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Abstract
This paper reports the first phase of a larger project considering the educational legacy that flows from mega-events such as the Olympic/Paralympic and Commonwealth Games. The project utilises Q methodology to elucidate the perceptions of stakeholders associated with the 2012 Olympics. This phase was concerned with the development of the Q sort items. This was done through a number of interviews and documentary surveys around the Manchester Commonwealth Games, supplemented by focus group and semi-structured interviews with a focus on the 2012 Olympic Games, which will be held in London.

Introduction
“increasingly, sports events are part of a broader strategy aimed at raising the profile of a city... Often the attraction of events is linked to a re-imaging process and in the case of many cities, is invariably linked to strategies of urban regeneration and tourism development” (Gratton, Shibli et al. 2006 p44)

Jacques Rogge, President of the International Olympic Committee, is clear that the Olympic Games should produce a sustainable legacy that is of long term benefit to the community of the host city and country. However, nobody really knows if these events generate a net community benefit, although an attempt, by Preuss (2004), to rank beneficiaries puts the local community into fifth place.

Rarely, if at all, do the organisers of major sporting events/festivals review the net community benefit of the event. For sure, the IOC conduct a global impact study which utilises 150 indicators grouped into 3 dimensions: environmental, social and economic, but the economic justification tends to be so compelling that other impacts have a tendency to be diminished, with qualitative aspects being given less prominence. It is also the case that the ‘legacy’ only considers the two years after the Games;

There is also the problematic nature of the term legacy - rarely defined and existing in Olympic discourse as being a worthwhile and self-evident given. However, it is clear that legacy doesn’t flow automatically nor is it necessarily self-evident. There is also a potential for negative legacy, for example securing Olympic funding by delaying capital funding on non-Olympic budgets. Hall (2004) feels that:

investment in accessible and affordable education, health and communications technology, along with a diversified job creation strategy is far more likely to have long term benefits for urban economic and social well being than investment in elite mega sports events and infrastructure (p68)

But to some extent this neglects the catalytic nature of the event, and the opportunity it affords for ‘re-imagineering’ at all levels of society. The Olympic Movement itself is constantly reinventing itself even if, given that the Olympic Games have a big place in collective consciousness, it is sometimes difficult to realise that they didn’t emerge as a fully defined entity when they first arrived in Athens in 1896. Indeed, in their first few iterations the Games were part of other festivals. For example, the Paris Games of 1900 were held as part of the Exposition Universelle Internationale. The exposition organizers spread the events over five months and de-emphasized their Olympic status to such an extent that many athletes died without ever knowing that they had participated in the Olympics.
In some respects the Olympics and other sporting megaevents are extensions of the once popular World Fairs which were not just about selling goods but about “selling ideas: ideas about the relations between nations, the spread of education, the advancement of science, the form of cities, the nature of domestic life, the place of art in society” (Benedict (1983) p2).

What we need to decide is what ideas do we want to “sell” through an engagement with megaevents? And what types of engagement will allow the broader notions of legacy to flow?

At the 2007 Pierre De Coubertin lecture held at the RSA in London, Christophe Dubi, the Deputy Executive Director of the International Olympic Committee talked of the evolution that he can discern in the nature of the games: an evolution that has seen a shift from personal inspiration to the Games being used to influence the image of city and country and then onto a position where it is used to drive a deep transformation of shape and function in the urban fabric. In terms of the London Games Dubi talked about the integration of sustainable development into the equation of change as being at the heart of the event. The scale of the London legacy plan is one of the largest ever and has sustainability as a cross cutting theme. London has high ambitions to carry on the development of the Games and their legacy, giving, for example, careful consideration to what do you do with venues when the Games have gone. Dubi sees this evolution as being vital if the Games are to remain a prime event which has meaning across generations.

**Methodology**

**Research aims and questions**

This study aims to consider a number of questions relating to the dynamic interaction of ongoing regeneration, one-off events and educational provision. In doing so it hopes to draw out the factors that maximise the impact of such interaction.

Within the overall project the concern lies with actionable factors. It is hoped that the outcomes of this project will inform further development with an action agenda for reform. Thus a policy research framework has been adopted where the tendency was towards a multi-method, multi-level study taking account of the potentially conflicting interests of teachers, students and others who are affected by the potential educational legacy.

Within this project one of the aims is to rely as much as possible on the participants’ views of the situation being studied. It is for this reason that Q methodology is the dominant mode of enquiry.

**Q Methodology**

Q-methodology was devised and developed by William Stephenson. By training a physicist, Stephenson was concerned to bring a scientific framework to bear on the elusiveness of subjectivity. Q’s purpose is to allow the person to represent his or her vantage point for purposes of holding it constant for inspection and comparison.

The key to this approach is to consider data in terms of the individual’s whole pattern of responses, what Stephenson called 'self-reference' rather than looking for patterns amongst people.
In Q Participants are presented with a range of statements, the so called Q-sample, and are asked to order them in a Q-sort. Each of the Q sample’s stimulus items should make a different but nonetheless recognisable assertion about the appropriate subject matter, which flows from the research question.

A Q sample may be elicited from:

- Literature
- Popular texts
- Formal interviews
- Informal discussions
- Pilot studies

There are a wide range of people who have an ‘interest’ in the Games. Some of these people will be formally attached to the delivery bodies, some will work within organizations that are touched by the Games, some will be residents in the areas where the Games take place. The perception of each of these groups is important in the delivery and sustainability of the legacy.

The aim of the next stage of the project will be to gain a ‘measure’ of how each of the defined groups positions themselves in terms of the Q sort items about the legacy outcomes of the Games.

The first phase of the project, that reported here, was concerned with the development of the Q-sample. This was initially done through documentary analysis which, as a method of enquiry, can be used to illuminate trends and, as Cohen et al (2007) point out contributes to “a fuller understanding of the relationships between politics and education, between school and society, between local and central government” (p192). Within this project a wide range of documents were drawn upon to either generate Q sample items directly or to inform the interviews with participants, from which Q sample items would subsequently be drawn.

The function of the interviews undertaken with participants from the Manchester case was to generate items for the Q sample that was to be used with London participants. In this way, the interview brought a richness, incorporating informant ‘voice’, to the Manchester case whilst at the same time being used in conjunction with other methods.

Within this project a semi-structured approach to interviews was taken. This type of interview has a number of main characteristics:

- they are a formal encounter concerned with an agreed subject
- the overall structure of the interview is set by the questions defined by the interviewer, with prompts and probes filling in the framework
- within the interview there are likely to be a mixture of open and closed questions
- whilst the interviewee has a degree of freedom the interviewer can assert control when necessary (after Dreever 1995).
As recommended by Bryman (2004) an interview guide, containing the main questions and possible prompts and probes, was used. The interview questions were informed by the research questions as detailed below and were sequenced to provide for logical development. As Kvale (2007) points out: “a good interview question should contribute thematically to knowledge production and dynamically to promoting a good interview interaction” (p57).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research question</th>
<th>Interview question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • How do megaevents impact on regeneration?  
  • What role does education play in this impact?  
  • What are the perceptions of stakeholders about the benefits of the 2012 Games? | 1. How do you feel that the fact that the Commonwealth Games were held here impacted on the development of the area?  
  2. How did you see it linking into other regeneration activities  
  3. What did local people think about the Games – was this different across different boroughs |
| • What were the educational initiatives associated with the Manchester Commonwealth Games?  
  • How were these defined?  
  • What was their impact?  
  • Have they been sustained? | 4. Tell me a little bit about the extent that educational outcomes were discussed in planning the Games.  
  5. What effect did people hope the education packages would have?  
  6. Did people think about how the impact of the initiatives would be measured?  
  7. What impact do you think that they did have?  
  8. Is there a legacy? |
| • What are the implications for London of the facilitators/inhibitors that operate in terms of legacy? | 9. What types of things facilitated the uptake of the resource/initiative?  
  10. What things got in the way?  
  11. If you were able to start over again with the whole process, is there anything you would do differently? |
Participants for the interviews leading to the generation of the Q set were sought from appropriate individuals from the following categories:

- Those who had input to the educational resources produced for the Manchester Games
- Those who developed regeneration policy allied to the Manchester Games

The interview, which was of 1 hour duration, was split into three stages with an introductory and a concluding statement that was the same for all participants. The first section collected some background information, the second was the substantive part of the interview and the third offered the participant the opportunity to raise any issues that had not been dealt with elsewhere. At each transition point within the interview there was member checking in operation and therefore the opportunity to withdraw from further engagement. The introductory statement reiterated the purposes of the research and the treatment of the data that is generated in the research, with the undertaking to keep the information anonymous, the steps that would be taken to do this and a check that it is alright to proceed. The concluding section restated the measures that would be taken to safeguard the data and the undertaking to provide a transcript for checking within 28 days. The participant was also informed that, should they so wish, they could choose not to allow the interview to proceed to the analysis stage of the project. In all cases, a face to face interview was sought in the first instance, with the location of the interview being chosen for the subject’s convenience. If scheduling difficulties arose then a telephone interview was offered.

The interviews were recorded and transcribed. The transcripts were analysed in an inductive manner, “seeking what emerges as important and of interest from the text” (Seidman (2006) p116). At this stage a sifting process took place where statements that were likely to be included in the Q sample were separated from those that were not. This sifting is called by Rowan (1981) a dialectical process (p134) – “the participants have spoken, and now the interviewer is responding to their words, concentrating his or her intuition and intellect on the process” (Seidman (2006) p127). This analysis was used to ensure balance in the Q set.

The Manchester Case

Having successfully bid for the games in 1995, the 17th Commonwealth Games were hosted by the City of Manchester, from July 25th to August 4th, 2002.

In the early 1990s, there was recognition by Manchester City Council and its partners that a mega-event such as hosting the Olympics could offer a mechanism for promoting the regeneration of East Manchester and also generate wider investment opportunities. The stated prime focus of Manchester City Council was to attract a major sporting event to the city which would act as a vehicle to bring substantial investment into East Manchester. As such, East Manchester, one of the most deprived areas in England, had been chosen as the area where ‘Sportcity’ would be built in the early 1990s. East Manchester was, historically, characterised by expanding and prosperous light and heavy engineering industry. In the early 1970s, East Manchester supported 34,000 jobs, two thirds of which were in engineering, textiles and coal-mining. Industrial decline began to set in from the late 1960s, when a number of major employers closed their works. By the mid-1980s, 20,000 jobs had
disappeared; unemployment rose, and firm closures created large tracts of vacant and under-used buildings and land. The economic decline of the area led to severe social as well as economic problems.

Being seen as typical of many inner city areas in the north of England - a declining economic base, high unemployment, low educational attainment, high crime rates, and a poor quality environment – in 1992, the East Manchester Regeneration Strategy was produced based on three factors, one of which was the provision of sports and leisure facilities of international importance at the Eastlands site in East Manchester. A sports-led regeneration strategy began to evolve from this period onwards. This is in line with Marivoet (2006) who states that “[a]s globalisation intensifies, sport is increasingly being used as a vehicle for the affirmation of territorial or cultural identities on regional, national and continental scales.” (p127)

Since 1999 East Manchester has been awarded a number of comprehensive regeneration initiatives, East Manchester has been the site of a number of regeneration initiatives:

- **Beacons for a Brighter Future** - There are seven programme areas within the ‘Beacons for a Brighter Future’ project: Crime, Education, Health, Worklessness, Physical environment, Local Services, and Community capacity and cohesion. The ‘Beacons for a Brighter Future’ Partnership provides strategic direction and aims to ensure complementarity between the New Deal for Communities and the Single Regeneration Budget initiatives and other regeneration initiatives operating in the area.

- **New East Manchester Ltd** - launched in October 1999, and formally incorporated as a Company limited by guarantee in February 2000. NEM was the second pilot Urban Regeneration Company (URC) to be established in England.

- **East Manchester Education Action Zone (EAZ)** - Beginning in December 1999, the EAZ incorporates 17 schools and 6,500 pupils in East Manchester. Its stated aim was to “ensure that all children, young people, and adults in East Manchester realise their educational potential, and are equipped with the confidence, qualifications, and skills, to enable them to make a positive contribution to the social and economic well-being of their community” (East Manchester EAZ Action Plan).

- **East Manchester Sports Action Zone (SAZ)** - funded by Sport England through the National Lottery for five years commencing in September 2000.

A key task for New East Manchester Ltd has been to co-ordinate the many funded and unfunded initiatives operating across all or part of East Manchester.

The evaluation report on the 2002 Commonwealth Games produced by Ecotec (2004) states that a key motivation for hosting the Games was the event’s ability to stimulate sustainable regeneration. A central plank for securing these legacies came in the form of the 2002 Economic and Social Programme for the North West. This aimed to ensure that disadvantaged communities throughout the North West would benefit from Manchester hosting the event.

The stated aims of the Games Legacy Programme were:

- to improve skills, educational attainment and personal development
to develop skills and improve cohesion through participation in events and health improvement projects; and

- to improve the competitiveness of Small and Medium Enterprises.

The reports on aspects of the Manchester legacy point out that school attendance rates increased at both primary (by 2 percentage points) and secondary (4.4 percentage points) levels. Furthermore, a higher proportion of Year 11 leavers were seen to progress into higher and further education (an increase of 17.5 percentage points). It is also reported that resident satisfaction with the quality of local schools increased to 76.5%.

Some workers felt that opportunities were missed in terms of building a more concrete legacy able to operate after the funding allocated tailed off.

The 2012 Games, Social Space and Social Capital

It can be seen that, in Manchester’s case, the Commonwealth Games was used as a planning tool. Drawing upon the stories from other cities Muñoz (2006) claims that “Olympic urbanism has even transformed the urban profile of a city, having a strong impact on the post-Olympic evolution of the whole urban space through the intensive production of public spaces that are in fact used by different urban populations from all over the city…” (p181-182). This impact on urban planning and policy is globally important as at the start of the 21st Century the majority of the human population is urbanised, with economic growth being driven by investment in infrastructure, renovation and real estate. This is altering the physical and social landscape of cities. Policy has to struggle with the inherent tension within urban development – the complex issues around the size, shape, distribution and density of the city, along with the impact on social inclusion and the quality of life.

It is vital that we understand how urban living affects people and the environment. It is equally important that we use this understanding to develop an education that allows a proper engagement with the urban. We might even pose the question ‘can education be planned for within regeneration?’

Studying megaevents, such as the Olympics, offers us a lens through which to explore such issues. This is a particularly powerful lens in terms of the 2012 Games as it is occurring in London, a global megacity with the challenges and opportunities that this poses.

London’s economic and demographic boom allied to the presence of the Games throws the spotlight on it in terms of social trends in labour markets, housing, transport and public life. The 2012 Games is seen as being one of the key regeneration catalysts for an urban landscape that is fragmented and constrained by busy roads and train lines, but with large amounts of space and water in the Lower Lea Valley. The event facilities will be situated within this area, which it is envisaged will be an open environment and will engage local communities. The landscape architect, Jason Prior, states that:

_Existing conditions on both sides of the Lea Valley reflect a geography of separation – the city has flown across its space. When talking to the boroughs and the community groups, it became obvious that we should be growing inwards from the edges, not creating new communities in the middle. The project should be about repairing the rift in the city fabric and promoting the greater integration of community with what we can bring forward as an improved environment. So what we are doing is extending existing frameworks and networks into the valley, whatever we put in the valley centre will be something that is accessible to a much broader group of people_ (Prior 2007)
But as Sun (1999) puts it in a different context “[w]hether these collectively owned resources can be successfully utilized for educational purposes largely depends on the strengths of social ties among community members, and therefore, requires collective investment in such social relationships” (p405). A suitable framework for exploring this is to be found within the literature on social capital. The wider project, of which this paper is part, is exploring the extent to which the megaevent with its associated symbols has the ability to generate social capital.

Social capital has at its core the idea that social networks have value, providing a set of resources that can be drawn down from the relationships that exist within the social organisation of the community. In doing this it allows consideration of the links between the micro-level of individual experiences, the meso-level of institutions, association and community and the macro-level of national and international policy makers.

Consideration of social capital resonates through the work of Bourdieu, Coleman and Putnam. All of these authors view social networks as being relational and lending themselves to being explored through the metaphor of capital. Thus “[s]ocial capital is a form of power, a currency, a resource: it can be utilised, traded, exchanged, drawn upon, invested or cashed in…social capital is a purposeful means toward other ends” (McGonigal, Doherty et al. (2007) p80).

This base metaphor of capital has been differentiated into 3 forms of social capital, namely:

- Bonding social capital which denotes ties between like people in similar situations—immediate family, close friends and neighbours
- Bridging social capital, which encompasses more distant ties of like persons, such as loose friendships and workmates
- Linking social capital which reaches out to unlike people in dissimilar situations, such as those entirely outside of the community, thus enabling members to leverage a far wider range of resources than are available within the community

Halpern (2005) who sees the disproportionate underperformance of neighbourhoods with concentrated unemployment, with respect to the basis of the disadvantage of the individuals within them, as being attributable to the lack of social connections of those in these neighbourhoods to the employed and the economically advantaged. It may be that disconnection from place through poor design, urban mobility and sprawl is a contributory factor in the decline of this linking social capital.

Sun’s work (1999) clearly indicates that “educational disadvantages of living in communities with a high concentration of large, and particularly, non-traditional families would be reduced by a small but statistically significant extent if members of the community could actively engage in community-based activities” (p422). This is in accord with Halpern (2005) who cites evidence that social capital at the micro-, meso- and macro- levels has significant impact on educational outcomes. For example, at the microlevel, higher levels of child-parent contact generally leads to higher educational aspirations and attainments. At the meso-level, some school types appear to perform significantly better than others with stronger parent-school relationships and parent-parent relationships appearing to explain the effect. There is some evidence that social capital within the school – that is teacher-teacher relationships - may also be important in explaining differences between schools.
“many so-called school effects are really community effects. High concentrations of low social capital families in an area amplify disadvantage. The low average social capital of a community adds to the child’s educational disadvantage creating a ‘double jeopardy’ effect (p168). An issue that will be explored in the second phase of this project is the extent to which the area is perceived to be impoverished by the professionals working in the area – do they see education as a way out and how does this aspiration affect the life of the area?

McGonigal et al (2007) point out that social capital “will be encountered and made active by schools and by pupils in multiple and multiply related ways. Whilst it is clear that not all of these ‘networks’ will lead to validated educational outcomes, it is important to realise that social capital is also of value in the evolution of a secure self-identity. Thus:

*schools offer each child contact with additional human capital in the persons of an intelligent and generally caring staff. This leads through curriculum and classroom interaction to the accumulation of cultural capital in the form of academic qualifications and also insight or entry into a range of intellectual and social activities, including sports and other interests, which allow a young person to profit at a deeper level from the culture into which he or she is being inducted, through an increasingly confident ability to read its semiotic codes and social norms*” (McGonigal et al (2007) p86).

But the links extend beyond the school, forming a nexus of home, school and community that is configured and nuanced by the range of individuals within each of these.

Sun (1999) speculates:

*that community based social capital includes a process and a structural component. … the process component refers to intentional interpersonal interactions among community members and social ties built through such interactions…[t]he structural component refers to certain community characteristics which either facilitate or block interpersonal interactions among community members*” (p407).

This is somewhat problematic because Sun’s definition of community as being “residential neighbourhoods in which children go to the same public school” does not reflect the London situation. Within London, the engagement of schools with communities is made more difficult because the size and fragmentation of the education system allied to a good transport infrastructure enables a choice of schools for those families who possess the cultural, social and economic capital to negotiate these complexities. Thus, in London 99.6% of secondary school pupils have 3 schools within 5km (which compares to a figure of 78% in the rest of the country) and pupils are therefore less likely to go to their nearest one, in fact only 25% do so (Burgess et al 2005).

“[T]he impact of differential school reputations seems not to have been to reduce the overall desirability of the areas, but to encourage families to choose schools other than their most local one and hence to loosen the ties between particular schools and particular localities (Crowther et al 2003 p23).”

Even if this were not the case, the national educational policy context which focuses heavily on ‘standards’ of pupil attainment tend to override the desire for schools to engage with their communities. A study carried out by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation (Crowther et al 2003) saw some eclectic if not incoherent practice from which the authors identified 3 basic models of school contribution:

- the community resourcing model in which schools seek to make their facilities, networks and expertise available to otherwise resource poor communities
o the individual transformation model in which schools focus exclusively on improving the life chances of individual young people by raising their attainment

o the contextual transformation model in which schools likewise seek to raise attainment, but feel that they can only do so by involving families and the community and that they must develop a wider range of attributes in their pupils. Schools were engaged in community oriented activities and could have considerable impact on individual pupils. However, there was no evidence that schools were able to have large scale impacts on the communities as a whole nor that they were able to bring about transformations of the life chances of large groups of young people.

Sun (1999) feels that more opportunities “should be provided for community members to engage in community wide interactions. Policy-makers and community leaders should be reminded that in addition to other possible benefits to the community, tight interpersonal relationships also help the community achieve its educational goal” (p424). The development of social networks with the local community may be facilitated through engagement with the 2012 Games. Whilst the opportunity to engage does not equate with engagement, the potential for high profile events to lever engagement, allied to “an explicit attention to the mechanisms of trust and reciprocity within pedagogy could enhance young people’s understanding of the need for such engagement, as might school-based developments towards the active used of social capital by disadvantaged youngsters.” (McGonigal et al 2007 p83)

These levers of engagement might include the symbols associated with the Games. It was certainly the perception of those involved in the Manchester Commonwealth Games that they were “a great hook and pulled people into activities that they wouldn’t normally be involved in.”

Stadia: Concrete Expression of the Games

A Stadium, more than any other building type in history, has the ability to shape a town or a city. A stadium is able to put a community on the map, establishing an identity and providing a focal point in the landscape. Stadia are the most viewed buildings in history and have the power to change lives; they represent a nation’s pride and aspirations. They can be massively expensive to build but they can also generate huge amounts of money. The power and fiscal weight of sport is increasing as an industry around the world, and I believe the 21st century will establish sport as the world’s first global culture. It will become the internationally recognised social currency. Consequently the stadium will become the most important building any community can own, and if it is used wisely, it will be the most useful urban planning tool a city can possess (Sheard 2005).

The crucial determinants for stadium design in the 21st Century will be the potential for urban regeneration, and the role of the ‘iconic’ stadium in the marketing and positioning of the area. Increasingly stadia are not designed as stand alone buildings. Horne and Manzenreiter (2006) see them as facilitating synergies “between previously discrete activities such as shopping, dining out, entertainment and education, lead[ing] to de-differentiation” but of course this leads one to raise questions about the cost of this de-differentiation. Policy makers need to be aware of “the social distribution of the supposed benefits of urban development initiatives…which social groups actually benefit, which are excluded, and what scope is there for contestation of these developments” (p8).
One way in which sports stadia have been used to impact on school students is through The Department for Children, Schools and Families initiative called ‘Playing for Success’. This aims to establish out of school hours study support centres at football clubs and other sports’ grounds. The centres use the environment and medium of football, rugby and other sports as motivational tools, and focus on raising literacy, numeracy and ICT standards amongst KS2 and KS3 pupils. In 2007 the National Foundation for Educational Research (Sharp et al 2007) published a report on the longer term impact of the initiative.

Overall, the report shows some differential effects in terms of the impact of programmes on the attainment of pupils. For example, low attaining pupils made greater progress, white pupils made greater progress. There was a positive effect at KS4 (which isn’t one of the target groups). Girls at key stage 3 and at key stage 4 made less progress than those in the comparison group. However, it was also found that “if pupils benefit from their experience at PfS but they are not offered opportunities to demonstrate their learning once they leave, then there is a possibility of increased frustration and disaffection as a result (p64).” This last point resonates with the issues surrounding legacy. In one centre that is involved in this project it was acknowledged that:

there is no formal tracking of the extent to which programme participants fare once their attendance stops. However, contact with the participants, or at least some of them, is maintained. There is a celebration event, both at [the stadium] and often within the school as well. Pupils are asked to act as mentors and as advocates for the programme, by speaking at assemblies. One participant from each cohort becomes a graduate. Graduates attend on Saturday mornings and develop new resources. From this group, individuals are elected to the Student Council. This body is responsible, amongst other things, for organising the celebration events.

An issue touched upon in the report, but more strongly expressed during some of the interviews undertaken as part of this project was the way in which the centres facilitated interaction between parents/carers and teachers:

Parents and teachers do tend to mix, parents will talk to teachers and share experiences. Obviously parents don’t feel as threatened in some ways when they come here purely for celebration of their child’s achievement and they may not have had that opportunity before, so it’s really a big thing for the whole family.

This points to the potential of such embedded initiatives to encourage the development of linking capital.

Conclusion

The interviews and documentary analysis that have been carried out have enabled a bank of 58 statements to be formulated. These will be used in the Q sort which will take place over the next few months, and then be repeated at regular intervals into the legacy period.
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