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## Introduction

Any attempt to understand stakeholders in the Paralympic Games and Movement is a challenging task for a number of reasons. First, the term stakeholder is often used without a clear understanding of the term. For example, in the International Olympic Committee’s (IOC) London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games Final Report (IOC 2013), the word ‘stakeholder’ was used 57 times, making reference to government, commercial partners, transportation and security agencies amongst others. But nowhere in the document was the full list of actual stakeholders provided. Hence, the term stakeholder is one that is used so often that we rarely stop to reflect on its actual meaning. Second, any attempt to define Paralympic Movement stakeholders is further complicated by the Paralympic Movement’s own definitional complexities. The International Paralympic Committee’s (IPC) Strategic Plan (2015-2018), for example, defines the Paralympic Movement as “a global network of individuals and organizations brought together through their commitment to provide sporting opportunities for all para-athletes – from grassroots to elite – and through the belief to contribute to a better world with equal opportunities for all” (9). The Movement itself can thus be defined based upon the multitude perspectives from its various member organizations, such as National Paralympic Committees (NPCs) and International Federations, with this umbrella entity attempting to transcend and represent the different backgrounds of the organizations (IPC 2015; Legg and Steadward 2011). Third, the difficulty of comprehending the complexity of stakeholder relationships is, in part, due to the rapid evolution of the Games themselves. The Paralympics have steadily grown since their inauguration in Rome in 1960 where 400 athletes from 23 different countries competed; contrast this to 4,237 athletes from 164 countries competing in the most recent Games in London (Legg and Steadward 2011). Furthermore, the sheer size, scale, and complexity of the modern Paralympic Games and Movement make the identification of key stakeholders very difficult. Today the Games are the second largest multi sport event held in the world with major international corporate sponsors, support from political leaders and increasing popularity in social media. Fourth, and as a consequence of the abovementioned growth, the Games and Movement and its stakeholders are constantly changing and evolving. What was originally a focus on rehabilitation has now morphed into one of elite sport, marketing sophistication and and bureaucratic complexity.

With the above caveats in mind, and in acknowledging the extent of the challenge that lies ahead, it is not our intention here to systematically or empirically classify all Paralympic Movement stakeholders. As the above discussion suggests, any attempt to map the entire Movement would be problematic if not impossible – although scholars have attempted to do this for specific mega-events such as the Formula 1 Shanghai Grand Prix (Xue and Mason 2011) and the Vancouver 2010 Olympic Games (Parent et al. 2011). Rather, our intention with this chapter is far more modest in that we specifically focus on, and deliberately delimit our discussion to, the key stakeholders involved in the bidding, hosting, and aftermath/legacy phases of the Paralympic Games. More specifically, the chapter draws upon stakeholder theory (Freeman 1984) as a useful approach to examining groups and individuals (i.e. stakeholders) that affect or can potentially be affected by an organizational entity (Friedman et al. 2004). In particular, Mitchell, Agle and Woods’ (1997) *Theory of Stakeholder Salience* is utilized as a useful heuristic and organizing framework in which to explore the increasingly complex and evolving organizational landscape of the Paralympic Games and to discuss the challenges, conflicts, and tensions faced by Paralympic Games’ organizers in the planning and management of the event itself. To these ends, the purpose of this chapter is twofold: (i) To outline the roles and responsibilities of the key stakeholders involved in the organization of the Paralympic Games and (ii) to highlight stakeholder-related management issues faced by the Paralympic Games organizers when bidding for and hosting a Paralympic Games.

## What is a Paralympic Stakeholder?

Perhaps a useful starting point in understanding the role of key stakeholders in a Paralympic Games context is a brief consideration of stakeholder definitions (see Mitchell et al. (1997) and Friedman et al. (2004) for more a comprehensive discussion of stakeholder definitions). Neoclassical economist definitions of stakeholders tended to focus on those entities that have immediate or direct (often financial) influence over an organization; a focus that has become known as the traditional shareholder model of governance (Johnson et al. 2014). The Stanford Research Institute (1963), for example, defines stakeholders are groups “on which the organization is dependent for survival” (91). Similarly, Alkhafaji (1989) identifies stakeholders as “groups of whom the corporation is responsible” (36). In contrast, other scholars have emphasized a much broader set of organizational entities to define stakeholders that have gone beyond the normative core organizational relationships. Thompson (1991), for example define stakeholders as groups “in relationship with an organization” (209). In contrast to the narrow conceptions of the traditional shareholder approach, Freeman (1984) defines a stakeholder more broadly “as any group or individual who can affect or is affected by the achievement of the organization’s objectives” (46). This broader and more encompassing approach, which would later become known as the stakeholder approach, emphasizes the importance of a business in creating value in order to ensure long-term survival with no one set of interests dominating over another (Freeman 1984). Hence, any attempt to define a Paralympic stakeholder finds itself at a conceptual impasse and conundrum in deciding whether to adopt a narrow definition of stakeholders that identifies a small-set of organizations “based on the practical reality of limited resources, limited time and attention, and limited patience of managers for dealing with external constraints” on the one hand, versus a broader more encompassing definition formulated “on the empirical reality that companies can indeed be vitally affected by, or they can vitally affect, almost anyone” on the other (Mitchell et al. 1997: 857).

### Prioritizing Paralympic Stakeholders

One potential solution to overcoming this definitional quandary is to focus instead on stakeholder salience i.e., the degree to which managers give priority to competing stakeholder claims. Mitchell et al. (1997) proposed a normative theory of stakeholder identification in response to a lack of definitional agreement as to ‘who and what really counts’ in stakeholder management (Mitchell et al. 1997). This model will now be outlined in brief (see Mitchell et al (1997) and Friedman et al (2004) for more comprehensive overviews). Mitchell et al’s stakeholder salience model is based upon three attributes: *power*, *legitimacy*, and *urgency*. *Power* is the ability of a stakeholder to gain access to coercive (physical), utilitarian (material), and normative (symbolic) means to influence other actors (Etzioni 1964). *Legitimacy* is the desirability and appropriateness of actions within a socially constructed system of norms, value, and beliefs (Suchman 1995). *Urgency* is the ability of an actor to call for immediate action based on time sensitivity and degree of likely impact upon stakeholder interests. For Mitchell et al. (1997), “each attribute is a variable, not a steady state, and can change for any particular entity or stakeholder-manager relationship” (868). Furthermore, “the existence (or degree present) of each attribute is a matter of multiple perceptions and is a constructed reality rather than an objective one,” and “an individual or entity may not be conscious of possessing the attribute or, if conscious of possession, may not choose to enact any implied behaviors” (868).

Based upon the above three broad attributes (i.e. power, legitimacy, and urgency), Mitchell et al (1997) developed a typology in order to classify the stakeholder environment into four groups: *Non-Stakeholders* (no attributes), *Latent Stakeholders* (one attribute, low importance), *Expectant* *Stakeholders* (two or more attributes, medium importance), and *Definitive Stakeholders* (three attributes, high important). From the identification of these classes Mitchell et al (1997) propose seven stakeholder types:

**\*\*\*INSERT TABLE 1: MITCHELL ET AL’S (1997) TYPES OF STAKEHOLDER ABOUT HERE\*\*\***

|  |
| --- |
| **Latent Stakeholders** |
| 1. *Dormant Stakeholders*: Possess power to impose their will but have little or no interaction /involvement as they lack legitimacy or urgency.
 |
| 1. *Discretionary Stakeholders*: Possess legitimacy but no power. No pressure on managers to engage with this group.
 |
| 1. *Demanding Stakeholders*: Those with urgent claims, but no legitimacy or power. Demanding and irritating for management.
 |
| **Expectant Stakeholders** |
| 1. *Dominant Stakeholders*: Viewed by many as the only stakeholders of an organization or project. These stakeholders should matter to management
 |
| 1. *Dependent Stakeholders*: Stakeholders who are dependent on others to carry out their will, because they lack the power to enforce.
 |
| 1. *Dangerous Stakeholders*: Those with powerful and urgent claims will be coercive and possibly violent.
 |
| **Definitive Stakeholders** |
| 1. *Definitive Stakeholders*: An expectant stakeholder who gains the relevant missing attribute.
 |

Adapted from Mitchell et al (1997)

According to Mitchell et al’s (1997) stakeholder salience model, then, Paralympic stakeholders vary in their degree of power, legitimacy, and urgency and may possess none, few, or all of these attributes. Furthermore, Mitchell et al’s (1997) typology would suggest that Paralympic Games stakeholders should be understood as dynamic and constantly changing, socially constructed based upon multiple perceptions, and organizational entities that are able to exercise their will either conscious or unconsciously. Based on the above, it is argued that Mitchell et al.’s (1997) typology of stakeholder salience provides a useful approach to conceptualizing Paralympic stakeholders by moving one’s understanding of the Paralympic landscape beyond simply identifying and listing organizations that directly influence or are connected to the bidding, planning, and delivery of a Paralympic Games. We therefore adopt a similar rationale to Friedman et al. (2004) in that stakeholder theory in general, and Mitchell et al.’s (1997) typology, in particular, “provides a framework through which to understand managerial decision-making by focusing on the groups and individuals (i.e. stakeholders) who can affect or are affected by an organization’s actions,” (170) and therefore “allows for the comprehensive and systematic identification of constituents, claims, and expectations of those involved in different issues, and recognizes those groups with which an organization must effectively interact in order to be successful” (170).

In adopting a stakeholder theory perspective, what follows is an assessment of the roles and responsibilities of nine stakeholder groups that are unique to a Paralympic Games. These include the IPC, IOC, NPC’s, Organizing Committees for the Olympic Games, International Federations, Regional Paralympic Committees, International Independent Disabled Federations/Groups, Able Bodied Sport Organizations, and Other Disability Sport Organizations. By delimiting our discussion to these nine stakeholders we are not suggesting that other stakeholders such as the media, athletes, sponsors, and government (local and national) amongst others are not salient, nor are we suggesting that they are any less important. Rather, they are not included in this discussion because they are either dealt with in greater detail in other chapters or are discussed more comprehensively in the able-bodied/Olympic sport literature. To reiterate, our intention below is not to provide an empirical examination of the organizations operating in organizational landscape of the Paralympic Games; we make no such claim – although we certainly encourage such attempts in the future. Rather, Mitchell et al’s (1997) taxonomy is adopted below as a useful heuristic and organizing framework in order to develop a more dynamic conceptualization of the organizational landscape surrounding the Paralympic Games and therefore move the discussion beyond simply describing Paralympic stakeholders.

## Key Stakeholders of the Paralympic Games

 Before delving into the nine stakeholders it is necessary to caveat the discussion that follows by acknowledging that the Paralympic Games does not represent all disability sport. For example, the international sport governing body for the deaf was at one time under the Paralympic umbrella but chose to go its own way, in part, because deaf people see themselves not as having a disability but as a linguistically separate group. Their choice to refer to themselves as ‘deaf people’ rather than ‘persons who are deaf’ reflecting person-first terminology often espoused in the disability-sport literature (e.g., Perrier et al. (2014); Smith (2014)) is purposeful, because they are proud of their language and culture and thus compete at the Deaflympics (Legg et al. 2004). Similarly, athletes with an intellectual disability are also predominantly served by an event called the Special Olympics (see http://www.special- olympics.org/), but in a few instances, athletes with intellectual disability have competed at the Paralympic Games. The first time that athletes with intellectual disability were included into the Paralympic Games was 1992 when a separate Paralympic Games for athletes with intellectual disability was held in Madrid while athletes with physical disabilities competed in the Paralympic Games in Barcelona. A cheating scandal at the Sydney 2000 Paralympic Games resulted in intellectual disability athletes being banned from the movement with the suspension ending in 2012 when a limited number of events for intellectual disability athletes were held at the London 2012 Paralympic Games (Tomlinson 2013). These examples illustrate the much broader organizational landscape in which the Paralympic Games is situated. Therefore it should be acknowledged from the outset that disability sport is a much broader organizational field in which the Paralympic Games and its various stakeholders operate.

 What follows now is a description of the nine stakeholders unique to the Paralympic movement that impact the hosting of the Games themselves.

### INSERT FIGURE ONE: Stakeholders of the Paralympic Games, about here.

### (1) The International Paralympic Committee (IPC)

The IPC is the international governing body of the Paralympic Movement and is thus responsible for the organization of the Paralympic Games and functions as the international federation for the nine Paralympic sport (IPC 2015). Officially founded in 1989, IPC’s mission is to “enable para-athletes to achieve sporting excellence and inspire and excite the world” with a shared Paralympic Movement vision “To make for a more inclusive society for people with an impairment through para-sport.” (IPC 2015: 13) The IPC can be viewed as a dominant (if not definitive) stakeholder in that it has both power and legitimacy. According to Mitchell et al. (1997), this type of stakeholder often has formal mechanisms that acknowledge their importance to the relationship. These formal mechanisms are evident, for example, by the composition of the IPC which include: A General Assembly, Governing Board, Management Team, and various Committees and Councils. As members of the IPC, International Federations (IFs), National Paralympic Committee’s (NPCs), International Organizations of Sport for the Disabled (IOSDs), and Regional Organizations have the right to submit motions, vote at meetings, nominate candidates for appropriate IPC bodies and participate in IPC activities with the most important and well known of these being the Paralympic Games.

The IPC’s power as a stakeholder primarily stems from it being the rights holder to the Games and its ability govern over the Paralympic Games and Movement. In the system by which organizations are directed and managed, governance relates to defining expectations, delegating authority, verifying performance, and adhering to legal requirements (Girginov 2011; Hoye and Cuskelly 2007; Leopkey and Parent 2012). The issue of governance is therefore central to understanding the stakeholder relationships within the Paralympic Games for a number of reasons. First, the Paralympic Games are held in a complex organizational environment, thus governance protocols are critical to effective project management and event delivery. Second, the Games’ demands and expectations from stakeholders are fundamental to organizational success. Third, the Games typically receive significant public funding, and therefore strong governance and accountability is necessary requirement in order to justify public investment (Hoye and Cuskelly 2007). Where difficulties sometimes emerge is when stakeholders do not follow good governance principles, such as transparent policies, fiduciary checks and balance, ethical behavior, as well as leadership, vision and a culture of integrity (SIRC n.d.).

### (2) International Olympic Committee (IOC)

 It is here that the introduction of the IOC as a stakeholder of the Games is pertinent as the creation of the International Coordinating Committee (ICC) which was the precursor to the IPC came about, in part, because of the IOC’s request to correspond and collaborate with one umbrella organization as opposed to the four Independent Disability Organizations (see stakeholder group (7) for more detail). In 1984, Dr. Robert Steadward, on behalf of the Canadian Federation of Sports for the Disabled (CFSOD) (which would become the Canadian Paralympic Committee), circulated a proposal to every member nation in the ICC recommending a new organizational structure for disability sport, with democratically elected governance. Steadward also requested that other nations and disability sport organizations consider submitting alternative proposals from their national perspective. The ICC Secretariat, which was situated in Arnhem, the Netherlands as a result of funds remaining there from the 1980 Summer Paralympic Games, organized a seminar in 1987 where representatives could debate and discuss the various proposals. Disability sport leaders spent the first day presenting their proposals, with the following two days dedicated discussing the various ideas. From these 23 resolutions emerged, the most essential of which were as follows:

* to change the structure of the existing organization;
* to include national representation as well as regional and athlete representation
* to reduce the number of classifications
* to implement a functional classification system
* to develop a structure by sport and not by disability
* to work towards integration with the International Olympic Committee and other International Sport Federations.

(Steadward and Foster 2003)

At the end of the meetings in Arnhem, an Ad Hoc Committee was elected with a mandate to take the 23 resolutions and develop a new constitution and bylaws for a global organization. Steadward, following the Arnhem Seminar met with IOC President Samaranch in Calgary, Canada during IOC meetings pertaining to the 1988 Olympic Winter Games. Samaranch was presented with the results from the Arnhem Seminar and a request to develop a formal working relationship between the two organizations resulting in a Memorandum of Understanding regarding an integration policy (Legg and Steadward 2011).

 A year later at the Summer Paralympic Games in 1988 in Seoul, Korea the results of the Arnhem Seminars were further debated but no final decision was made regarding the creation of a new global organization. The Task Force presented their recommendations a year following to the member nations in Dusseldorf, Germany where some of the ideas were accepted in principle resulting in the creation of the IPC. On 22 September 1989 Dr. Steadward was elected as the IPC’s Founding President (Legg and Steadward 2011). For the next several years, the IPC operated without a formal headquarters and managed principally by volunteers. In 1997, Bonn, Germany was selected as the host city for the IPC Headquarters, which was officially opened in 1999. Understanding this history then now allows a better understanding of how and why the various stakeholders continue to play roles and perhaps why conflict occurs among them.

 The role of the IOC, in particular, is impacted by this history and as a result is one of the most important definitive stakeholders for the Games. Based on Mitchell et al’s (1997) notion of dynamic stakeholder relationships, however, what might change is whether the IOC will continue to be such a significant stakeholder in the future. At the 2010 Winter Paralympic Games in Vancouver, for example, a debate re-emerged between the present and past Presidents of the IPC over the right place for the Paralympic Games themselves. Steadward, former IPC President was interviewed in the Vancouver Sun regarding his view of the future of the Paralympic Games (Lee 2010a). In the ensuing article, Steadward suggested that it might be time for the Olympic and Paralympic Games to consider a further step along their evolution, whereby the two Games would be held at the same time, using the same venues thereby creating efficiencies and letting the Paralympics take advantage of public support for the Olympics. Steadward suggested that the natural evolution of the Paralympic movement would call for disability contests to be increasingly included in the Olympics. “I wouldn’t mind seeing the 100-metre men’s final, the 100-metre women’s final, the 100-metre wheelchair final and the 100-metre final for blind runners.” Pointing to the intense national pride in Canada that emerged in Vancouver during the Olympics, he said it was a shame for the Paralympics to have to “re-energize” the city 10 days later (Lee 2010a).

 Meanwhile, Sir Phil Craven the current President for the IPC, rejected the idea of combining the Olympic and Paralympic Winter Games into one sport mega-event, asserting that the Paralympic movement was doing just fine as it is. Craven, who replaced Steadward in 2001, said that the Paralympics had become a force of their own over the last decade and would be diminished if melded with the Olympic Games:

Any coming together would, I think, by its very nature, be restrictive from a logistics point of view. We have it as we like it at the moment, and we don’t see any need to change. We believe by having the Paralympics and the Olympics separate, we’re able to have our own identity while coming together in a festival of sport that gives a wonderful face to the world of what sport can do (Lee 2010b).

Gilbert Felli, the Executive Director of Olympic Games for the IOC in 2010, concurred saying that putting the two events together would only hamstring the Paralympic Games, resulting in fewer Paralympic athletes competing. Craven also dismissed the idea that the Paralympics should be held in advance of the Olympic Games to take advantage of the 10,000 media and broadcasters who descend on an Olympic host city. Craven said the Paralympics want to stand on their own merit. “I believe the Paralympic Games have to attract the media in their own right” (Lee 2010b).

 This conversation continues to reflect the ongoing evolution of the Games and movement. Since its advent, the Paralympic Games have been at a crossroads of sport and social change with multiple stakeholders trying to sway the Games’ evolution. Many (perhaps even those intimately involved in the movement) may still see the Paralympic Games as a glorified form of rehabilitation with a narrative of pity rather than performance (Perrier et al. 2014). A related but distinct issue among stakeholders is the role of the able-bodied sport system versus the disability centric ones that founded the movement. Here the question is not so much about the Games themselves, but which stakeholders are responsible for preparing the athletes, coaches, officials and other leaders competing and participating in the Games.

### (3) National Paralympic Committees (NPCs)

The stakeholder that has this responsibility is the National Paralympic Committees (NPCs) that are recognized by the IPC as the legitimate official representatives of athletes from their respective countries. The IPC currently has 177 registered NPCs, which are responsible for their national team’s management and preparations for the Paralympic Games and other IPC-sanctioned competitions. Whilst the OCOGs and IPC are the rights holders for the Games and thus have dominant stakeholder roles, they would be incapable of hosting the Games without the National Paralympic Committees (NPCs) which send national teams to the Games. The NPCs, therefore, can be viewed as discretionary stakeholders in that they have legitimacy as the National Paralympic Committee responsible for representing Paralympic interests in a given geographical region.

 Each NPC that attends the Games is represented by a mission staff, a core leadership group responsible for the oversight and management of the team competing at the Games (Legg 2015). The leader is often given the title ‘Chef de Mission’. The mission administration is an integral part of the Games as they provide the link between the host organizing committee, nations and their teams. They are the conduit between the host organizing committee, athletes, coaches, national governments, and media, among others. They are problem solvers, symbolic figureheads, and administrators with latent coercive, utilitarian and normative power within their own networks (Legg 2015).

 The mission administration then includes among them multiple stakeholders from each team. By their nature, every coach and athlete thinks they are the most important person – and it is often this self-driven attitude that got them to this position in the first place. Balancing demands from multiple and perhaps competing demands can thus be very difficult. Added to this tension is the need for each mission to entertain their own national sponsors, board members, media, dignitaries, and government officials, which at multi-sport Games can be significant in size and scope. The challenge, of course, is balancing the desire of a government bureaucrat or elected official to meet an athlete or team prior to or after an event when a coach does not think this is optimal (Legg 2015). This is particularly challenging as Governments continue to pay a large portion of the bill – coercive power – for sending national teams to the Games with sponsors of NPCs becoming much more important over the past three decades (Gold and Gold 2007).

### (4) Organizing Committees for the Olympic Games (OCOGs)

OCOGs are the fourth stakeholder and certainly have many roles to play in hosting a Games that will evolve from bidding, planning and legacy. One particularly unique role throughout this process is dealing with marketing and domestic sponsorship. An important part of an OCOG’s ability to stage the Games is the support it receives from the private sector in the form of national corporate sponsorship. This support may be either cash to assist with covering costs or ‘in-kind’ donations to help offset or eliminate expenses. Whatever the support, the OCOG must protect the integrity of the Games while recognizing the legitimate concerns of definitive stakeholders such as the IOC and IPC sponsors and the inherent business interests they maintain. As a sponsor, corporations should expect that in return for their support, they will be recognized. The IOC has longstanding financial arrangements with a few select corporations known as the TOP sponsors, and the IOC is primarily the beneficiary of that sponsorship (Giannoulakis et al. 2008). The capacity for OCOGs to have their own sponsors is therefore compromised by the interests of the principal Olympic stakeholder. There is also a Host Agreement that the OCOG signs with the IOC for both the Olympic and Paralympic Games that seriously constrains what locals can and cannot do when putting on Games. The reality is that the host city takes on a great deal of the risk for hosting the Games while the IOC receives a great deal of the revenue. Nonetheless, as the Paralympic Games’ draws closer, OCOG’s degree of urgency (i.e. time sensitivity and criticality) increases. Consequently, the IPC and IOC become increasingly dependent on OCOGs in order to deliver the Games.

Specific to the Paralympic Games, Parent (2013) argues that the rights to the Paralympic Games and all ‘things’ Paralympic are owned by the IPC but this is somewhat misleading by current standards. The IOC, through its 2003 agreement with the IPC and agreements that have followed, has now gained influence over how the Paralympic Games are managed. As one example, because of the inter-dependent relationship between the IOC and IPC as it relates to Games the IPC must protect IOC sponsors (see Chapter X by Legg and Dottori for further elaboration on these issues). This issue becomes further complicated with the variety of athlete and national team specific sponsorships which a mission staff member from each NPC monitors. Regardless, examples of what is now referred to as ‘ambush marketing’ abound with OCOGs and national teams, needing to protect their sponsors’ expectations and rights (Legg et al. 2012).

### (5) International Federations (IFs)

A fifth significant group of stakeholders is the International Federations that are independent federations recognized by the IPC as the sole representative of a Paralympic Sport. Their responsibilities include technical jurisdiction and guidance over the competition and training venues of the respective sports during the Paralympic Games.

The IPC currently recognizes 17 International Federations including:

**\*\*\*INSERT TABLE 2: INTERNATIONAL FEDERATIONS ABOUT HERE\*\*\***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Boccia International Sports Federation (BISFed) | Badminton World Federation (BWF) | International Equestrian Federation (FEI) |
| World Rowing Federation (FISA) | International Canoe Federation (ICF) | International Federation for CP Football (IFCPF) |
| International Tennis Federation (ITF) | International Table Tennis Federation (ITTF) | International Triathlon Union (ITU) |
| International Wheelchair Basketball Federation (IWBF) | International Wheelchair Rugby Federation (IWRF) | International Cycling Union (UCI) |
| World Archery (WA) | World Curling Federation (WCF) | World ParaVolley (WPV) |
| World Sailing | World Taekwondo Federation (WTF) |  |

 The IPC also recognizes International Federations that represent both able bodied sport and Para sports that are not on the Paralympic Games schedule. Some if not all endeavor to do so at some point so their role in the hosting of Games is noteworthy as they observe, lobby and attempt to consider how they become more involved.

**\*\*\*INSERT TABLE 3: INTERNATIONAL CO-FEDERATIONS ABOUT HERE\*\*\***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| International Bobsleigh & Skeleton Federation (IBSF) | International Federation of Powerchair Football (FIPFA) |
| International Golf Federation (IGF) | International Handball Federation (IHF) |
| International Hockey Federation (FIH) | World Flying Disc Federation (WFDF) |
| Union Internationale de Pentathlon Moderne (UIPM) | World Armwrestling Federation (WAF) |
| World Squash Federation | World Karate Federation |

### (6) Regional Paralympic Committees

Regional organizations are a sixth group of stakeholders that are less significant within the Paralympic Games context but because of historical influence continue to play a role depending on where the Games are hosted. The Regional Paralympic Committees are independent of the IPC and recognized as the legitimate and sole representatives of IPC members within a specific part of the world. They act as liaisons of the IPC, organize regional sporting events, coordinate development activities and provide support to the IPC membership department in the respective regions. They also have the right to participate in IPC activities. The IPC currently recognizes four Regional Organizations:

* African Paralympic Committee
* Asian Paralympic Committee
* European Paralympic Committee
* Oceania Paralympic Committee

Until an independent regional organization is created in the Americas, the IPC has established the Americas Paralympic Committee; thus when the Pan Parapan American Games are held in this region, with the most recent 2015 Games being in Toronto, Canada and the 2019 Games being held in Lima, Peru, the responsibilities for the Games are officially with the IPC.

###  (7) Independent Disability Federations/Groups

A seventh group of organizational stakeholders are independent disability groups known as International Organizations of Sport for the Disabled (IOSD). These were the founding members of the IPC and include the following organizations along with the year they were incorporated:

* International Blind Sport Association (IBSA) (1981)
* International Stoke Mandeville Gamed Federation (ISMGF) (1952)
* International Sport Organization for the Disabled (ISOD) (1964)
* Cerebral Palsy – International Sport and Recreation Association (CP-ISRA) (1978)

These were the founding members of the IPC but have slowly ceded control over sports to what was previously the able-bodied only sport system or to independent sport federations. For instance, CP-ISRA no longer governs boccia and football since these sports have their own governing bodies (e.g. Boccia International Sport Federation and International Federation of Cerebral Palsy Football). IWAS, which came about as the result of a merger between ISMGF and ISOD currently only governs wheelchair fencing with wheelchair rugby being the most recent sport to become independent with the creation of the International Wheelchair Rugby Federation. It is anticipated that the role of the IOSDs will be to help recruit athletes and expand on athlete development pathways, including investing in young para-athletes and thus will have less direct influence on the Paralympic Games themselves.

 This was not always the case, however, as the four disability groups were the founders of the Paralympic movement deciding in 1982 that “there was a need for coordinating the games in the Olympic year and so the International Coordinating Committee (ICC) was formed by representatives from the four groups” (Steadward 1996: 31). For that reason, the IOSDs still hold some power as stakeholders through tradition and connections.

### (8) Able Bodied Sport Organizations

The eighth group of stakeholders for the Paralympic Games are able bodied sport organizations that over time have become responsible for managing Paralympic sport and Para athletes. The second author of this chapter, David Legg, is the former President of the Canadian Paralympic Committee (CPC) and was a board member for 12 years. In his personal experience he observed that in Canada, and in many other nations prior to the mid 1990s, sport for persons with a disability were predominantly run and organized by Disability Sport Organizations (DSOs). These groups had access to persons with a disability, and were outstanding at identifying potential participants, and acculturating them into sport. What they sometimes lacked was the physiological and psychological knowledge required to optimally train athletes at the highest level. In the mid 1990s, a major shift occurred with National Sport Organizations (NSOs) made responsible for ALL athletes engaged in their sport, both traditional and adapted, and this then included athletes with a disability. This change brought the full coaching knowledge and expertise within a sport from the able bodied system to the high-performance training environment for Para athletes. In Canada, Swimming Canada and the Canadian Federation of Archers were the first two NSOs to fully embrace this new philosophy. Ultimately, many other NSOs took on the responsibility of providing leadership for programs and services for athletes with a disability, while disability focused organizations, such as the Canadian Blind Sport Association (CBSA), continued to provide guidance to “able bodied” NSOs, also managing “orphan” sports such as Goalball where no obvious able bodied sport partner existed.

 What happened, was a transition from a focus on disability to sport which while positive was not without challenges. Previously, the disability focus meant that sport was often introduced via a disability-based organization, which allowed relatively safe, non threatening, supportive and welcoming points of entry for participants. The challenge was that this did not necessarily promote elite athlete development due to lack of capacity or interest. Coaches were typically parents of friends who had little background in elite sport. With the shift to mainstream or able-bodied sport, this limitation was supposed to change. Coaches at both the grassroots and high performance levels were expected to be trained to accommodate both able bodied and disabled athletes, while sport administrators were anticipated to support both groups. The reality, though, was that this did not happen systematically or consistently. Another issue was that the entry points were more foreboding to athletes with disability by requiring the individual to advocate on their own behalf. A hypothetical scenario was having an individual with a spinal injury needing to approach a local, traditionally able-bodied, tennis club to ask for coaching and support versus joining a wheelchair sport club and having tennis presented as an option. Another challenge was that while there was considerable change at the National (NSO) level in many, if probably most sports, this change did not readily filter down to the Provincial / Territorial or community level. This inconsistency fractured the entire system and resulted in a disjointed athlete pathway.

 According to Canadian Paralympian Jason Dunkerley, this transition has resulted in elite athletes with a disability today enjoying unprecedented support and opportunities, but the system has placed a premium on its aging cohort of best performers without effectively mobilizing a next generation capable of taking their place (Dunkerley 2010). In lieu of programs previously extended to prospective athletes by disability sport groups, the Canadian Paralympic Committee and NSO’s have tried to fill the void with information or talent identification events. More often than not, though, attendees do not continue on within a competitive program (Dunkerley 2010).

 While the above example is specific to a Canadian context, it is symptomatic of what happened in many other nations and thus the Paralympic Games as a whole. The Paralympic Games are thus at a confluence of the old traditional disability focus and the newer able-bodied high performance models at the NPC and international levels. The nations competing at the Paralympic Games represent the entire continuum of this transition and at times there is conflict between the stakeholders.

### (9) Other Disability-Based Organizations

A final group of stakeholders that further complicates a complete understanding of Paralympic Games are the unknown actors or those that are only starting to emerge. Sport for persons with disability is rapidly evolving, as seen through inclusion into the University based amateur sport system in the United States (Crain 2015), the creation of disability specific events in the increasingly popular X Games (Baron 2015), and the development of extreme recreation through advances in technology and equipment (Rothbart 2016; Schwartz 2014; Young 2015). According to Mitchell et al (1997), however, if newly emerging actors intend to become Paralympic stakeholders it is likely that they will attempt to gain power, legitimacy, and urgency within a given organizational field. We can therefore view new organizations and individual personalities (i.e. agents) as latent stakeholders that potentially may wield significant influence on the Paralympic Games in the future. In particular, one other ‘Games’ that could become a significant stakeholder is the Cybathlon. This is being held for the first time in Switzerland (Kiernan 2016). Another is the recently created Invictus Games (invictusgames-foundation.org) that has been patronized by Price Harry and hosted the first time in the UK and most recently in Orlando, USA. These Games are specifically for injured servicemen with the third Games taking place in Toronto, Canada in 2017 and have received significant political support from leaders including the Prime Minister of Canada, President and first lady of the United States, and the Royal Family of Great Britain. According to Mitchell et al (1997), this would suggest that the Invictus Games already has already attained symbolic power over the media as a newly emerging stakeholder within the organizational field of disability sport. Nonetheless, the impact of these newly emerging stakeholders on Paralympic Games still remains to be seen.

Amongst all of these stakeholders it is worth noting that the Paralympic Movement is a membership-based structure, which is not the case with the IOC. Here, the IFs and National Olympic Committees are not ‘members,’ while the IOC Members are the approximately 120 voting right holders who are appointed individuals or representatives of a stakeholder group such as athletes. In the Paralympic Movement, each IF, NPC as well as the Regions and IOSDs are individual members maintain voting rights at the IPC General Assembly and are thus stakeholders of the Games.

## Summary

 The Paralympic Games and Movement are growing and so too are their complexity, this owing in many respects to the volume and variety of stakeholders. This chapter has attempted to sketch the organizational landscape of the Paralympic Games through the adoption of a stakeholder perspective. In particular, the chapter adopted Mitchell et al’s (1997) *model of stakeholder salience* as a heuristic device in which to conceptualize the dynamic and constantly changing Paralympic domain, and outlined the roles and responsibilities of the key stakeholders involved in the bidding, planning, and delivery of the Paralympic Games. This included several stakeholders that are unique to the Paralympic context including the IPC, NPCs, Regional Paralympic Committees, IOSDs, and other new disability-based entities such as the XGames and Invictus Games. As Mitchell et al. (1997) note, “the idea of comprehensively identifying stakeholder types, then, is to equip managers with the ability to recognize and respond effectively to a disparate, yet systematically comprehensible, set of entities” (857). It is only through the systematic identification of these stakeholders that the Paralympic Games can be better managed. Furthermore, the chapter also highlighted a number of unique stakeholder-related management issues faced by the Paralympic Games organizers when bidding for and hosting a Paralympic Games, such as the ongoing tensions between the IPC and IOC which continue to characterize the Paralympic domain.

The organization of para-sport is complex and fragmented, and faces some important challenges, such as integration within mainstream sports, the lack of disability-specific knowledge (e.g. inclusion strategies in schools, recruiting and developing disability athletes), limited coaching expertise and coach education pathway, higher cost equipment, and the level of awareness and recognition in society (Doll-Tepper and Radtke 2014). These elements, when combined, contribute further to complexity within para-sport’s organisation and development. The dynamic interaction of these elements is also influenced by prevailing culture, the political system, geography, cultural and historical context that all seem to play an important role in how each host country runs a Paralympic Games.

Among all of these stakeholders, both current and future, are competing demands as each have something they want to get in return for their participation and and support of the Games. (Parent 2013) identified 13 types of issue that could affect OCOG-stakeholder relationships and these included finances, human resources, infrastructure, interdependence, legacy, media, operations, organizing, participation, politics, relationships, sport and visibility. (Parent 2013) then identified 11 different types of issues associated only with the relationship between government and the OCOG that change in priority as the Games lifespan evolves. The importance then of understanding stakeholders in a Paralympic context during all three stages of a Games lifespan from bid, to hosting to legacy are indisputable and must be managed delicately and with a firm understanding of the Games’ specific objectives.
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