

The Historical Evolution of Olympic Games Legacy Governance: 1896-2016

Becca Leopkey, University of Ottawa

Milena M. Parent (Advisor), University of Ottawa

**Governance
Abstract 2009-119**

**May 29, 2009
2:30 PM**

**25 minute oral
(Richland C)**

The legacy, that is to say "all planned and unplanned, positive and negative, intangible and tangible structures created by and for a sport event that remains for a longer time than the event itself" (Preuss, 2007, p. 86), varies enormously over time in the modern Olympic movement in addition to city to city (Cashman, 1999, 2003; Gold & Gold, 2007). Although there have been discussions of event impacts since the days of de Coubertin, legacy as a key term for bid and organizing committees of large/mega sporting events only emerged at the turn of the 20th century. Following this increase in emphasis, legacy became part of the Olympic Charter in 2002. Sport event legacy and Olympic legacy have been touched on in the sport (event) management literature-though not necessarily using those terms-such research has typically focused on the economic impacts of these events (Crompton, 1995, 1999; Daniels & Norman, 2003; Horen & Manzenreite, 2004; Preuss, 2000, 2005).

No research has specifically examined the historical evolution (changing and development over time) or the actual organizational governance (i.e., "the system by which the elements of an organization are directed, controlled, and regulated" (Hoye & Cuskelly, 2007, p. 3) of legacy. The lack of research on legacy governance (i.e., the organizational system which directs, controls, and regulates the legacies of the event) is a critical omission by the academic world given the importance now placed on the legacy aspects by bid committees, local politicians and event organizers in addition to costs associated with previous editions of the Olympic Games (Athens 2004, \$11.6 billion US, Beijing 2008, \$40-65 billion US, and the estimated \$3-4 billion US for the upcoming 2010 Winter Olympic Games in Vancouver) (Watch2010, 2008).

Purpose/Objectives Gaps in the event management literature, and more specifically in the event legacy literature, show the need for more research about the governance of legacy in sporting events. The purpose of this study is therefore to explore the evolution of the governance of Olympic Games legacy using network analysis. The specific objective of this study is: to map the historical evolution of legacy governance throughout the modern Olympic movement (i.e., 1896-current day) in order to highlight legacy governance trends (i.e., changes in how legacy has been directed, controlled and regulated) and changes in the network actors.

Methodology Given the lens needed to examine in-depth the governance of legacy, a network analysis (see Knoke & Yang, 2008; Scott, 2007) will be performed in this research project in order to highlight the governance network structure of various editions of the Olympic Games. In order to meet the objective of this research, a review of legacy in the modern Olympic Games has been performed on all available Olympic Games final report and bid documents (both winter and summer). Data analysis on the sampling units (i.e., organizations and individuals within each edition of the Olympic Games' legacy governance network) was in the form of a content analysis using the qualitative data analysis software ATLAS.ti 5.2 and network analyses using UCINET 6.0. The ATLAS.ti 5.2 software program facilitated the coding and retrieval of the data by allowing the researcher to highlight themes that appeared in the bid documents and final reports, whereas UCINET aided in the building and analysis of the Games' networks. As data was collected, it was inductively and deductively analyzed following guidelines set out by Miles and Huberman (1994) and Yin (2003), and constant comparison techniques by Glaser and Strauss (1967). These approaches facilitated the content analysis by helping to clearly identify themes and ideas in the documents. The analysis began with the identification of legacy network actors and related concepts and the grouping of them into categories. The data was then coded using a simple descriptive phrase such as network stakeholder-government. Axial coding (see Corley & Gioia, 2004) was subsequently performed, where data was scanned for relational aspects between and among the open codes. This resulted in the creation of the higher-order themes which made up the emergent findings. Following the content analysis of the data, network information such as stakeholders/actors, and types of relationships was imputed into UCINET for subsequent network analysis techniques including visualization (i.e., describing the characteristics of the network) and quantification (i.e., use of sociomatrices)(Quatman & Chelladurai, 2008).

Discussion and implications Emerging themes from the document analysis showed various legacy governance trends and changes in network actors. Early in the history of the modern Olympic movement, legacy emphasized the successful organization of the games through the provision of necessary competition venues (Gold & Gold, 2007). Legacy impacts in this era reflected individual donations in the case of M.G. Averhoff, a private citizen who donated the entire amount of funding required to restore the ancient Panathenian Stadium during the 1896 Athens Games, the control of the Games by World Fair committees in the early 1900s, and the direction by small sub committees responsible for the building of facilities. As the Games increased in scale over time, especially from the 1950s-60 onwards (due mainly to TV coverage), legacy became a more

2009 North American Society for Sport Management Conference (NASSM 2009)

important aspect to the hosting the games (Gold & Gold, 2007). As such, the governance of legacy changed. For instance, Barcelona focused on urban regeneration and the responsibility for Games legacy is spread over three organizations: the Olympic Galleria, the city library, and the Centre for Olympic Studies (Cashman, 1999). Sydney 2000 only created their governing organization, the Sydney Olympic Park Authority one year following the Games of the XXVII Olympiad (Cashman, 2003), whereas Vancouver 2010 was the first candidate city to create an independent organization dealing with the legacy of the Games even if they were not awarded to the city. LegaciesNow was developed to focus on sport development and community capacity building within the province of British Columbia, and to ensure that sustainable (i.e., maintained over the long-term) legacy was a viable possibility (LegaciesNow, 2008;VANOC, 2008).

In conclusion, it is clear that the governance of Olympic legacy has changed over time with the increased scale and impact of the Olympic Games. Due to the growing importance of legacy impacts, candidates for upcoming Olympic Games including Vancouver, 2010, London 2012, Sochi, 2014, candidates for 2016 and hosts of the upcoming Youth Olympic Games answered questions regarding possible legacies the Games will potentially have on them as host nation/city in the first section of candidature questionnaire before even making the cut as a candidate city. The findings from this study show the need for greater in-depth exploration on the governance of Olympic legacy. As such future research should expand on understanding and explaining the governance (stakeholder network, decision structure/control) of Olympic Games legacies and comparing and contrasting organizational approaches to legacy governance in order to critically analyze the effective and efficient governance of Olympic Games legacy.