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Recently, cities that bid for hosting the Olympic Games withdrew due to public referendums and lack of political support (Preuss, 2015), despite the International Olympic Committee (IOC)’s efforts to underline the importance of the Olympic legacy at a series of symposiums such as “The legacy of the Olympic Games 1984-2000” and the “Olympic Agenda of 2020” (Chappelet, 2008; Sant & Mason, 2015). Numerous media platforms and studies have presented the negative consequences of hosting the Olympics including land acquisition (Davis & Thornely, 2010), elite capture (Muller, 2015; Short, 2008), housing and job (Kennelly, 2016), use of public expenditure (Chalip, 2004; Kennelly, 2016), and social exclusion/inequality (Celik, 2011; Kennelly, 2016; Silva, 2005).

According to the IOC (2012), Olympic legacies are divided into five categories: economic, sporting, urban, environment, and social. Hosting the Olympics influences the economic legacy which embraces the level of direct or indirect economic activity in the host city, regions, and country. Additionally, hosting the Olympics will provide lasting sporting legacy through the advancement in sports. The IOC expects the Olympics to provide an opportunity to enhance the urban and environmental legacy, making the host city an attractive place to visit and live, and to raise public awareness about the environment. Lastly, the IOC highlights the importance of the social legacy which also embraces political and cultural aspects of the Olympic Games. By encouraging behavioral and attitudinal changes for a better society, the Olympics will help to build up the social legacy (IOC, 2012).

Compared to other legacies, the social legacy of the Olympics was relatively overlooked until recently (Minnaert, 2012). Although the IOC has set objectives to uphold the positive aspects of its social legacy, the development of practical strategies to address the socially-driven issues caused by hosting the Olympics still remains as a challenge to overcome (Kennelly, 2017; Minnaert, 2012). In efforts to fill this gap, this study introduces the model of Social Innovation through the Olympic Games (SIOG) elaborating how the social innovation framework can be applied to the Olympic games to boost its positive social legacy.

Hosting the Olympics can be an effective way to accomplish social innovation. Social innovation has been gaining more attention from both practical and academic fields to address various social problems (Howaldt & Schwarz, 2010; Mulgan et al., 2007). According to Mulgan et al. (2007), social innovation is defined as "innovative activities and services that are motivated by the goal of meeting a social need and that are predominantly developed and diffused through organizations whose primary purposes are social" (p. 8). Three main agents that exist to promote social innovation in various sectors are individuals, movement, and organization (Mulgan et al., 2007). Although social innovation can be initiated by each independent agent, the three agents are required to network with each other in that social problems cannot be easily identified or solved by one agent alone in a complex system (Westley & Antadze, 2010).

The outcome of social innovation can be realized as a new product, services, process, markets, platforms, organizational forms, and business models (Caulier-Grice et al., 2012). Murray and colleagues (2010) proposed the following six stages of social innovation process: (1) prompts, (2) proposals, (3) prototypes, (4) sustaining, (5) scaling, and (6) systemic change. Caulier-Grice and colleagues from The Young Foundation (2012) stated that the existing feedback loops in between every stage is iterative; hence this nonlinear process is represented visually with a spiral. The first stage, prompts, identifies the social needs and problems that require innovation. The second stage is proposals, which is the process of creating ideas to solve the problems addressed during the first stage. Next stage is prototyping wherein the proposed ideas are tested. Sustaining is the fourth stage, where the idea becomes a routine practice. The fifth stage is scaling which includes a variety of strategies to expand the social innovation. The last stage
is systemic change which encompasses mutual interactions between business models, regulations, and infrastructure. The interactions offset the old, ineffective structure or barriers, and create a new structure, allowing various sectors to last for a long time (Murray et al., 2010).

In the Social Innovation through the Olympic Games (SIOG) model, we apply this Murray et al’s (2010) six-stage cycle to the three periods (i.e., bidding and candidature-process, Olympics, and post-Olympics) of building up planned legacy for the Olympic Games proposed by Preuss (2007). In the first stage 'prompts', the National Olympic Committees (NOC) need to identify and diagnose the social problems of its city and country and their causes before finalizing its decision to bid for the Olympics. In this process, the NOC must communicate with their residents, communities, and institutions. In the second stage (Proposals), the NOC and its related stakeholders (i.e., sponsors) propose ideas to solve the addressed problems and their probable causes, and put the ideas in their 'Candidature File'. During the third stage (Prototypes), promising ideas are tested to be refined or reformed. From here, there are two directions according to the feature of the proposed ideas - for pre-event and for during-event. In the case of the ideas conceived for pre-Olympic Games, the ideas can be implicated before the Olympic Games and applied during the Olympics period to boost and expand the effects. In the case of the ideas for during-event, the host city has a longer preparation period since the ideas will be implemented near or at the start of the Olympics. The fourth and fifth stages (Sustaining and Scaling) are conducted during the Olympics or post-Olympics. The IOC, NOC, and Organizing Committees for the Olympic Games (OCOG) need to strive to settle and spread the persisting ideas through ongoing communications between themselves and with the resident or community of the host city. In particular, sufficient resource and support must be secured to sustain the implemented ideas after the Olympics. The last stage (Systemic change) allows the IOC, NOC, and OCOG to create a new structure based on the ideas implemented during or after the Olympic Games to fit the environment of the city or the country. Westley (2008) proposed a cross scale and a cross system because the objectives of the social innovation are not a short-term effect but a broad and durable effect. Cross scale refers to replicating and disseminating the established social innovations beyond certain boundaries (Westley, 2008). Cross system is to transform social innovation into a broader system by connecting more resources or opportunities such as a legislation or an economic instrument (Westley, 2008). Both cross scale and cross system are adopted for the SIOG model in that the social legacies need to be scaled out beyond the host city boundary once they are well-settled. In the presentation, we will discuss more in detail how the three agents (i.e., individuals, movement, organizations) were identified and how they should interact with each other within a network at each stage.