference experienced the initiative as being very positive and educational. "The money was well spent", as one participant expressed, and it was overall regarded as a good conference.

> *One thing is all the knowledge you get at these conferences, but the other thing is the connections you gain, other people´s experiences, meeting new people, and yeah. I think it was a very good conference. (Oppland)*

Although the regional confederations received no clear guidance from NIF, the conference may have created a meeting spot for the regional confederations that otherwise seemed to be missing when talking about the issue of youth leaders in Norwegian sports. The regional confederations had the chance to meet up, exchange experiences regarding their youth strategies, and make new valuable connections that

could be advantageous for their own programs.

> *I got to talk to a lot of people at the conference, and get to hear the status at the different places. So I think it was good. (Vest-Agder)*

The arena of interaction between the regional confederations when it comes to discussing and sharing experience and knowledge about this issue seems to be missing. All of the study participants agree to this; they long for guidance, and then look to each other for assistance concerning this particular matter. It is something that ideally should have been present after their experience, as pointed out in the quote below.

> *And there exists so much knowledge out there, but it all comes back to the question of resources. How do we take advantage of this? The knowledge has to be made available on the local level. This is what´s so easy to say, but yet so hard to do. You could say that there´s so much knowledge here at ours, but so many mistakes made out there. That´s why it is so important to share these experiences, to a larger extent. Norwegian elite sports.. I´ve been working closely with elite sports and the national ski team.. and that was at the end of the 90s. Then Olympiatoppen was far ahead concerning development. They shared the knowledge and created meeting spots. That might be their success criteria that made them peak at that time. And now I work with grassroots sports, and I discovered that this is not the case here. We´re not supposed to copy elite sports. That´s not the point, but the thing with meeting spots.. We have not reached that stage within Norwegian sports yet. That´s one of the weaknesses, and also a challenge concerning legacy and the YOG. It´s the very same thing, I believe. How to make this knowledge accessible and present in the day to day life. The knowledge, experiences and enthusiasm exists still. The Youth Olympics' created this, but it´s about to fade. There´s still a lot of strong experiences related to the event. A lot more people should take advantage of this. Yeah, we should make that happen, or we can make that happen. (Hedmark)*

I argue that the regional confederations seek efficiency in their hunt for good youth implementation strategies. There is a frustration hanging in the air over the lack of a better system to solve the problem of the lack of youth leaders. The participants want to be able to find the best solution to this problem by seeking cooperation.

> *We do a lot of things with the same intentions, and then we all dig our own direction that really are very similar to each other. We use a lot of resources to achieve a goal that another confederation might have reached a while ago.*
> (Buskerud)

Legitimacy did not explain the legacy implementer´s actions in striving for a young

leader legacy. However, the lack of legacy strategies from NIF have led to uncertainty in the shape of isomorphic processes that make the legacy implementers´ strategies relate to each other. The participants have clearly expressed that they wanted more cooperation in terms of strategies to target youths as leaders. They are knowledgeable and know what hinders their efficiency towards the target. As such, there is a strong focus and agreement among the participants on cooperation with their peers. They are uncertain on what to do regarding the issue of well working youth strategies. There is no overall legacy strategy, so they look to each other for assistance. This is how they become more and more similar.

6.4.4 Institutional entrepreneurs create institutional pressure within the field of Norwegian sports

Oppland´s and Hedmark´s "Mentor project" has been described as a success and it has been presented at both of the events where observations for the current study were made. Their project started in 2014 specifically aiming to benefit from the YOG2016. This initiative also demonstrates the enthusiasm for the games that was not found when interviewing the other regional confederations. Several mentors were selected to assist youths that had taken a leader education in terms of tasks in sport clubs and other, local sport projects. According to the participant from Oppland, their Mentor project was likely to influence other regional confederations as well. This was also confirmed from the research observations.

> *It was being said in Trondheim that there were mentor projects in the planning stage in several regions. So then it is likely that people see that it is necessary and sensible to do. Yeah, to have a system to support youth further.* (Oppland)

The administration of the regional confederations of Oppland and Hedmark saw that it was not enough to simply arrange courses for youths to educate them in their role as leaders. They saw the need to assist the youths further because of the difficulties young leaders faced within the sport clubs. They buffered themselves from the idea that taking a course is enough for goal obtainment, since they had experienced that youths faced considerable challenges as leaders within the sports clubs. They saw that it was not enough to only have strategies that would empower youths as leaders and make them motivated to take on responsibilities within their sport club.

> *It´s easy to... you have to find the youths and get them to participate, but it´s not easy for the youths themselves to go to a club and and say "Hey, listen. I´ve taken the young leaders course. Can you use me?" That is hard. That´s why we thought that we could create a mentor project where we have someone to help them. That would be easier. (Oppland)*

With the implementation of their new project, they created something new within the field of Norwegian sports. They took on the challenge and achieved results that have been seen as a great success when turning to observations collected for this current study. Thus, they can be seen as institutional entrepreneurs in this given case. Their desire to implement additional youth leader strategies can be seen as a wish to keep their role as a successful organization, but still in terms of the efficiency aspect, as legitimacy reasoning was not found. Organizations who are seen as successful, such as the regional confederations of Oppland and Hedmark, contribute to institutional pressure within the movement of Norwegian organized sports. This was a result of the uncertainty within the field concerning youth sport policies.

Having young leaders into NIF structures has over the past decades become an institutional norm (Strittmatter, 2016). With the rise of the YOG2016, it can be argued that this focus has contributed to an even greater strengthening of this institutional rule post-games. With the YOG2016, there has been put a considerable high focus on youths within the sports movement, and the formulated legacy has made it Norwegian sports´ mission to obtain. The focus on youth is sports has therefore been even greater, and NIF has contributed to exposing these successful programs to the movement to emphasize that the legacy is being taken care of. Regional confederations like Oppland, Hedmark, and also Akershus with their "Young Active" initiative, contribute to this pressure by being seen as successful. This pressure comes as a result of uncertainty within the movement. Although NIF does not put any coercive pressure on the regional confederations to manage the desired legacy, NIF indirectly contributes to this pressure by highlighting these successful programs at various events. This has lead to mimetic pressure which affects the regional confederations. It leads other confederations to want to be successful; however, this is not in terms of legitimacy, but in terms of efficiency. The results of the present study show that the regional confederations wanted to see results happen when implementing youth strategies.

> *One sees that one has to start doing things differently now, but yeah. Where that initiative comes from is maybe a little vague. (Akershus)*

In contrast to Strittmatter's (2017) results, who argued that NIF uses the young leader´s course as legitimization of its own actions in order to be perceived as a youth-driven organization, the results of this study show that the legacy implementers actually aimed at achieving efficiency. They actively worked for and wished to get more young leaders into the structures under their regional confederations. Rather than using their work regarding young leaders to enhance legitimacy, they strive for efficiency, as the following quote where the participant was asked to talk about how their "Mentor project" came to be implies:

> *We thought that "well, maybe we should try to create a mentor project to show that we are serious about this". Because we saw that.. both me and (name removed) have experience from clubs, right. You need to catch those youths that are here and make them participate, but it is not easy for youths to go to the club and say "listen, I´ve taken the youth leaders course. Can you use me?" That is hard. That´s why we thought that we could create a mentor project where we have someone to help them. That would be easier. (Oppland)*

This is an interesting finding, as it shows that the perspective of legitimacy of institutional theory was not helpful when trying to understand the actions of the legacy implementers. The legacy implementing actions were not purposefully enhancing legitimacy, as Strittmatter (2017) argued when examining at the young leader´s course pre-event. This indicates that research about legacy implementation needs to differentiate between different hierarchical levels within the organization under scrutiny. Top-level management of sport organizations, such as the NIF leaders, general secretary and board of directors, may pursue legitimacy by formulating an ambitious legacy. However, administrative staff within regional confederations may actually pursue efficiency with the wish to efficiently implement the formulated legacy.

In this study, efficient legacy implementation was not possible for the regional confederations due to the focus on legitimacy from the top-management of NIF. As a result, an efficient legacy achievement was not possible at the regional confederation level at the time the research was conducted.

The stated legacy of the YOG2016 is ambitious, and needs a strategic plan for efficiency, yet, as these thesis has demonstrated, this is not the reality in this case. The legacy process post-games was controlled by institutional processes that greatly affected the regional confederation and their ability to achieve the stated legacy. NIF´s ceremonial actions regarding the legacy planning and management have led the regional confederations to uncertainty that makes the them mimic each other´s youth leader strategies, without fully knowing what the outcome is supposed to be in regards to the stated legacy. This significantly hinders the efficiency process.

7. Conclusion

This master´s thesis examined the post-event phase of the YOG2016 regarding the stated legacy through the conduction of interviews with participants from several regional confederations. The project aimed to answer what institutional processes that hinder the achievement of the formulated legacy "new generation of leaders".

It was found that the regional confederations as legacy implementers were subject to the institutionalisation of the legacy process from NIF. This has led to problems in efficient implementation of the legacy. The stated legacy and the achievement for it to be achieved were seen as vague, and ceremonial acceptance through the use of institutional myths by NIF were used to evaluate the process to avoid illegitimacy. This led to uncertainty among the participants that made them mimic each other´s youth strategies to look for appropriate courses of actions, since an overall legacy plan and strategies were non-existent. Even though there was no great coercive pressure on the regional confederations to implement the young leader legacy, they experienced high degrees of mimetic pressure due to uncertainty on how to get more young people into organized sports. This lead to inefficient legacy implementation.

The regional confederations as implementers were longing for action, results and efficiency, as opposed to NIF who was more concerned with avoiding illegitimacy before considering a legacy achievement. The regional confederations´ actions towards the achievement of the stated legacy did not stem from legitimacy, and demonstrates the difference between policy makers and legacy implementers. These institutionalizing processes created a distance between the politicians and the implementers. Legacy implementers should ideally have been involved in the strategic planning in order for clear guidelines, communication and feeling of legacy responsibility to happen. More importantly, implementers also possess practical and highly valuable knowledge with respect to strategy implementations. The problem is that there is a too great distance up to the policy makers, which hinders efficient legacy implementation. This thesis demonstrates that there is a great need to decrease this gap concerning legacy achievement; thus, legacy implementers should be made a priority in the planning of legacies. A stated legacy has costs for both NIF and the regional confederations to leverage. In addition to this, sufficient planning time is needed.

The regional confederations have the ability to create great results with their youth strategies; however, we do not know when the legacy is reached, because the "new generation of leaders" is not defined. Legacy as a highly institutional concept is a problem in itself; the concept is confusing. Sport organizations and their stakeholders should make higher demands considering a strategy for achieving a legacy. Even if the legacy is not classified as hard or tangible, it is still expensive aiming to obtain.

This study confirms previous research on legacy management. In the end, it all comes back to the construction of the stated legacy, and problems with achieving legacies. In the case of YOG2016, there was a lack of a plan when the legacy was formulated, and the stated legacy of a new generation of leaders was both ambitious and vague for the regional confederations to implement. Still, as long as sports depend on a number of powerful and important stakeholders, sport event legacies will likely remain connected to institutional processes.

7.1 Limitations and suggestions for future research

For this project, it would have been beneficial to conduct interviews with youths who took part in the regional confederations´ implementations strategies to get their experience of legacy implementation efficiency post-games. However, in terms of capacity, this was not an option for this thesis, as a greater number of participants would have been needed from the different regional confederations´ projects and programs.

The translation processes were not looked into when analyzing the legacy management post-games. The way the participants interpreted the stated legacy and the different elements they took into their own programs that were influenced by other actors was also not investigated in depth. Future research has the potential to look into how the regional confederations translate and make these programs and ideas fit into their own organizational system.

Another aspect that could have been considered further is the is legitimation processes concerning the relationship between the regional confederations and their stakeholders, who provided essential funding to finance their youth leader strategies. This study found that efficiency was the main reason for implementing their strategies; however,

legitimacy may have played a bigger role considering these crucial relationships with important stakeholders.

References

Andersen, S. (2013). Casestudier - Forskningsstrategi, generalisering og forklaring. (2. utgave). Bergen: Fagbokforlaget.

Andrew, D., Pedersen, P. & McEvoy, C. (2011). *Research methods and design in sport management*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Allan, J. B. & Bartle, M. (2013). Sport event volunteers´ engagement: management matters. *Managing Leisure. 19*(1), 36-50.

Bell, B. & Gallimore, K. (2015). Embracing the games? Leverage and legacy of London 2012 Olympics at the sub-regional level by means of strategic partnerships. *Leisure studies*, *34*(6), 720-741.

Bryman, A. (2008). Breaking down the quantitative/ qualitative divide. Social research methods (3rd ed., pp. 589-598). New York: Oxford University Press.

Cashman, R. (2005). *The bitter-sweet awakening. The legacy of the Sydney 2000 Olympic Games*. Sydney: Walla Walla Press.

Chappalet, J.-L. (2012). Mega Sporting Event Legacies: A multifaceted concept. *Papales de Europa.*

Crotty, M. (1998). *The foundation of social research*. London, UK: Sage.

DiMaggio & Powell (1983). The iron cage revisited: Collective rationality and institutional isomorphism in organizational fields.

Edwards, A. & Skinner, J. (2009). *Qualitative research in sport management*. Amsterdam Boston: Butterworth-Heinemann.

Garud, R., Hardy, C. & Maguire, S. (2007). Institutional Entrepreneurship as Embedded Agency: An Introduction to the Special Issue. *Organization Studies, 28*(7), 957-969.

Getz, D. (2002). Bidding on events. *Journal of Convention & Exhibition Management*, 5(2) 2003.

Giorgi, A., & Giorgi, B. (2003). Phenomenology. In J. A. Smith (Ed.), *Qualitative physiology: A practical guide to research methods* (pp. 25-50). Thousands Oaks, CA:Sage.

Girginov, G. & Hills, L. (2008). A Sustainable Sports Legacy: Creating a link between the London Olympics and sports participation. *The International Journey of the History of Sports, 25*(14), 2091-2116.

Gratton, C., & Preuss, H. (2008). Maximizing Olympic impacts by building up legacies. *The International Journal of the History of Sport, 25*(14), 1922-1938.

Guba, E. (1990). *The Paradigm dialog*. Newbury Park, Calif: Sage Publications.

Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1994). Competing paradigms in qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 105-117). London: Sage.

Halvorsen, K. (2008). *Å forske på samfunnet: En innføring i samfunnsvitenskapelig metode.* (5th ed). Oslo: Cappelen Akademisk Forlag.

Hanstad, D. V. & Parent, M. M. & Krisitansen, E. (2013). The Youth Olympic Games: the best of the Olympics or a poor copy? *European Sport Management Quarterly. 13*(3), 315-338.

Hanstad, D. V. (2014). A new generation of volunteers. In: Hanstad, D. V., Parent, M. M. and Houlihan, B. (Ed.), *The Youth Olympic Games* (s. 91-105). New York: Routledge.

Hardy, C., & S. Maguire. 2008. “Institutional Entrepreneurship.” In *The SAGE Handbook of Organizational Institutionalism*, edited by R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, K. Sahlin, and R. Suddaby, 198–217. London: Sage.

Hartley, J. F. 1994. Case studies in organizational research. In *Qualitative methods in organizational research: A practical guide*, edited by C. Cassell and G. Symon, 209–29. London: Sage.

Hustinx, L & Lammertyn, F. (2003). Collective and reflexive styles of volunteering: A sociological Modernization Perspective. *Voluntas, 14,* 167-187.

IOC (2014). Innovative Nanjing delivers bright future for Youth Olympic Games. Retrieved 20.04.2015 from http://Olympic.org/nanjing-2014-youth-olympic games

Jacobsen, D. I. (2005). Hvordan gjennomføre undersøkelser? Innføring i samfunnsvitenskaplig metode (2. utgave). Kristiansand: Høyskoleforlaget.

Kellett, P., Hede, A.-M. & Chalip, L. (2008). Social Policy for Sport Events: Leveraging (Relationships with) Teams from other Nations for Community Benefit. *European Sport Management Quarterly, 8*(2), 101-121.

Leng, H. K., Kuo, T. Y., Bayse-Pee, G., & Tay, J. (2012). Make me proud! Singapore 2010 Youth Olympic Games and its effect on national pride of young Singaporeans. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 1-16.

Lillehammer kommune (n.d) Lillehammer Legacy Center. Retrieved 2.10.16 from http://www.lillehammer.kommune.no/ansettelse-lillehammer-legacy-center.5420906-172351.html

Maclean, J. & Hamm, S. (2010). Motivations, commitment, and intentions of volunteers at a large Canadian sporting event. *Leisure/Loisire. 31*(2), 526-526.

Mangan, J. A. (2008). Prologue: Guarantees of Global Goodwill: Post-Olympic Legacies – Too Many Limping White Elephants? *The International Journal of the History of Sports, 25*(14), 1869-1883.

Meyer, B. C. (2001). A case in case study methodology. *Sage Publications, 13*(4), 329 325.

Meyer, J. W. & Rowan, B. (1977). Institutionalized organizations: Formal Structure as Myth and Ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology, 83*(2), 340-363.

Miles, M., Huberman, A. & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis : a methods sourcebook*. Thousand Oaks, Califorinia: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Nichols, G. & Ralston, R. (2010). Lessons from the Volunteering Legacy of the 2002 Commonwealth Games. *Urban Studies*. *49*(1), 169-184.

NIF (n.d). Organisering. Retrived 20.02.2017 from https://www.idrettsforbundet.no/omnif/organisering

NIF (2010). *Søknad om statsgarantier vedr. YOG2016,* Retrived 20.03.2016 from http://docplayer.me/7970855-Til-kulturdepartementet-oslo-15-12-2010-soknad-om-statsgarantier-vedr-yog-2016.htmll

NIF (2011). *Lillehammer 2016: candidate city for the Winter Youth Olympic Games, Volume 1*. Retrieved 20.03.2015 from https://web.archive.org/web/20141021120631/http://www.idrett.no/nyheter/Documents/YOG2016_Lillehammer_VOL1.pdf*f*

Parent, M. M. & Smith-Swan, S. (2013). *Managing major sports events: Theory and practice*. New York: Routledge.

Preuss, H. (2007). The conceptualization and measurement of mega sport event legacies. *Journal of Sport & Tourism*, *12*, 207–227.

Richards, L., & Morse, J. M. (2007). The integrity of qualitative research. In *Readme first for a user´s guide to qualitative methods* (2nd ed., pp. 25-44). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

Thagaard, T. (2009). *Systematikk og innlevelse: En innføring i kvalitativ metode* (3.. utg.). Bergen: Fagbokforlaget.

Thomson, A., Schlenker, K. & Schulenkorf, N. (2013). Conceptualizing Sport Event Legacy. *Event Management, 17*, 111-122-

Toohey, K. (2008). The Sydney Olympics: Striving for Legacies – Overcoming Short Term Disappointments and Long-Term Deficiencies. *The International Journal of the History of Sport*, *25*(14), 1953-1971.

Twynam, G. D., Farrell, J. M. & Johnston, M. E. (2010). Leisure and volunteer motivation at a special sporting event. *Leisure/Loisir. 27*(3-4). 363-377.

Veal, A. J. Toohey, K. & Frawley, S. (2012). The sport participation legacy of the Sydney 2000 Olympic Games and other international sporting events hosted in Australia. *Journal of Policy Research in Tourism, Leisure and Events, 4*(2), 155-184.

Singleton, R. A. & Straits, B. C. (1999). Elements of research design. In *Approaches to social research* (3rd ed., pp. 65-98). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Stake, R. (2005). Qualitative case studies. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed., pp. 443-466). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Strittmatter, A., M. & Skille, E. Å. (2016). Boosting youth sport? Implementation of Norwegian youth sport policy through the 2016 Lillehammer Winter Youth Olympic Games. *Sport in Society.*

Strittmatter, A. M. (2016). Defining a problem to fit the solution: A neo-institutional explanation for legitimising the bid for the 2016 Lillehammer winter Youth Olympic Games. *International Journal of Sport Policy and Politics.*

Strittmatter, A. M. (in press). Increasing youth sport engagement through the Youth Olympic Games: Leveraging strategies and tactics.

Yin, R. K. (1989). *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*. Newbury, California: Sage Publications.

Washington, M. & Patterson, K. D. W. (2011). Hostile takeover or joint venture: Connections between institutional theory and sport management research. *Sport Management Review, 14,* 1-12.

Wollebæk, D. & Sivesind, K., H. (2010). Rapport: Fra folkebevegelse til filantropi? Frivillig innsats i Norge 1997- 2009. Oslo: Senter for forskning på sivilsamfunn og frivillig sektor.

Wollebæk, D., Skirstad, B. & Hanstad, D., V. (2012). Between two volunteer cultures: Social composition and motivation among volunteers at the 2010 test event for the FIS Nordic World Ski Championships. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport. 49*(1), 22-41.

Appendices

Appendix 1: Norwegian Social Science Data Service acceptance for collecting and keeping personal data

Anna-Maria Strittmatter
Seksjon for kultur og samfunn Norges idrettshøgskole
Postboks 4014 Ullevål stadion
0806 OSLO

Vår dato: 13.10.2016 Vår ref: 49920 / 3 / AGL Deres dato: Deres ref:

TILBAKEMELDING PÅ MELDING OM BEHANDLING AV PERSONOPPLYSNINGER

Vi viser til melding om behandling av personopplysninger, mottatt 12.09.2016. All nødvendig informasjon om prosjektet forelå i sin helhet 12.10.2016. Meldingen gjelder prosjektet:

49920	*Strategic Planning and Managing of the Young Leader Legacy of the Youth Olympic Games - Post Event Phase*
Behandlingsansvarlig	*Norges idrettshøgskole, ved institusjonens øverste leder*
Daglig ansvarlig	*Anna-Maria Strittmatter*
Student	*Ingrid Eikestøl Lægreid*

Personvernombudet har vurdert prosjektet og finner at behandlingen av personopplysninger er meldepliktig i henhold til personopplysningsloven § 31. Behandlingen tilfredsstiller kravene i personopplysningsloven.

Personvernombudets vurdering forutsetter at prosjektet gjennomføres i tråd med opplysningene gitt i meldeskjemaet, korrespondanse med ombudet, ombudets kommentarer samt personopplysningsloven og helseregisterloven med forskrifter. Behandlingen av personopplysninger kan settes i gang.

Det gjøres oppmerksom på at det skal gis ny melding dersom behandlingen endres i forhold til de opplysninger som ligger til grunn for personvernombudets vurdering. Endringsmeldinger gis via et eget skjema, http://www.nsd.uib.no/personvern/meldeplikt/skjema.html. Det skal også gis melding etter tre år dersom prosjektet fortsatt pågår. Meldinger skal skje skriftlig til ombudet.

Personvernombudet har lagt ut opplysninger om prosjektet i en offentlig database, http://pvo.nsd.no/prosjekt.

Personvernombudet vil ved prosjektets avslutning, 30.05.2018, rette en henvendelse angående status for behandlingen av personopplysninger.

Vennlig hilsen

Katrine Utaaker Segadal

Audun Løvlie

Kontaktperson: Audun Løvlie tlf: 55 58 23 07

Dokumentet er elektronisk produsert og godkjent ved NSDs rutiner for elektronisk godkjenning.

Personvernombudet for forskning

Prosjektvurdering - Kommentar

Prosjektnr: 49920

Utvalget informeres skriftlig og muntlig om prosjektet og samtykker til deltakelse. Informasjonsskriv mottatt 12.10.2016 er godt utformet.

Ombudet legger til grunn at studenten søker de korrekte instanser om og får tilgang til å være tilstede under møter, samt at det kun gjennomføres observasjon dersom det er innhentet frivillig samtykke fra samtlige møtedeltakere.

Personvernombudet legger til grunn at studenten etterfølger Norges idrettshøgskole sine regler for datasikkerhet.

Forventet prosjektslutt er 30.05.2018. Ifølge prosjektmeldingen skal innsamlede opplysninger da anonymiseres. Anonymisering innebærer å bearbeide datamaterialet slik at ingen enkeltpersoner kan gjenkjennes. Det gjøres ved å:
- slette direkte personopplysninger (som navn/koblingsnøkkel)
- slette/omskrive indirekte personopplysninger (identifiserende sammenstilling av bakgrunnsopplysninger som f.eks. bosted/arbeidssted, alder og kjønn)
- slette digitale lyd-/bilde- og videoopptak

Appendix 2: Written informed consent form

Forespørsel om deltakelse i forskningsprosjektet:

"Strategic planning and managing of the young leader legacy of the Youth Olympic Games 2016 – post-event phase"

Bakgrunn og formål

Ungdoms-OL ble gjennomført i februar 2016 på Lillehammer, Norge. Formålet med studien er å belyse arbeidet for å oppnå den planlagte arven relatert til unge ledere i tiden etter arrangementet.

Et hovedfokus ligger på idrettskretsene som har innflytelse på om arven blir oppnådd, hvordan de arbeider for å nå dette, og hvordan de forstår den planlagte arven slik den har blitt kommunisert. Dette skal belyses ved hjelp av intervjuer og observasjoner.

Prosjektet er en mastergradstudie i Sport Management ved Seksjon for Kultur og Samfunn på Norges Idrettshøgskole.

Utvalget i studien er representanter fra ulike idrettskretser som er involvert i legacy-prosessen av Ungdoms-OL 2016.

Hva innebærer deltakelse i studien?

Hovedtrekkene i studien er datainnsamling via intervjuer og observasjoner. Deltakerne for intervju vil være representanter fra ulike idrettskretser. Spørsmålene vil omhandle hvordan aktørene er involvert i legacy-prosessen av Ungdoms-OL i etterkant av arrangementet. Hvilke aktører idrettskretsene arbeider sammen med? Hva som eventuelt blir gjort annerledes i etterkant av arrangementet med målsetning om å oppnå den planlagte arven? Hvordan blir den planlagte arven forstått? Intervjuet registreres med hjelp av notater og lydopptak.

Observasjon vil foregå på møter arrangert av Norges Idrettsforbund (NIF), eller organisasjonsledd under NIF, der arven etter Ungdoms OL er et tema. Deltakerne vil her være styremedlemmer av idrettskretser, ansatte, frivillige, og de som deltar i

diskusjonen. Observasjon kan da finne sted i Oslo, Akershus, Buskerud, Hedmark, og Oppland.

Hva skjer med informasjonen om deg?

Alle personopplysninger vil bli behandlet konfidensielt. Det er bare forskeren (Ingrid Eikestøl Lægreid) som vil ha tilgang til personopplysninger. Direkte personidentifiserende opplysninger erstattes med et referansenummer som viser til en atskilt navneliste (koblingsnøkkel). Personopplysninger lagres adskilt fra koblingsnøkkel i et låst skap i forskerens låste kontor.

Prosjektet er planlagt ferdigstilt innen 30.05.2017. Personopplysninger vil lagres kryptert i ett år, og vil deretter bli slettet. Under lagringen vil ikke opplysningene kunne vise tilbake til hvem dataene stemmer fra. Hvis prosjektdeltaker ønsker det, vil personopplysninger bli slettet etter prosjektet er avsluttet.

Frivillig deltakelse

Det er frivillig å delta i studien, og du kan når som helst trekke ditt samtykke uten å oppgi årsak. Dersom du trekker deg, vil alle opplysninger om deg bli anonymisert.

Dersom du har spørsmål til studien, ta kontakt med Ingrid Eikestøl Lægreid, tlf. 48277364.

Studien er meldt til Personvernombudet for forskning, Norsk samfunnsvitenskapelig datatjeneste AS.

Samtykke til deltakelse i studien

Jeg har mottatt informasjon om studien, og er villig til å delta

---

(Signert av prosjektdeltaker, dato)

☐ ***Jeg samtykker til å delta i intervju***
☐ ***Jeg samtykker til at personopplysninger kan lagres etter prosjektslutt (1 år)***

Appendix 3: Interview guide

Personlig informasjon

- Kan du fortelle litt om deg selv: hvilken utdannelse, yrkeserfaring og kompetanse har du?

Idrettskretsens arbeid

- Har dere noe arbeid i deres krets som engasjerer ungdom?
  Hvordan engasjeres de?
- Finnes det noe arbeid for å utvikle ungdom som ledere i idretten?
  Hva går programmet/programmene ut på?
  - I hvilken aldersgruppe er deltakerne?
  - Hvor mange deltar?
  - Er det krav for å delta?
  - Når ble disse programmene startet opp?
  - Var noen av disse ungdommene med på "ung leder kurs" i forkant av Ungdoms OL?
  - Hva gjør deltakerne? Brukes de som ledere/trenere i idretten?
  - Følges de opp på noe vis? Hvordan?
- Har du noen innsyn i hvordan andre kretser gjør det?
  - Har dere sett til andre kretser og kopiert noe av det dere gjør fra andre?
- Hva er deres mål med programmet/programmene?
  - Evalueres programmene? Hvordan?
- Hvilken betydning hadde Ungdoms OL på arbeidet med ungdom i deres krets?
  - Har arrangementet gitt dere noen muligheter?
- Er satsningen på ungdomsfeltet høyere etter YOG?
- Evt. Hva blir gjort annerledes?
- Tenker du at dere har medvind nå når det gjelder satsning på ungdom og unge ledere?

Forståelsen av den planlagte arven

- Hvordan tolker du den planlagte arven om utvikling av ungdom innenfor norsk idrett som den er formulert/kommunisert fra NIF?

Andre aktører

- Hvilke aktører er innblandet i programmene?
- Hvordan drar alle parter nytte av samarbeidet?
- Hva slags dialog har dere med disse aktørene?

Relasjon til NIF

- Hvordan ble arven om ledere i tilknytning til YOG formidlet til dere?
- Hva ble kommunisert? Hvordan ble dette kommunisert?
- Er det blitt kommunisert hvordan deres krets skal arbeide mot dette?
- Har dere fått noen føringer? Instrukser eller retningslinjer? I så fall hvilke?
- Har NIF på noen måte presset dere til å adoptere program rettet mot utvikling av ungdom i idretten?
- Får dere ekstra støtte fra NIF om dere implementerer slike programmer?
- Hva skjer hvis dere ikke gjør dette?

Rapporterer dere til NIF om arbeidet deres? Blir dere evaluert på noen måte?

Hvordan har utviklingen i dialogen om arven vært? Før arrangementet, rett etter og nå?

Relasjon til organisasjonskomiteen

- Kan du beskriv deres forhold/tilknytning til organisasjonskomiteen for Ungdoms OL?
- I hvor stor grad følte du at videreformidlingen fra organisasjonskomiteen av arbeidet med ungdomsidrett, unge frivillige og unge ledere var et tema?
    - Noen instrukser fra organisasjonskomiteen retter mot arv?

Hvem tenker du har ansvaret for å oppnå arven?