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Introduction
Organizing Committees for the Olympic Games (OCOGs) often establish relationships with local organizing committees (LOCs) at satellite venue locations to stage Olympic competitions. Albeit these peripheral settings experience event legacies (Deccio & Baloglou, 2002; Hoff & Leopkey, 2019), research has yet to investigate how these relationships impact legacy creation. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to examine the interorganizational relationships (IORs) between an OCOG and satellite host LOCs, and explore how they influenced the creation of the satellite venue legacies. In doing so, we are able to provide insight into how these relationships could be utilized to enhance positive legacy outcomes and mitigate negative ones. This is significant as OCOGs for recent and future editions of the Games continue to use satellite hosts to stage the event.

Literature
Researchers (e.g., Alexander et al., 2008; Babiak, 2003; Sotiriadou et al., 2017) have considered formation, management, and outcomes as the three stages of IORs. In this vein, IORs has served as a theoretical underpinning in sport management research, namely to increase our understanding of why and how various community (e.g., Misener & Doherty, 2014), professional (e.g., Babiak, 2007), and national sport organizations (e.g., O’Boyle & Shilbury, 2016) establish relationships with other organizations to reduce risk and capitalize on opportunities. However, IORs has yet to be employed in an Olympic context, and evaluating IOR outcomes in sport has been overlooked (Babiak et al., 2018; Parent & Harvey, 2009). Therefore, this study helps fill these glaring gaps.

Method
An embedded cross-case analysis (cf. Stake, 2013) focused on the Atlanta 1996 Olympic Games, and the satellite cities of Athens, Columbus, Conyers, and Savannah was built. This edition of the Games was selected because it included a number of satellite host settings. Additionally, it was considered timely as long-term impacts of mega-events are notably sustainable when they have remained for at least 20 years (Kassens-Noor, 2012). Archival materials (e.g., email correspondences, newsletters, and meeting minutes), official IOC documents (e.g., bid books and final reports), and semi-structured interviews (n=20) with key stakeholders served as the data sources. Then, a general content analysis of the data was conducted by the use of a qualitative software.

Findings
In this case, the Atlanta Committee for the Olympic Games (ACOG) engaged in relationships with LOCs in satellite host settings to improve their stability, asymmetry, and legitimacy, while enhancing efficiency, reciprocity, and individual-level factors were motives shared by ACOG and the LOCs. As a result of these motives, formal controls and informal processes helped manage these relationships. Moreover, legacies across all of the satellite venue settings were identified. Unique to this study, we found the Games acted as a catalyst to legacy creation. Moreover, certain factors (i.e., varying levels of connectedness between the host OCOG and LOCs and post-event commitment) influenced some of the long-term outcomes.

Conclusion
This study enhances our understanding of IORs in this context and offers practical insight for event managers as the Games continue to rely on IORs in future editions.