

Original Article

Proactive Management of Olympic Legacies: Updating Munich 1972 in the Perspectives of Triple Helix Model

BIANCA GAMA PENA¹; LEONARDO JOSÉ MATARUNA DOS SANTOS²; LAMARTINE PEREIRA DACOSTA¹

¹ Physical Education Department, State University of Rio de Janeiro, BRAZIL

² College of Business Administration, American University in the Emirates, Dubai, UNITED ARAB EMIRATES

Published online: September 30, 2019

(Accepted for publication: August 27, 2019)

DOI:10.7752/jpes.2019.03237

Abstract:

In the mega-events of the Olympic Games, we can identify and evaluate the presence of three protagonists named as university, companies and government, when considering the Triple Helix (TH) model, currently adopted in project management. This study aims to analyze the performance of the three actors involved in the management of a selected Olympic legacy i.e. the Olympic Park in Munich, product of the 1972 Olympic Games, with the purpose of verifying the decision making in the scenarios: a) **IOC recommendations and b) studies in the same theme provided by specialized literature**. It was then used i) documental analysis, from the site of the Olympic Park, ii) field research with unstructured qualitative observation method and iii) interview with semi-structured **instrument**. We interviewed 3 sponsors, 2 management people and a sponsorship contract management company. **Conclusively**, the actor university proved to be non-existent **but** government **acted** as the largest subsidiary of the Park, prevailing then a private company. In addition, the study also concluded that for the management of the Olympic legacy, a **proactive** path is required to attract partners with greater efficiency involving the **TH** players, focusing on attracting company resources, considering the partners' needs in offering the programs that achieve common goals, as well as clearly understand expected outcomes and align specific goals with the overall goal of the project, visualizing it as part of the enduring legacy of the event.

Key Words: innovation, sporting mega-events, olympic games, sport management.

Introduction

The concept of a "legacy" of sport megaevents emerged during the 1990s, when questions about their costs and benefits were raised. Firstly, these impacts were examined from a financial and economic point of view and a posteriori in relation to social and environmental aspects, as is shown in Chappellet (2012). Later, the term legacy was explicitly mentioned in 1991 when the Organizing Committee of the 1996 Atlanta Centennial Olympic Games included in its mission the expressed goal by the declaration: "To leave a positive physical and spiritual legacy and a mark in Olympic history, organizing the most memorable Olympic Games of all time" (ACOG, 1997).

Three years before the 2002 *Commonwealth Games* in Manchester, a "Commission of Games Opportunities and Legacies Partnerships" was set up by that UK city to deal with the post-games phase. In 1997, the Athens Olympics Games Application Committee 2004 titled a brochure presenting its project "A Legacy for Olympism" (ABC, 1997). On the other hand, the International Olympic Committee (IOC) Evaluation Committee, which was set up to evaluate the 2008 Games, said in its 2001 report: "The Commission believes that the Beijing Games will leave an unique legacy to China and to sport" (IOC, 2001, p.95). It was therefore no surprise that in 2003 the IOC amended its "Olympic Charter" to include a fourteenth mission: "To promote a positive legacy of the Olympic Games to host cities and host countries" (rule 2.14).

Moreover, in the case of the most recent edition of the Rio's Olympiad, the planning for the legacy formally began in 2009 when the IOC's 121st Session in Copenhagen chose Rio de Janeiro as the host city for the 2016 Olympic Games. Once that city made the decision to run for the Olympic Games, the legacy carried on in all its activities. According to the IOC president, this was the reason for the successful election (IOC, 2016). Ultimately, according to Chappellet (2012), the classification of the sporting mega-events legacies could be seen under different perspectives by their stakeholders. Thus far, the author in focus classifies in principle the legacy as positive or negative, tangible or intangible, territorial or personal, intentional or unintentional, global or local, short or long term, sporting or unrelated to sport.

In short, the legacy of the Games is a multifaceted and widely recognized topic. It is due to the city due to the improvements of urban infrastructure resulting from the Games; for the local population, it is characterized as a progressive expansion of multiple achievements (Dacosta, 2008). In other words, to a better understanding of the

manifestation of the legacy, it is advisable to evaluate the actions planned before and those carried out during the mega-event so that these multifarious achievements will effectively take place after the event.

The first impacts that a legacy begins to develop can be observed by footprints, that is by “Footprints of the Mega-events” (Mataruna-Dos-Santos & Pena, 2017), using a current technical jargon. Such concept is based on the traces and marks left by the event in a locality, and it is sprawling in layers for the city, state, region, country until the borders are crossed. The *footprints* can be classified as *short (short)* - being evidenced before, during and up to one year from the end of the event; *medium* one to three years after the event; or *long* - three to five years after the event. Mataruna-Dos-Santos and Pena (2017, p.6) further elucidate that footprints are generally accompanied by criticism and that they develop popular questioning of the impacts and traces that will influence the handling of the legacy over the years. Symptomatically, concerning the case of Munich 1972 Olympics, the terrorist attacks negatively marked the Games for decades afterwards (Large, 2012; Reeve 2000).

As far as Munich 1972 refer directly to terrorism the development of the legacy tries to move away from its footprints, without erasing the story. Significantly it remains alive in the sport museum both of Cologne (Germany) and at the Olympic Museum in Lausanne (Switzerland) as well, but not being shown in Munich in the same dimensions and narratives. To deny the attacks, or hide this episode, would be a deviation of the historical fact so far what was conversely managed by creating an alternative symbolic memory: in the Olympic Village of Munich the footprintson focus were elevated to the legacy degree with totems and messages marking this grueling moment in the history of the Olympic Games and they have been kept physically present until today at the Olympic Park. Furthermore, these memorial facilities have become the main legacy of the 1972 Olympic Games, standing out as a major leisure attraction in Europe (Schiller, 2010).

The context of the legacies was, however, reassessed by Campestrini (2015), in the case of an infrastructure legacy. This researcher proposed the adaptation of the mega-events’ projects in a customized way with the peculiarities of the region where the sport equipment was built, these being: (a) historical of the installation, (b) habit of entertainment consumption and income of the population, (c) events of competition analysis, (d) possible attractions, (e) tourism, (f) maintenance costs, among others. Thus, this proactive and multiple analysis is classified as fundamental, in principle, from the standpoint of maintaining the Olympic Park (OP) - the main area of the Olympic Games (OG) - so that it is not only financially sustainable, but also attractive to the local population after the Games.

Munich in these concerns showcases an even more remarkable history of legacy since it opened the doors of the local Olympic Park (MOP) for leisure to the German community shortly after the completion of the OG. Therefore, the different cases of OP becomes a significant scenario for the analysis of the legacy management model.

Theoretically speaking, having behind the sustainable and overall demands of legacies, an interactive management process, involving several actors collaborating through their potentialities, is needed to evaluate the universe of stakeholders. Those supportive actors are generally found in companies, in universities and in government entities, operating together or by independent initiatives. When these three institutional actors emerge as an aggregation they are able to have a typical function addressed as a collaborative process which is proposed under the name of Triple Helix - TH (Etzkowitz, 2006). This theoretical model developed by means of practical examples, operates in the sense of leveraging innovation in science and technology through the interaction between the three protagonists mentioned; it is understood by companies or the private initiative, government or public support, and universities or educational institutions. In addition, the Triple Helix provides a methodology for examining strengths and weaknesses and filling gaps in the relationships between these institutional actors. By its general and practical background, the so called TH theory was chosen by the present investigation for the analysis of the MOP management scenario in light of its legacies.

In Table 1 we look forward a better clarification of the TH potentialities presenting the attributions of each actor of the model’s spheres stratified by spaces, according to conceptions, classifications and denominations of Etzkowitz (2010).

Table 1. Assignments of the actors of the Triple Helix

Spaces	Spheres		
	Government	Companies	Universities
Knowledge	Mobilization of resources	Mobilization of resources	Mobilization of resources
	Policies to increase company participation in public research	Research and development performance R&D	Research and development performance R&D
	Promotion of policies to support partnerships	Promotion of partnerships	Training

Innovation	Appropriation of technologies (non R&D)	Technology Transfer	Entrepreneurial Education
	Realization of consortia	Realization of consortia	Realization of consortia
	Entrepreneurial Activities	Entrepreneurial Activities	Ability to generate and transfer technology
	Ability to generate technology	Incubation program (venture capital)	Intellectual Property Policies and Generation of Patents
	Creation of new organizations with the three actors	Intellectual Property and Generation of Patents	Incubation program
Consensus	Market formation	Market formation	Market formation
	Governance support: Transparency between public, private	Governance support: Transparency between public, private	Governance support: Transparency between public, private
	Interdependence between organizations	Interdependence between organizations	Interdependence between organizations

Adapted from Etzkowitz (2010)

While TH has been designed with a focus on effectiveness of innovation and entrepreneurship, the model has revealed an expressive breadth of validity, proving to be efficient to explain a wide range of management and economic areas. Among these areas, sporting is the one with the potential to focus the Olympic sport experiences, provided their impacts are mostly recognized directly or indirectly through the interaction between the actors.

A fact of significant value to the debate about the applicability of TH is referred to the sport mega-events which are able to eventually aggregate the three protagonists as stakeholders and increase so far the viability of that enterprise including the promotion of innovation. This proactive capability was demonstrated by Terra, Batista & Almeida (2013) following up universities training the workforce, companies with the financial support and the government also financially supporting and facilitating local legal procedures in sport large commitments. Despite these evidences, there is a gap in the literature regarding the analysis of the applicability of TH in the post sporting mega-event context, i.e. direct application to the realization of the legacy. Consequently, this study aims to investigate an Olympic installation considered as an effective legacy of the 1972 Games: the Munich Olympic Park in Germany; being a sociocultural and sports activities facility, it is hypothetically adaptable to the perspective of the Triple Helix, being able to apply the model in the interests and in the decision making of the scenarios henceforth selected by the present study.

Material & Methods

The present study adopted the following methods: a) documentary analysis, from the site of the Olympic Park; b) field research with the method of unstructured qualitative observation (Veal & Darcy, 2014, p. 226), the background observation in this study was carried on by two physical education professionals, with experience in sport management, one doctor and the other doctoral student. Field journal entries were made from visits to the facilities of the Olympic Park on a systematic weekly basis during the months of February and March 2017 and c) interview with a semi-structured itinerary (*op cit*, p. 226) with: 1) sponsors of the Park, 2) people running the park, and 3) management company for Park sponsorship contracts.

The criterion-selection method (Veal & Darcy, 2014, p. 403) was used in the interviews with the park director, the former director as well as the marketing director since the interviewees were selected based on specific criteria as follows. We considered important to interview the former director of the Park because of the 45 years of management of the park post OG in Munich in 1972. The interview with the director was relevant so that we can understand the current status and the forecasts for the future. The director of the marketing company was interviewed in order to understand the model of integration of the sponsors with the management of the Park. Sponsors of the MOP were evaluated in order to understand their motivation to participate in the official Park's sponsorship program. In addition, it was developed a semi-structured instrument for the interviews with the sponsors of the Park, conducted according to the proposal of Apostolopoulou (2004). For the research carried out with the Park management team, the semi-structured instrument were submitted to an assessment by three PhDs, being a researcher from the Technical University of Munich (Sports Marketing Department) and a researcher from the University of Patras in Greece (Department of Sports Marketing) and the other from the State University of Rio de Janeiro (Department of Post-Graduation in Exercise and Sports Sciences).

The study was constituted by the population: a) Sponsors: the sponsorship program of the MOP was composed of seven sponsors, which had only one category of sponsorship, b) Olympic Park management team: consisting of seven people in different sectors internally, as well as, c) an outsourced marketing company responsible for attracting sponsorship.

An e-mail was sent inviting the seven sponsors and four responded, but only three agreed to participate in the study. The director, the former director of the Park, as well as the director of the marketing company also received an email inviting them to take part in the study and all three accepted. The respondents were informed of the research objectives by reading and consenting by means of the Free Informed Consent Form (FICF), duly approved by the Ethics Committee of the State University of Rio de Janeiro. Table 2 presents the profile of the participants.

Table 2. Profile of participants

Interviewee	Sector or Formation	Post interviewed
Company 1	Beverage Provider	Marketing director
Company 2	Ice cream Provider	Commercial and marketing director
Company 3	Hotel chain	Chief Marketing Officer
Director of the Park	Management training and accounting	Former financial director of the park.
Marketing company	Marketing training	Director of the marketing company.
Former director of the Park	Engineering training	Director of the park for 43 years from 1973 to 2016.

Information obtained from interviews

The interviews with the director of the Park as well as with the sponsors occurred in their offices and the interview with the former director took place in his own house. All interviews had an average duration of 1h30 occurring in the city of Munich in Germany between January 2017 and April 2017. The interviews were recorded with a recording device of the a brand called VERDE, transcribed by the interviewer (Silverman, 2010, p. 55), and submitted to the interviewees for validation. The software MaxQDA 11, version 2017, recognized and classified by the CAQDAS - *Computer Assisted Qualitative Data Analysis* for data aggregation (Verbi, 2017) was used to analyze the data.

Results & Discussion

The speeches of all the interviewees led us to extract quotations in search of the understanding about the preponderant elements for the management of the MOP. The reports of participants highlighted through interviews are shown in Table 3.

Table 3: Data

Interviewee	Interview data / frames
1. Director of the MOP	"The MOP is an almost integral subsidiary of the Government. The management team is composed by the General Manager and the heads of the following departments: financial, technical, sales and events, and the continuous business."; "The MOP is responsible for the management of Olympic venues. The facilities are outsourced to companies in exchange for rent payment."; "The Park has its own events, sports, fireworks show, as well as cultural fair, considered as socio-cultural sports attractions"; "In 2016, the MOP hosted more than 400 events and more than four million people visited the Olympic Park."
2. Former director of the MOP	"The MOP was opened to the public in the following year of the OG as a result of legacy planning in the period before the OG. To maintain attractiveness, we have developed modern and attractive event formats to inspire the participation of 15- to 25-year-olds."; "The Park has a daily active life, and its facilities are a stage for the sports-cultural practice, place of leisure and entertainment. These activities are funded by the German population through taxes and by the government as a form of social return."
3. Director of the marketing company	"The fundraising culture was only adopted in 2010 when the government reduced the transfer of funds. The government concern in establishing alliances with the companies, in order to make their actions and projects sustainable."; "As a marketing strategy, the MOP sponsors exploit the space in order to ensure the visibility of their brand with the public as well as making their year-end events with their employees in the Olympic installation."
4. Company -A	"We have exclusive sales of our products and an exclusive restaurant in the Park."; "We chose to sponsor the MOP based on the daily amount of the public."
5. Company -B	"We have space inside the park to promote and sell our products."; "We sponsor the cultural and sports appeal that the Park has, characterizing it as the great center of tourist attraction and of the German population."
6. Company -C	"I do not receive any accompanying report with goals and indicators regarding sponsorship"; "We have exclusivity to reserve rooms in our hotel network thus obtaining good revenues".

Information obtained from interviews

In view of the statements in Table 3, it is important to highlight the IOC's "2020 Agenda" with recommendations issued in 2014, such as: (1) learning to control costs of maintenance and equipment improvements for consumers; (2) commercial activities that are well accepted by the public in a specific way according to each locality; (3) content and attractions to be promoted on site; (4) form of financing made during the construction phase of the facility and its respective amortization over time, which affect the profitability and cash flow of the project; and (5) definition of clear and feasible indicators that measure the efficiency of the installation and assist in the management of the site. Summarizing, these five general IOC recommendations have correspondence with frames 3, 4, 5 and 6 from Table 3 bringing legitimacy to the synthetic approaches from the respondents.

Furthermore, Schiller (2010), in his book dedicated to 1972 OG gives grounds initially to the appreciation of Table 3 approaches when considering the "Park a legacy of the OG of 1972". The author claims to be the MOP the "Europe's most popular leisure attraction" (Schiller, 2010, p. 227). In addition to this legacy of infrastructure, according to the author, the city developed other heritages, among them: a) the restructuring of the subway b) large parks and sports plazas, c) 6000 apartments d) 3 schools and e) revitalization of existing sports arenas. Schiller (2010) also suggests that because of all the established legacy of infrastructure, the city has been included in the European tourist route of visitation. Shortly after the Munich Olympics, until 1985, 5.8 million overnight stays were verified in the city's hotel network. The city hosted until 1977, 21 million paying visitors, with an average of 11,000 sport participants per week (*op. cit.*, 2010, p. 227). Overall, these data are supportive to frames 1, 2 and 3 confirming the state of art forwarded by Schiller (2010).

Concomitantly and highlighting the statements from interview 1 (Table 3), checks are required and although there has been partnership with companies in the case in question, it was necessary to establish a path for the improvement of the attraction of more resources coming from the private initiative as well as improvements in the governance model especially in the area of transparency. In terms of a proactive decision making this option to be applied would demand fiscal incentives, as suggested by Etzkovitz (2010), in which the government's attribution is set by encouraging companies to support programs related to culture, science and technology, innovation and sports.

Still in view of the sponsors' lack of knowledge of indicators and alignment of expectations related to targets as suggested by interview 3 framed in Table 3 there might had a discontinuation of support, as they were not statistically aware of the benefits of linking their brand to the Park. In this case Motta et al (2018) in the study of the theory of TH as a strategy of establishing a partnership between physical education and companies, suggests that listening to the interested party is fundamental to understand the demand, thus assuming a more strategic position rather than just operational.

Another important aspect is related to the university: none of the interviewees reported by Table 3, who are managers of the Park as well as sponsors, mentioned a university as a missing or present actor in the management of the Park. This allows us to conclude that the actors, companies and government do not understand in this case the potential role that the university could assume in the management of the MOP as well as the power of collaboration of this actor for a more effective performance of the government and business actors. Due to the absence of the university in the statements, it is understood that the Park no longer takes advantage of the capacity to generate research and to develop programs in partnership with researchers of the academic environment, thus not occurring the pillar research and development of knowledge. It would be like taking the increasing theoretical knowledge with practical needs to think intelligent and innovative solutions for the management of the Olympic equipment reducing the negative impacts of the legacies and optimizing the available data management decisions.

Indeed, the post-Olympics challenge of the Olympic Park is also exemplified in two specific cases of legacy: Barcelona 1992 OG and London 2012 OG. In the first case, Simón (2017) discusses the powerful success narrative of Barcelona in relation to the maintenance as a legacy of the four Olympic Parks (Montjuic, Diagonal, Vall d'Hebron and Parc de Mar), competition and training facilities, which are now considered as socio-cultural sports attractions. These approaches agree with declarations of the Director of MOP (frame 1, Table 3) who explicitly refers to cultural meanings of the Park's programs. Simón (2017) also points out that one of the determining factors for this implementation was the creation of a mixed economic model (public and private), reinforcing the affirmation of our study regarding the power of TH for the sporting context. There is also the presence of a university within the Olympic Park of Montjuic, characterizing a case of integration to groups of studies applied to the sport. Again the declarations of respondents show a convergence with public & private collaboration (frame 3) despite the missing link with universities.

Regarding London 2012, Gold (2017) presents the strategies for the maintenance and use of the Queen Elizabeth Olympic Park (QEOP), corroborating the idea of an entertainment center and, therefore, an important focus for the management of the legacy, as well as the importance of management of partnerships. The QEOP includes Olympic Stadium, Aquatic Center, Velodrome, Multipurpose Arena, Hockey Center, Olympic Village and Media Centers. All arenas are available for public use with programming for both families and international competitions. There are also cultural and sporting events throughout the year in the open spaces of the QEOP

through private public partnership. In all, those entertainment approaches are much alike the positions framed by Table 3, interviews 1 and 2.

In this context of good results, it is worth emphasizing the theme of the sports facility costing as a relevant challenge. According Campestrini (2015) is of paramount importance that the managers of new arenas and sports facilities seek alternatives and solutions to monetize them. The author exemplifies the case of the Amsterdam Arena, which is one of the most acclaimed sports facilities in the world for its multifunctionality and resource generation. Yet it took at least five years to deliver positive results in its operation, and success finally emerged through effective partnership management. These interpretations correspond again with the essential meanings reported by Table 3, especially in interviews 3, 4 and 5.

Conclusions

Due to the lack of mention of the TH model by the interviewees, it is noted that the management model is not known by the managers as well as to the sponsors. This may be the reason why the model is not applied, which would be explained mainly by the absence of the university in several cases of legacy. Therefore, the use of the TH model under proactive conditions could optimize the operation of the MOP since each actor would be positioned to perform its functions in its maximum capacities, as presented in Table 1, above all, for a) the production of the relevant knowledge in the universities and transfer of this knowledge to society; b) technological innovation in companies; c) government as agent and not subsidiary almost entirely in the management process.

An immediate theoretical and practical contribution of this study focuses conclusively through the proposition that the presence and interaction of the three actors of the Triple Helix presents itself as viable for the legacy management of Olympic infrastructure and can be applied in other areas for the management of mega-events, in spite of its limited knowledge by its managers.

In final accounts, for the management of the Olympic legacy, one must consider prior planning of strategies for attracting financial resources and partners, identifying their needs to offer them programs that achieve common goals. It is also advisable to build a network of partnerships to ensure the development of the project, including government, companies and universities, viewing them as catalysts of the event's lasting legacy.

Conflicts of interest - The authors don't have any conflicts of interest to declare.

Funding - Apoio da União Europeia Projeto IRSES: FP7 PEOPLE – 2013 – IRSES (612614)

References

- ABC (1997). *A Legacy for Olympism*. Athens: 2004 Olympic Bid Committee.
- ACOG (1997) *The Official report of the centennial olympic games*. Atlanta Committee for the Olympic Games: Peachtree Publishers. Access in June 16th of 2017. Available at: www.la84foundation.org/6oic/OfficialReports/1996/1996v1.pdf.
- Apostolopoulou, A. & Papadimitriou, D. (2004) Welcome home: Motivations and objectives of the 2004 grand national olympic sponsors. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 13(4), 180-192.
- Terra, B.; Batista, L. A.; Campos, S. R. C. & Almeida, M. (2013). Interaction among universities, government and spin-off companies in a brazilian context to generate sports innovation. *Journal of Technology Management & Innovation*, 8, 93-106.
- Campestrini, G. (2015). Instalações esportivas como legado pós-copa 2014 e projetos para os jogos olímpicos RIO 2016. In: Deslandes, A., DaCosta, L.P.; Miragaya, A. (Eds) *The Future of Sports Mega-events*. Rio de Janeiro: Engenho Arte e Cultura, 309-324
- Chappelet, J.L. (2012). *Mega sporting event legacies: a multifaceted concept*. *Papeles de Europa* 25, 76-86. Doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.5209/rev_PADE.2012.n25.41096
- International Olympic Committee. (2016). *Legacy Rio 2016*. Access in August 15th of 2017. Available at: <https://www.olympic.org/news/olympic-games-rio-2016-the-legacy>.
- International Olympic Committee. (2001) *Evaluation Commission Report, Games of the XIX Olympiad in 2008*. Lausanne: International Olympic Committee.
- Etzkowitz, H. & Ranga, M. (2010). A Triple Helix System for knowledge-based regional development: From Spheres to Spaces. In: *VIII Triple Helix Conference*, 1-29.
- Etzkowitz, H. & Zhou, C. (2006). Triple Helix twins: innovation and sustainability. *Science and Public Policy*. 33 (1), 77–83. [Doi.org/10.3152/147154306781779154](https://doi.org/10.3152/147154306781779154)
- Gold, M. (2017). Londres 2012: Uma Análise da Regeneração e dos Legados no Parque Olímpico Rainha Elizabeth. In: Mataruna-Dos-Santos, L.J. & Pena, B. G. (Eds) *Mega events footprints: past, present and future*. Rio de Janeiro: Engenho Arte e Cultura, 4, 202-220.
- Large, D.C. (2012). *Munich 1972: Tragedy, Terror and Triumph at the Olympic Games*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield publishers.

- Mataruna-Dos-Santos, L.J. & Pena, B.G. (2017). *Mega events footprints: past, present and future*. Rio de Janeiro: Engenho, Arte e Cultura.
- Motta, C. F., Figueiredo, C. A., Dos Santos, R. F. Strategies for establishing partnerships between physical education and industry. (2018). *Journal of Physical Education and Sport*, 18(3), 1524-1532.
- Reeve, S. (2000). *One day in September: the full story of the 1972 Munich olympics massacre and the Israeli revenge operation wrath of god*. New York: Arcade publishing.
- Schiller, K. & Young, C. (2010). *The 1972 Munich olympics and the making of modern Germany*, University of California Press.
- Silverman, D. (2010). *Doing Qualitative Research: A Practical Handbook*. SAGE.
- Simón, J. A. (2017). Os Jogos Olímpicos de Barcelona '92 e as pegadas urbanas na cidade olímpica. In: Mataruna-Dos-Santos, L.J. & Pena, B. G. (Eds). *Mega events footprints: Past, Present and Future*. Rio de Janeiro: Engenho, Arte e Cultura, 888-904.
- Veal, A.J.& Darcy, S. (2014). *Research Methods in Sport Studies and Sport Management: A Practical Guide*. Routledge.
- Verbi. (2017). Software MAXQDA Plus Analytic Pro [Computer Programme]. Berlin, Germany.