



**BRITISH ACADEMY
OF MANAGEMENT**

BAM
CONFERENCE

3RD-5TH SEPTEMBER

ASTON UNIVERSITY BIRMINGHAM UNITED KINGDOM

This paper is from the BAM2019 Conference Proceedings

About BAM

The British Academy of Management (BAM) is the leading authority on the academic field of management in the UK, supporting and representing the community of scholars and engaging with international peers.

<http://www.bam.ac.uk/>

Social Enterprise, Public Management, and Institutional Complexity in Global Sporting Mega-Event Projects: Public Service Provision and ‘Legacy’.

Dr Alex G. Gillett

Dr Kevin D. Tennent

(Both of The York Management School, University of York, UK)

Outline and Justification:

Hybrid organizations are defined as “organizations that exist in the intersections of two distinct spheres i.e. the public and the private” (Kickert 2001, p. 135). Indeed, Billis (2010) argues that they inherit characteristics from more than one sector. One form of hybrid organization is Social Enterprise (SE), defined as an organization that trades, not for private gain, but to generate positive social and environmental externalities (Santos, 2012). SE use their sector hybridity to blend social purpose and market-oriented income generation, in whatever co-production model they use (Choi, Berry and Ghadimi, 2018; Choi and Berry, 2018).

Despite expectations for organizational collaboration in public and not-for-profit sectors (Agranoff and McGuire, 2003) and for public-private ‘joint ventures’ (Andrews et al., 2015) as well as emerging research on how individual SE hybrid organizations manage their hybridity (e.g. Batillana and Lee, 2014; Powell et al, 2018; Santos et al, 2015) and their institutional logics (e.g. Besharov and Smith, 2014; Battilana et al. 2015), there are very few existing studies (e.g. Gillett et al, 2016; 2018) to address how hybrids manage these logics in collaborative project-based situations involving actors from multiple sectors, in which combinations of institutional logics result in institutional complexity (Greenwood et al, 2011) leading to ambiguities and problems as to with whom or what responsibilities lie (Timms, 2015). For example, public infrastructure projects must comply with the divergent and even conflicting demands of multiple institutional logics causing institutional complexity (Matinheikki et al, 2018).

We have therefore identified gaps: specifically a need for deeper information regarding the governance of, and management within, complex project-based collaborations involving SE hybrids and public sector bodies, particularly where the multiple collaborators are working to a common goal but with differing priorities.

Definitions of SE and hybrid organizations are compatible and also broad, allowing the SE and hybridity lenses to be applied to a wide variety of organizational forms, including situations including “public value entrepreneurship in multi-actor, multi-level settings” that “often takes the form of co-production and inter-organizational collaboration within or across sectors” (Bryson et al, 2017). Although extant literature has typically focussed on relatively small-scale contexts such as cafes and gardening businesses providing adult social care (e.g. Powell et al, 2018) or regional social housing providers and national initiatives such as ‘Empty Homes’ schemes

(e.g. Gillett et al 2016; 2018), larger and higher profile multi-actor project organizations can also fit the definition.

We therefore propose to apply the SE and organizational hybridity lenses to a much larger-scale and under-researched context: The temporary organizations involved in delivering global mega-sporting events such as the summer Olympic Games and the FIFA World Cup, including their proposed benefits to local communities and longer-term legacy for society. This is important because it is often claimed by organisers - in particular the host national and local government and public authorities, that such events / mega-projects which involve public service and infrastructure development and provision are financially and reputationally very risky (Flyvbjerg, 2014; Flyvbjerg et al, 2003) justify investment because they can be a part of the national and local authorities' strategies to bring community benefits stemming from tourism, local economic multiplier effects, ethical supply chains, and address issues around health and well-being, and regenerate and improve urban areas (e.g. Gillett and Tennent, 2018; Timms, 2015). Indeed, surpluses generated by these events can be used for investment in charitable aims with a societal or public service focus, most famously the 1984 Los Angeles Olympics LA84 Foundation in the USA which is still going strong today, and the legacy for regenerating East London following the 2012 Olympic Games. Such legacy is now an important part of any bid to host the Olympic Games (and also increasingly for the FIFA World Cup).

Our study thus focuses on a special form of SE: Collaborative project-form organizations established and operated to bid for and to deliver global mega-events and a sustainable legacy for society: The summer Olympic Games and FIFA (soccer) World Cup. These organizations typically have a combination of funding streams including earned income from operating the event, private sector backing, as well as contributions from the public and civic sectors (financial and 'in kind'), and re-allocate any profits raised from hosting the mega-event into providing a meaningful longer-term legacy for public infrastructure and/or societal need.

Research Question & Proposed Theoretical Contribution

We use the sport mega event project organizations as a vehicle to address the broader research question *'how do SEs manage institutional complexity over the evolution of a mega-project in order to leverage non-financial (public service and infrastructure) as well as financial benefits for society in short-term and in the long-term?'*

The theoretical contribution is to critically examine the factors that enable SEs to build effective relationships, to govern themselves and project manage effectively, and to evolve over the duration of a defined project in scenarios where objectives are divergent and at times conflicting. Specifically, the contribution will relate to institutional complexity and collaborative working, how the SEs successfully planned and delivered hybrid objectives as the project evolves (I.e. to win the rights to host and deliver a world-class event that promotes the host location, provide operational services and infrastructure to the public such as transport and security, catalyse the market for soccer in the USA, and also to generate a cash surplus for re-investment in societal/'good' causes in host communities), how effectively they work with

government stakeholders to achieve public management objectives, and the extent to which the planned-for public service outcomes in the form of community benefits and reinvestment in the social mission were achieved.

As well as the longitudinal nature of our data which covers three decades (see below), our proposed study is particularly novel for the public management and SE/hybridity literatures because of the nature of our two comparative cases: temporary project-form organization, operating as part of multi-million dollar projects of global significance.

Methodology

Our study focuses on two comparative longitudinal cases: The 1994 FIFA World Cup and the 1996 Summer Olympic Games, both held in the USA. These cases are very interesting because of the amount of data we have been able to obtain in relation to our research objective, and also the benefit of having a truly longitudinal run of data (1980s-present date) from which to generate highly informative cases spanning planning, delivery, and long-term legacy. This is consistent with the recommendations of Wond and Macaulay (2011) whose article published in *Public Management Review* identified the benefits in using longitudinal research and considering extended temporality in public management and public policy research and evaluation, which they argue is too often short-term in nature. It is also supported by Rose (1993) who identifies the importance of the contexts of temporality and geography (or ‘time’ and ‘space’) in lesson-drawing in public policy.

We use inductively based archival research, drawing upon project documents owned by FIFA (soccer’s global governing body) and the International Olympic Committee (IOC) and by local USA based SE project organizations, along with periodicals and secondary sources to triangulate and compensate for the problems of archival silence and selection (Decker, 2013; Kipping, Wadhvani, & Bucheli, 2013).

Returning to the documents generated by the original stakeholders is the optimal way of avoiding the danger of ahistoricism, enabling our understanding of how the Olympic and World Cup projects were contextualized within the economic and social settings of its time, rather than applying our present-day understanding of these events to the past. This historical survey of the topic allows us to examine planning and organization, and the extent to which the FIFA World Cup and summer Olympic Games of that period were captured by social and economic concerns. We offer a public management and organizational history of a global event, focusing on the institutional context and the organizations involved in delivering the event.

Using historical methods is valuable because a temporal perspective allows us to see the longitudinal scope and the process of a project, while avoiding concerns about the presentism of much management research (Biesenthal, Sankaran, Pitsis, & Clegg, 2015). Maylor, Brady, Cooke-Davies, and Hodgson (2006) argue that where a task stretches over many years, a project is not a temporary organization. However, our project is, by definition, a temporary organization, as there was a defined plan and period for project delivery. A further benefit of an historical study is that we were

able to observe longer-term legacy, such as the ways in which profits generated from hosting the FIFA World Cup were re-invested into community sport programmes, organizations and projects for several years after the event had ended.

By focusing on two case studies, we aim to draw out the deep structures of the cases, drawing richer and more detailed insights than possible from a greater number of case studies (Dyer & Wilkins, 1991; Platt, 1988). We use these insights to evaluate the case studies, highlighting the general in particular in order to uncover the “dynamics of phenomena” (Maclean, Harvey, & Clegg, 2016, pp. 612–613). In doing this, we follow the lead of Eisenhardt (1989) in highlighting the extent to which historical specificity matters—in this case, creating opportunities for future researchers to exploit the differences between this and the involvement of SEs in other mega-projects.

Following Yin’s (2003) matrix of relevant situations for different situation strategies, our study exists within the overlap of archival analysis, history, and case study. We are mainly concerned with the “How?” and “Why?” of our cases in relation to motives and decision making, and ultimately, to the legacy of the event in terms of outcomes relevant to public management. We are mostly concerned with the past, although we also have an interest in contemporary manifestations of “legacy,” such as events to commemorate the 25th anniversary of the 1994 World Cup tournament, particularly now that the USA has been announced as a host country for the 2026 edition of the FIFA World Cup. With reference to Yin’s (2003) taxonomy, it will not be necessary to control behavioral events because most have already occurred, while the ongoing legacy can be observed.

Regarding data analysis, over several years we have already travelled internationally to collect a unique and extensive collection of empirical archival material generated by the local and national level organizers from archives held in the USA, and also from archives based in Switzerland (where the IOC and FIFA are based), as well as from myriad other sources, including data produced by the US public sector on tourism, economic data, news sources, and so on with which to triangulate. We have since created an extensive database, from which we will systematically induce our themes.

References

Agranoff, R. and McGuire, M., 2004. *Collaborative public management: New strategies for local governments*. Georgetown University Press.

Battilana, J. and Lee, M., 2014. Advancing research on hybrid organizing—Insights from the study of social enterprises. *The Academy of Management Annals*, 8(1), pp.397-441.

Battilana, J., Sengul, M., Pache, A., & Model, J. (2015). Harnessing productive tensions in hybrid organizations: The case of work integration social enterprises. *Academy of Management Journal*, 58(6), 1658–1685.

Biesenthal, C., Sankaran, S., Pitsis, T. and Clegg, S., 2015. Temporality in organization studies: Implications for strategic project management. *Open Economics and Management Journal*, 2(1).

Besharov, M. L., & Smith, W. K. (2014). Multiple institutional logics in organizations: Explaining their varied nature and implications. *Academy of Management Review*, 39(3), 364–381.

Billis, D. (2010). Towards a theory of hybrid organizations. In D. Billis (Ed.), *Hybrid organizations and the third sector* (pp. 46–69). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Bryson, J.; Sancino, A.; Benington, J. and Sørensen, E. (2017). Towards a multi-actor theory of public value co-creation. *Public Management Review*, 19(5) pp. 640–654.

Choi, Donwe and Frances Berry. 2018. Can Infused Publicness Contribute to Enhancing Public Value? Examining the Impact of Government Funding on the Performance of Social Enterprises in South Korea, under review, April 2018.

Choi, Donwe, Frances Berry and Adela Ghadimi. 2018. Considering the potential of social enterprise in addressing social problems and creating public value: A comparative analysis of American, British, and Korean social enterprises. Under review, May 2018.

Decker, S. (2013). The silence of the archives: Business history, postcolonialism and archival ethnography. *Management & Organizational History*, 8(2), 155–173.

Dyer, W. G., & Wilkins, A.L. (1991). Better stories, not better constructs, to generate better theory: A rejoinder to Eisenhardt. *Academy of Management Review*, 16(3), 613–619.

Eisenhardt, K. M. (1989). Building theories from case study research. *Academy of Management Review*, 14(4), 532–550.

Flyvbjerg, B. (2014). What you should know about megaprojects and why: An overview. *Project Management Journal*, 45(2), 6–19.

Flyvbjerg, B., Bruzelius, N., & Rothengatter, W. (2003). *Megaprojects and risk: An anatomy of ambition*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Gillett, A., Loader, K., Doherty, B. and Scott, J.M., 2016. A multi-organizational cross-sectoral collaboration: empirical evidence from an ‘Empty Homes’ project. *Public Money & Management*, 36(1), pp.15-22.

Gillett, A., Loader, K., Doherty, B. and Scott, J.M., 2018. An examination of tensions in a hybrid collaboration: A longitudinal study of an empty homes project. *Journal of Business Ethics*, pp.1-19. Online first DOI : <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-018-3962-7>

Gillett, A.G. and Tennent, K.D., 2017. Dynamic sublimes, changing plans, and the legacy of a megaproject: the case of the 1966 soccer world cup. *Project Management Journal*, 48(6), pp.93-116.

Greenwood, R., Raynard, M., Kodeih, F., Micelotta, E.R. and Lounsbury, M., 2011. Institutional complexity and organizational responses. *Academy of Management Annals*, 5(1), pp.317-371.

Kickert, W.J., 2001. Public management of hybrid organizations: governance of quasi-autonomous executive agencies. *International Public Management Journal*, 4(2), pp.135-150.

Kipping, M. R., Wadhvani, D., & Bucheli, M. (2013). Analyzing & interpreting historical sources: A basic methodology. In M. Bucheli & R. D. Wadhvani (Eds.), *Organizations in time: History, theory, methods* (pp. 305–329). Oxford, England: Oxford University Press

Maclean, M., Harvey, C., & Clegg, S. R. (2016). Conceptualizing historical organization studies. *Academy of Management Review*, 41(4), 609–632.

Matinheikki, J., Aaltonen, K. and Walker, D., 2018. Politics, public servants, and profits: Institutional complexity and temporary hybridization in a public infrastructure alliance project. *International Journal of Project Management*.

Maylor, H., Brady, T., Cooke-Davies, T., & Hodgson, D. (2006). From projectification to programmification, *International Journal of Project Management*, 24, 663–674.

Platt, J. (1988). What can case studies do? *Studies in Qualitative Methodology*, 1, 1–23.

Powell, M., Gillett, A. and Doherty, B., 2018. Sustainability in social enterprise: hybrid organizing in public services. *Public Management Review*, pp.1-28. 21:2, 159-186, DOI: [10.1080/14719037.2018.1438504](https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2018.1438504)

Rose, R., 1993. *Lesson-drawing in public policy: A guide to learning across time and space* (Vol. 91). Chatham: Chatham House Publishers.

Santos, F. M. (2012). A positive theory of social entrepreneurship. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 111(3), 335–351.

Santos, F. M., Pache, A.-C., & Birkholz, C. (2015). Making hybrids work. *California Management Review*, 57(3), 36–58.

Timms, J. (2015). A socially responsible business legacy: Raising standards in procurement, supply chains and employment at the London Olympics of 2012. In R. Holt, & D. Ruta (Eds.), *Routledge Handbook of Sport and Legacy: Meeting the Challenge of Major Sports Events* (pp. 217-228). (Routledge International Handbooks). Oxon: Routledge.

Wond, T. and Macaulay, M., 2011. Extending Time–Extended Benefits: Using longitudinal research in public management evaluation. *Public Management Review*, 13(2), pp.309-320.