



Olympic Games Legacy: From General Benefits to Sustainable Long-Term Legacy

Becca Leopkey & Milena M. Parent

To cite this article: Becca Leopkey & Milena M. Parent (2012) Olympic Games Legacy: From General Benefits to Sustainable Long-Term Legacy, The International Journal of the History of Sport, 29:6, 924-943, DOI: [10.1080/09523367.2011.623006](https://doi.org/10.1080/09523367.2011.623006)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09523367.2011.623006>



Published online: 24 Nov 2011.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 4591



View related articles [↗](#)



Citing articles: 29 View citing articles [↗](#)

Olympic Games Legacy: From General Benefits to Sustainable Long-Term Legacy

Becca Leopkey* and Milena M. Parent

School of Human Kinetics, University of Ottawa, Ottawa, Canada

The purpose of this article is to map and contextualise the evolution of the concept of legacy over time using bid and final report documentation from Olympic Games host and candidate cities. As a result of the increased importance of legacy in the modern Olympic movement, many trends have emerged. Examples of modern trends include numerous new legacy themes (e.g. environmental, information, educational); changes in the types of legacy being emphasised (e.g. closer links to city and regional planning initiatives and legacy sustainability), its increasing complexity and interconnectedness found within the typology of legacies, and legacy's overall governance including major influencers and decision makers.

Keywords: Olympic Games; legacy; sport events; legacy governance

L'héritage des Jeux olympiques: des bénéfices généraux à l'héritage durable à long termes

L'objet de cet article est de positionner et de contextualiser l'évolution du concept d'héritage dans le temps à partir de la documentation sur les dossiers de candidature et les rapports finaux des villes candidates ou ayant accueilli les Jeux olympiques. De nombreuses tendances ont émergé en conséquence de l'importance croissante de l'héritage du Mouvement olympique. Parmi les tendances modernes se trouvent de nombreux nouveaux thèmes (comme l'environnement, l'information, l'éducation), des modifications du type d'héritage développé (par exemple des liens plus étroits entre la ville, les initiatives régionales de planification et l'héritage durable), sa complexité croissante et son interconnectivité identifiés dans la typologie des héritages, et la gouvernance générale de l'héritage, y compris celles des principaux influenceurs et décideurs.

Mots clés: Jeux olympiques; héritage; événement sportif; gouvernance d'héritage

El legado de los Juegos Olímpicos: de los beneficios generales al legado sostenible a largo plazo

El objetivo de este artículo es describir y contextualizar la evolución del concepto de legado a lo largo del tiempo utilizando documentación de candidatura e informes finales de ciudades candidatas y ciudades sede de Juegos Olímpicos. Como resultado de la creciente importancia del legado en el movimiento olímpico moderno han surgido múltiples tendencias. Entre ellas encontramos numerosos aspectos nuevos (por ejemplo, el medio ambiente, la información y la educación); cambios en los tipos de legado a los que se da más importancia (por ejemplo, mayor proximidad a iniciativas de planificación urbana y regional,

*Corresponding author. Email: rleop060@uottawa.ca

y sostenibilidad del legado), la creciente complejidad e interconectividad entre los diferentes tipos de legado, y la gobernanza global del legado, incluyendo los principales actores y autoridades.

Palabras clave: Juegos Olímpicos; legado; acontecimientos deportivos; gobernanza del legado

Das Olympische Erbe: Vom allgemeinen Nutzen zu einem nachhaltigen Langzeit-Erbe

Der Artikel zielt darauf ab, die Entstehung des Nachhaltigkeitskonzeptes anhand von Bewerbungsdokumenten und Abschlussberichten von Olympiabewerbern- und Austragungsstädten über einen längeren Zeitraum aufzuzeichnen und zu kontextualisieren. Aufgrund der gestiegenen Bedeutung von Nachhaltigkeit in der Olympischen Bewegung sind viele neue Entwicklungen entstanden. Beispiele solcher moderner Trends beinhalten die zahlreichen neuen Themen zur Nachhaltigkeit (z.B. ökologisch, informativ, erzieherisch), die Veränderungen zu besonders wichtigen Aspekten des Olympischen Erbes (z.B. engere Verbindungen zu den städtischen und regionalen Planungsinitiativen und nachhaltigem Erbe), die sich steigernde Komplexität und Vernetzung innerhalb der Typologie von Nachhaltigkeit und die übergeordnete Steuerung eines nachhaltigen Olympischen Erbes einschließlich der Haupteinflussnehmer und Entscheidungsträger.

Schlagwörter: Olympische Spiele, Nachhaltigkeit, Sportereignisse, Steuerung von Nachhaltigkeit

奥运会遗产：从总收益到可持续性的长期遗产

本文的研究目的是通过分析历届奥运会候选城市的申办和最终陈述报告，将奥运遗产理念的演变置于不同的背景下进行重新审视。研究认为，作为现代奥林匹克运动重要性不断提升的结果，奥运遗产呈现出一些新趋势。这些趋势包括一些新的奥运遗产主题的出现（例如，环境，信息，教育）；一些遗产类型的变化（例如更密切地与城市相联系，积极倡导区域规划和遗产的可持续性）；不同类型的奥运遗产之间变得日益复杂和联系相互紧密。其次，这些变化还涉及包括主要的影响者和决策者在内的奥运遗产的整体治理。

关键词：奥运会；遗产；体育赛事；遗产管理

Introduction

‘Sport event legacy’ has been emerging as a key concept for bid and organising committees of large/mega sporting events since the late 1980s and is generally tied to the outcomes associated with the hosting of an event.¹ The growing importance of legacy within sport events has resulted in a heightened interest in the concept of legacy by various Olympic Games stakeholders especially the International Olympic Committee (IOC), host cities, and governments who have financed the Games. The study of legacy is increasingly important, especially from a management perspective, as the issue of return on investment (ROI) and the ability to acquire sustainable long-term benefits of hosting is central to a city’s decision to host or bid.²

Research on sport event legacy is relatively new, however coverage of the topic can be found in the literature of a variety of academic disciplines including history, management and sociology. For example, sporting event legacy and Olympic legacy have been touched on in the sport (event) management literature – though not necessarily using those terms – early research has typically focused on the economic impacts of these events.³ In 2008, this journal even had a special issue devoted to the topic where articles critiqued the good and bad, intended and unintended legacies associated with previous Olympic Games.⁴ Despite the topic’s growing popularity

the lack of research on the evolution of legacy is a critical omission by the academic world given the importance now placed on the impact of legacy (e.g. new local infrastructure and increased international profile) by bid committees, local politicians and event organisers in addition to the financial costs associated with past editions of the Olympic Games.⁵ In order to fully understand the evolution of legacy, it is also important to analyse how legacy has been governed from its inception. Governance is a broad concept that has been used in numerous ways throughout the literature. Uses of the term have been seen within the field of economic development, global and corporate governance to name a few however, this article will focus on the actual management system used to govern Olympic legacies.⁶

In order to address this gap, the purpose of this article is to investigate the evolution of legacy throughout the modern Olympic movement in order to examine and contextualise major trends (e.g. usage of the term, changes in legacy, governance structures) over time.⁷ Although this article touches on the benefits and impacts of the Olympic Games from their modern origin in 1896, the majority of it will focus on the evolution of the legacy concept from its emergence in the early 1980s to present day.

Olympic Legacy – The Emergence of a Concept

Although the concept of legacy did not gain popularity among scholars and practitioners until the middle of the past century, early references to legacy were commonly discussed as benefits or as motivation to host the Games and emphasised the successful organisation of the Games through the provision of necessary competition venues with the eventual inclusion of their expected post-Games use.⁸ From the very beginning, Pierre de Coubertin hoped that the world would benefit from the revival of the Olympic Games by bringing ‘athletism to a high state of perfection, and [by infusing] new elements of ambition in the lives of the rising generation’.⁹ According to McIntosh, prior to the use of the word legacy in the bid process, examples of purposefully benefiting the local area through the hosting of the Games can only be described as:

... vague and fleeting in their pattern of inclusion. Instead, the early potential candidate city hopefuls largely wrote of how suitable and capable they were, of what an “honour” it would be to serve the Olympic Movement in this capacity, or of what their promises would include in order to ensure that the celebration of the Games would be a success.¹⁰

As the Games increased in scale over time, especially from the 1950s–1960s onwards (due mainly to TV coverage), legacy became a more important aspect to the hosting the Games.¹¹ As a result of this growth, other issues occurring in the Olympic Movement raised concern about the future existence of the Games. In the 70s and 80s, the Olympic movement attained such importance that the organisation shifted to become globally politicised as reflected in the terrorist attack at the Munich Games (1972), and the boycotts associated with Montreal (1976), Moscow (1980) and Los Angeles (1984).¹² In addition, the Games have become increasingly commercialised, the number of doping incidences has risen, and the scandals associated with the selection of host cities, namely the Salt Lake City Games (2002), have provoked a more critical perspective of the movement (e.g. negative press).

Following the Centennial Games, legacy began to receive heightened focus by organising committees (e.g. Sydney); and by 2002, a conference on legacy was organised by the IOC in conjunction with the Olympic Studies Centre of the Autonomous University of Barcelona. Subsequently, in 2003, the IOC amended its charter by including a 14th mission statement which focuses on a positive legacy for hosts and as such legacy established itself in the discourse of the Olympic family.¹³ Scholarship on event legacy has continued to garner increased interest as a result of the growing importance of legacy trends within events. The manifestations of legacy trends are also found at the many conferences that have also been hosted to discuss event legacy including the *Legacy Lives* international conference series that focuses on event benefits.¹⁴

Legacy – The Debate

Although research has been conducted focusing on the legacies of mega sport events, there remains a lack of agreement on a clear definition and measuring techniques to conceptualise the term.¹⁵ Despite the risk of experiencing cost overruns and other negative aspects of legacy (e.g. overcrowding, deficits, and oversized, unused facilities also known as white elephants), governments of cities, regions, and nations continue to submit bids and pursue various types of mega sporting events including the Olympic Games.

Legacy has been considered as ‘an elusive, problematic and even dangerous word’.¹⁶ Within the English language, legacy has multiple meanings. More specifically, it is related to a gift or property left by will through an individual’s bequest (i.e. an inheritance) or more generally anything remaining from a time period or event.¹⁷ The second and broader definition of legacy is the usage seen within Olympic scholarship and discourse.¹⁸ The concept can also be problematic because organising committees continue to associate it with positive results, completely ignoring negative outcomes.¹⁹ Mangan suggests that this occurs for three reasons: a positive legacy provides evidence of a successful event, it justifies the use of public funds, and it motivates others to bid for and host the events in the future.²⁰ Therefore, it is important to note that, in addition to identifying the positive aspects of legacy such as sport infrastructure, urban regeneration, increased tourism, business opportunities, renewed community spirit, enhanced destination image and volunteer training, negative types of legacies can be associated to mega sporting events including local and national debts linked to the construction and production of the event, unused infrastructure after the event, overcrowding and strenuous use of local resources, housing issues and relocation of inhabitants.²¹ Another issue associated with sport event legacy is the fact that organising committees are temporary organisations and are generally disbanded within two years of the event’s conclusion when in reality it takes several years before legacies can be properly evaluated.²² This reinforces the need to further investigate the governance of sporting event legacy, especially post-event.

Legacy and the Modern Olympic Games

The first time the word legacy can be found in bid documents dates back to the Melbourne 1956 candidature.²³ The Lord Mayor of Melbourne, the Honourable James S. Disney stated that the city of Melbourne was ready to ‘establish, as a legacy

of the XVI Olympiad, an Athletic Centre perpetuating in Australia the high ideals in Amateur Sport and for which that movement stands'.²⁴ Between the time of the Melbourne candidature and bids for Games in the 80s, the only use of the term legacy was made in the 1968 Mexico Olympic Games final report with reference to their Mayan past and cultural links to dance.

It was not until the early 80s that legacy as a formal concept took off as a means to justify the hosting of the event. See Table 1 for a breakdown of the usage associated with the term legacy within bid documents and final reports of Olympic hosts and hopefuls. Los Angeles 1984 demonstrated to the world that it was possible to turn a profit from hosting an Olympic Games by realising a \$232 million dollar (US funds) surplus through a groundbreaking worldwide corporate sponsorship initiative.²⁵ Learning the hard way (i.e. from Montreal's massive debt from hosting the 1976 Games), Calgary's bid book for the XV Winter Games reflected the country's interest in hosting due to the potential to provide a permanent legacy (e.g. facilities and an Olympic Endowment Fund) to the people of Canada.²⁶ In addition, the final report described more idealised and intangible concepts of legacy such as talent, people, tourism, business and sport development.²⁷ Following this lead, some bid books and final reports in the late 80s and early 90s touched on various legacy elements, more notably, Anchorage's bid for the 1992 Winter Olympic Games (which had a small section in the bid book dedicated to legacy), and Barcelona's final report from the 1992 Summer Olympic Games (See Table 1).

Toronto's 1996 bid motivation had a strong focus on sharing their social and physical legacy with the people of the city. In order to ensure this, *The Toronto Legacy Commitment* was adopted by City Council. It called for:

The Olympic Village to become a new neighborhood of affordable housing after the Games; the Olympic venues to be available in the future for wide community use; and the facilities themselves to be designed and built in harmony with their environment.²⁸

Legacy continued to garner increased attention during the preparation phase of the 1996 Atlanta Games as a result of the organising committee's yearning to leave something behind to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the Games.

The new millennium witnessed a change in the use of the concept and the governance of legacy (a point that will be discussed in depth later in the article). By the early twenty-first century, legacy had made a permanent mark on the bid phase and the hosting of the Olympic Games. Legacy has now increased in importance so much so in recent years that it has become a re-occurring theme for an Organising Committee for the Olympic Games' (OCOG) overall mission. For example, the mission of the Athens 2004 Olympics Games repeatedly highlights legacy related themes:

To organise technically excellent Olympic Games and provide the best possible conditions for the athletes to compete.

To provide to the athletes, spectators and viewers a unique Olympic experience and a legacy for Olympism.

To present and promote the Olympic ideals in a contemporary manner through their traditional Greek symbols.

To promote and implement the Olympic Truce through the Torch Relay.

To control the commercial aspect of the Olympic Games.

Table 1. Usage of the word legacy in Olympic bid documents and final reports.

Edition of Olympic Games	Bid collateral (BC)*/final report (FR)	Informational/				Olympic movement		Political	Psychological	Social	Sport	Sustainability	Urban	Other
		Cultural	Economic	Environmental	Image	educational	Nostalgia							
Melbourne 1956 (S)	BC										x			x
Mexico 1968 (S)	FR	x					x				x			x
Montreal 1976 (S)	FR													
Moscow 1980 (S)	FR													x
Los Angeles 1984 (S)	BC/FR						x				x			x
Calgary 1988 (W)	BC/FR	x	x		x	x			x	x				x
Seoul 1988 (S)	FR	x	x		x									x
Nagoya 1988 (S)	BC													
Anchorage 1992 (W)	BC		x							x				x
Brisbane 1992 (S)	BC									x				
Barcelona 1992 (S)	FR	x				x				x				x
Anchorage 1994 (W)	BC													
Manchester 1996 (S)	BC		x						x	x			x	x
Toronto 1996 (S)	BC	x	x		x					x				x
Melbourne 1996 (S)	BC													
Atlanta 1996 (S)	BC	x	x		x									x
Salt Lake City 1998 (W)	BC		x		x		x			x				x
Nagano 1998 (W)	FR		x											
Sydney 2000 (S)	FR	x	x		x									x
Quebec 2002 (W)	BC													
Salt Lake City 2002 (W)	FR	x	x		x									x
Stockholm 2004 (S)	BC						x			x				
Cape Town 2004 (S)	BC											x		
San Juan 2004 (S)	BC									x				
Istanbul 2004 (S)	BC		x			x								
Athens 2004 (S)	FR		x		x									x
Turin 2006 (W)	FR	x	x		x									x
Seville 2008 (S)	BC													
Istanbul 2008 (S)	BC													
Toronto 2008 (S)	BC		x											
Bangkok 2008 (S)	BC													
Berne 2010 (W)	BC													
Salzburg 2010 (W)	BC		x											
Pyeong Chang 2010 (W)	BC													
Vancouver 2010 (W)	BC	x	x		x									x
New York 2012 (S)	BC		x	x			x							x

(continued)

Table 1. (Continued).

Edition of Olympic Games	Bid collateral (BC)*/final report (FR)*	Environmental				Image	Informational/educational		Olympic movement		Political	Psychological	Social	Sport	Sustainability	Urban	Other
		Cultural	Economic	Environmental	Image		Informational/educational	Nostalgia	movement								
Madrid 2012 (S)	BC	×		×										×		×	
Paris 2012 (S)	BC		×	×						×				×		×	
Moscow 2012 (S)	BC		×		×								×	×			
Rio de Janeiro 2012(S)	BC												×	×		×	
Istanbul 2012(S)	BC		×					×						×			
Leipzig 2012(S)	BC			×								×		×			
Havana 2012(S)	BC			×									×	×			
London 2012(S)	BC			×									×	×		×	
Pyeong Chang 2014 (W)	BC		×					×					×	×		×	
Almaty 2014 (W)	BC		×							×			×	×			
Jaca 2014 (W)	BC		×	×									×	×		×	
Sofia 2014 (W)	BC	×															×
Salzburg 2014 (W)	BC																×
Sochi 2014 (W)	BC		×										×	×			
Doha 2016 (S)	BC	×								×			×	×			
Tokyo 2016 (S)	BC												×	×		×	
Chicago 2016 (S)	BC		×	×									×	×		×	
Prague 2016 (S)	BC											×	×	×			
Madrid 2016 (S)	BC	×	×	×				×					×	×		×	
Rio de Janeiro 2016 (S)	BC												×	×		×	

Note: *Multiple documents and volumes for each edition of the Games.

To leave a lasting legacy for the people of Greece.

To re-position and promote the culture and historical heritage of Greece to the eyes of the world.

To showcase the achievements of modern Greece and its potential for the future.

To protect and enhance the natural environment and promote environmental awareness

To spread the benefits of hosting the Games throughout the country.²⁹

Prior to this time, bid information provided by the IOC in bid manuals focused on the principal motivations of the bidders and their major objectives for hosting the Olympic Games. Early 90s candidatures for the 2000 and 2002 editions of the Games discussed expected and possible benefits of hosting the Games in section 2 of the candidature questionnaire. By 2003, the year of the bids for the 2010 Winter Olympic Games, a specific question under the first section of the bid book, *Motivation, Concept and Public Opinion*, queried bidders about the impact and the legacy of hosting the Games. All bidders for the following editions of the Games (i.e. 2012, 2014 and 2016) were required to discuss the concept of legacy within their bid documents in the first section of their candidature file under the theme *Olympic Games concept/motivation and legacy* a departure which is reinforced by the inclusion of the concept in 2003 into the Olympic Charter, the pinnacle governing document of the movement.

The increasing significance of legacy within the Olympic Movement has also led to the development of an analysis tool that aims to assess and quantify the worldwide impact of the Olympic Games. The Olympic Games Impact (OGI) tool collects information on 150 indicators from three broad dimensions of impact (social, environmental and economic) over a period of 11 years.³⁰ Data collection, which began at the Salt Lake Games in 2002, is now a foundational aspect of the transfer of Olympic knowledge that has been key within the IOC since the millennium.³¹ Even more recently, in recognition of the need to focus on sport development and community capacity building within the province of British Columbia, 2010 LegaciesNow (now LIFT, which is the organisation that succeeded them following the Games) was created in conjunction with the Vancouver 2010 Bid Corporation before obtaining the right to host the 2010 Winter Olympic Games in order to ensure that sustainable (i.e. maintained over the long-term) legacy was a viable possibility even if the city was not awarded the Games.³²

Legacy Trends

Expanding Types

Early impacts of the Games are typically associated with sporting or local infrastructure, although evidence suggests that Athens also benefited from sport development programmes and national pride as a result of hosting the Olympic Games in 1896.³³ As a result of the growing formalisation of legacy within the Olympic Movement, a variety of new kinds of legacy have emerged over the past one hundred years. The following legacy themes were highlighted in the content analysis: cultural, economic, environmental, image, informational/educational, nostalgia, Olympic Movement, physical, political, psychological, social, sport, sustainability and urban related legacy (see Table 2). It is important to note that similar to the

Table 2. Description of legacy themes identified in bid documents and final reports.

Legacy themes	Examples (both tangible and intangible)
Cultural	Legacy elements related to cultural programming and opportunities
Economic	Includes financial legacies such as jobs, tourism, funding, hosting opportunities and marketing
Environmental	Environmental legacies are comprised of aspects such as environmentally friendly architecture and engineering, policy, and education
Image	Legacies associated with heightened international awareness and image enhancement of the host destination and region
Informational/ Educational	Informational and educational legacies are ones that embrace opportunities for gaining experience, knowledge, personal development, research and governance capacity/processes
Nostalgia	Takes into account personal experience and memories associated with the event
Olympic Movement	Embraces impacts important to the Olympic Family such as global harmony, and influence on youth
Political	Encompasses policy and policy development instruments
Psychological	Includes personal and community wide feelings of national pride, enthusiasm and emotions
Social issues	Legacies related to these issues consist of social progress, health, impact on the general population and special populations, new opportunities and civic engagement
Sport	Sport related legacies are sport development, sport facilities, increased participation and health improvement
Sustainability	Includes long term planning, environmentally friendly, and economically viable legacies
Urban	These legacies include rejuvenation of sport facilities, transportation, city services, planning, and recreation spaces

reviewed literature, both tangible and intangible types of legacies existed for most categories; however, the more tangible types of legacy such as physical infrastructure tended to be highlighted more extensively.

Olympic Legacy Metamorphosis – Changes in Emphasis Over Time

Olympic events have become an important milestone in the history of any city that has hosted the event. Early references to a candidate's motivation to host the Games and the benefits associated with this bequest are associated mainly to the construction and rejuvenation of sporting infrastructure such as the restoration the ancient Panathenian Stadium during the 1896 Athens Games. Although not explicitly stated in the documents analysed, additional research³⁴ has shown that Olympic cities from the 1930s to the 1960s used the Olympic moniker to promote the images and local regimes associated with their countries (e.g. Berlin 1936 and the Nazi regime and the re-emergence of Tokyo 1964 following the Second World War).³⁵ By the late 1970s, the Olympics were being used as a stimulus to spark urban regeneration and local economies for the host region through the use of mega-event strategies.³⁶ For example, the financial success of Los Angeles 1984 showed the world that it was possible to make a substantial surplus and affect the tourism industry by hosting a mega-event.³⁷ A prosperous urban regeneration model was also made available following the success of the Barcelona 1992 organising committee's efforts to modernise the city. As a result, proposals with a strong link

to city planning agendas have garnered increased attention in candidature bid books from the mid-90s onwards and have become increasingly established in the bid process. For example, Rio's 2004 bid reflected the mega-event strategy of using the Games as a catalyst to speed up existing urban plans:

The Federal University of Rio de Janeiro, host of the projected Olympic Village, will benefit from the completion of an architectural and urban planning centre that was started decades ago, but left in an unfinished state, and the addition of an advanced technological centre. In addition to having a direct impact on urban planning, the Olympic Games will be a catalyst for the total restructuring and modernisation of the highways connecting the Olympic areas.³⁸

Similarly, the Athens 2004 bid was linked to an execution plan regarding major projects to revitalise the historical city centre and the Faliro coastal zone including new and existing roads, a new metro system, relocation of the international airport, and other state of the art infrastructure.³⁹

One of the most recent set of trends involves the Olympic movement's gravitation toward environmental concerns. In 1991, the Olympic Charter was amended to reflect the importance of the environment, and as such, candidature questionnaires for cities vying to host the 2002 Winter Games revealed questions related to the protection of the environment.⁴⁰ Following the adoption of Agenda 21 *Sport for Sustainable Development* in 1999, the IOC added environment to sport and culture to form the third pillar to the Olympic Movement. As a result, bid and host cities have added a plethora of environmentally oriented activities to their hosting agendas including policy development, education initiatives, and the construction of sustainable, environmentally friendly infrastructure. Although environmental concerns associated with the Games (and more specifically the Winter Games) have been traced back as early as the Lake Placid Games in 1932, it was the Lillehammer Games in 1994 and their focus on environmental policy that brought the issue to the forefront.⁴¹ Naturally, the environmental strategy bandwagon took off and organisers of subsequent Games included environmental initiatives in the hosting of the Games. More notably, Sydney 2000 promoted the concept of a *Green Games* in their bid and most recently, Torino 2006 and Vancouver 2010 highlighted environmental legacy as a principle component in the organising and hosting of the Games.

Wanting to ensure that the Torino 2006 Games would be seen and remembered as the eco-sustainable Olympics, TOROC set itself two major objectives as far back as the candidacy stage: to guarantee the environmental sustainability of the Olympic Programme during the planning of the Games, construction of the Olympic Venues and actual staging of the Olympiad; and to hand on a new way of thinking, planning and organizing major events.⁴²

Following the turn of this century, candidatures for cities vying to host the Olympic Games not only engaged the environmental movement, but the notion of sustainable development (i.e. maintaining over the long-term) which also emerged as a legacy theme.

Even though the concept of sustainability with regards to hosting an Olympic Games emerged hand-in-hand with the environmental movement, it is now seen as a much larger concept which relates to many of the legacy themes and the overall leftover benefits of the Games and as such was included as a separate legacy theme.

The concept of sustainability can be seen throughout candidatures of the new millennium. Discussions linked specifically to the construction of facilities that are aligned with the needs of the community, environmental protection and sustainable development policies, as well as long-term city planning. Chicago's 2016 candidature showcases the city's sustainable development initiatives:

In creating its plan, Chicago made the post-Games use of venues a priority, utilized existing and temporary facilities where possible and planned on building new facilities only where justified by long-term community needs and financial viability. The design for the Games also took advantage of the city's existing transportation infrastructure, which includes an extensive subway, bus and train system.⁴³

Similarly, London 2012s overall long-term objectives are:

to develop London as an exemplary sustainable world city, with strong, long-term and diverse economic growth, social inclusion, and fundamental improvements in the environment, and use of resources. It focuses investment and growth in the east of the city, recycling brownfield land to create high quality new mixed sustainable communities located around strategic transport nodes.⁴⁴

Other issues linked to the sustainability of the Games legacy include temporary versus permanent structures and the movement away from sole sport to non-sport use. For example, London has limited the number of permanent venues to five and is utilising a number of temporary venues such as swimming pools and a shooting range to meet the needs of the Games but will be dismantling and/or selling them post-Games in order to minimise the number of white elephants associated with hosting.⁴⁵ However, this has not occurred without objections, as there have been criticisms that some sports are benefiting much more than others from permanent legacy installations, creating a disparity among sports.⁴⁶ In addition, it is possible to see a shift in legacy venues from Olympic sport use to non-Olympic sport use and participation-based venues. It is even common to see facilities shift from sport use to non-sport use and employed for cultural and business events. For example, the Sydney stadiums used in 2000 are now used mainly for concerts and other cultural events, and parts of Sydney Olympic Park have been transformed to capitalise on popular community-based sports such as skateboarding. Since London was awarded the 2012 Games, sustainability has risen to another level illustrated by the development of a British Standard entitled *BS8909 Sustainability Management Systems for Events*.⁴⁷ This prompted the International Organization for Standardization (ISO) to develop an international standard (ISO 20121) which focuses on promoting sustainability in event management by helping to identify key sustainability issues such as venue selection, operating procedures, and procurement.⁴⁸

It is also important to note that both the candidature files and the final reports focused mainly on positive aspects of legacy, and as such reinforces Cashman's belief that one of the major issues associated with legacy is that the potential negative consequences are generally ignored, especially by host organisations.⁴⁹ Although, this is not to say that OCOGs have not learned from the previous experiences of their predecessor's as there are several occurrences where hosts referred to previous Games and final reports for guidance. For example, Calgary 1988 focused on providing the city with an economic legacy through the Olympic Endowment Fund as a result of researching the financial problems of the Montreal 1976 Games.

While not explicit in documents, a definite legacy theme that emerges relates to the politically themed legacy category. Toohey and Veal suggest that political Olympic legacy can be traced back to Coubertin himself who suggested that the Games provided both an athletic and political affect.⁵⁰ Much of this type of legacy is associated with contemporary political problems such as the human rights protests around the Beijing Olympics. However, a different type of political legacy including the actual transformation of the political landscape of the hosts (i.e. changes in government/governing parties, head politicians, and movement in leadership) in addition to policy and policy instruments related to winning and hosting the Games emerged. Within the data, this legacy theme is not necessarily seen as a benefit but more of a consequence of hosting and can lead to the creation of benchmarks and implications for future hosts. For example, amendments in sport hosting programmes and development of Games-specific Bills (e.g. *The Olympic and Paralympic Marks Act 2007* for the Vancouver 2010 Games) have been seen as a result of hosting the event.⁵¹ The resulting experience can be beneficial for the main Games stakeholders (e.g. government) as the administrative experience from hosting the Games can act as an accelerator in the development of organisational capacities and the emergence of effective leadership.

Legacy Complexity and Interconnectedness

From the first modern Games in 1896 to the candidature files for the 2016 Winter Olympic Games, the notion of Olympic Games legacy has become increasingly complex. All 13 emergent legacy themes have become progressively interconnected over time, and as such, are not distinct from each other and exist with significant overlap.

For example, the economic legacy theme is tied to 12 of the other legacy themes identified. The Chicago 2016 bid exemplifies the link between the provision of proper sport facilities (i.e. a physical legacy) and the economic, social and environmental/sustainability themes. 'The plan gives priority to the use of existing facilities, and new construction is limited to those structures justified by significant community needs and long-term commercial viability'.⁵² The link between a destination's image, urban plans and economic benefits are demonstrated in the Madrid 2016 bid:

Economic benefits are central to our legacy plans through interaction with the business community. Madrid 16 is working with Madrid Global, a department within Madrid City Council focused on urban renewal and other key stakeholders to raise the city's profile on the world stage, encourage business and tourism opportunities.⁵³

A degree of interconnectedness (i.e. amount of overlap with the other legacy themes) exists within all the legacy themes although not at the same extent. The above findings reinforce arguments made by Brown and Massey, Parent, and Koenig and Leopkey who purport that existing legacy types although distinct are not mutually exclusive.⁵⁴

Legacy Governance – Short-Term Individual Support to Strategic Long-Term Governance

Early editions of Games legacy reflected individual donations as 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 key influencers and decision makers for the Games and their legacies. As the Games increased in scale over time, legacy became a more important aspect to hosting successfully and the evolution of the governance of legacy reflects these changes. In 1976, Greek Prime Minister Constantinos Karamanlis suggested that Greece become the permanent home of the Games as he recognised the sporting and cultural benefits for the country including building on the historical connections to the Games of antiquity and the renewal of sport through the construction of new facilities and urban infrastructure in addition to the facilitation of planning that would occur if the event was held the same location every four years.⁵⁵ However, this did not occur, and Greece did not submit a bid until the Golden Jubilee Games of 1996, eventually receiving the honour to host the 2004 edition. More recently, Burbank, Andranovich and Heying argued that a growth regime (i.e. existing informal network of business leaders within a community) plays a significant role in the strategic approach a host city takes in securing the Games, its success, and the event legacy.⁵⁶

As a result of following a 'no frills' strategy and creating a successful privately funded Games, Los Angeles 1984 provided a turning point for legacy governance. Originally, the Amateur Athletic Foundation (AAF), now the LA 84 Foundation, a non-profit organisation, was founded in 1985 to manage Southern California's share (40% of the total profit) of the legacy funds generated from the hosting of the Games (the other 60% went to the United States Olympic Committee).⁵⁷ The LA 84 Foundation represents the first independent organisation of its kind specifically created to manage the legacy resulting from the Games. In addition to the \$11 million raised by the LAOOC (Los Angeles Olympic Organizing Committee) through the torch relay to support youth sport programmes, the LA 84 Foundation has spent over \$140 million, dramatically impacting the sporting landscape both in California and the world through educational opportunities (e.g. research, library and academic database), funding initiatives (e.g. grants for sport organisations and the support of new sporting infrastructure), volunteer engagement, and the promotion of Olympic sports since its inception.⁵⁸ As legacy became more routine and profiting from hosting the Games became a reality, bid cities and future hosts began to prepare for life after the Games. During the bid process, Calgary 1988 and the Canadian federal government planned for and provided funding for both the Calgary Olympic Development Association (CODA, and now WinSport) and the Canadian Olympic Association (now Canadian Olympic Committee) even without the \$260 million financial legacy.⁵⁹ The Canadian federal government used an approach that was developed specifically to go beyond the needs of the Games.

In addition to providing essential services, the Canadian government provided a direct funding commitment to the project, undertook to build or fund certain facilities for the Games and established a legacy fund to ensure the longer-term benefits for the Canadian community.⁶⁰

This was the first time in history that an Olympic fund was proposed prior to the Games (in the bidding process) specifically to support long-term training opportunities and continuous upkeep of the facilities. Barcelona 1992 spread the responsibility for Games legacy over three organisations: the Olympic Galleria, the city library, and the Olympic Studies Centre.⁶¹ Following in Calgary's footsteps, Toronto's 1996 candidature proposed the creation of a \$70 million dollar fund to

help maintain facilities, continue programming, and to share their Olympic experience with people from other parts of the world, especially third-world countries.⁶² Salt Lake City (2002) budgeted for a \$40 million legacy fund to be split between the IOC, USOC and the Utah Athletic Foundation (UAF), an organisation charged with taking care of the legacy facilities of the 2002 Winter Olympic Games.

The end goal for the Salt Lake 2002 Games budget was zero-deficit, which essentially meant to break even. In order for SLOC to accomplish this, the cost of staging the Salt Lake 2002 Games and Paralympics needed to be offset primarily by sponsorships, broadcasting fees, ticket sales and merchandise sales. In addition to covering the cost of the Games with income from these sources, SLOC established a Legacy Fund to maintain Olympic Venues after the Games. The Legacy Fund was a monetary gift to the state of Utah that was earmarked to support youth sport programs and keep the spirit of the Games alive in the community⁶³

Sydney 2000 created their governing organisation, the Sydney Olympic Park Authority one year following the Games of the XXVII Olympiad, whereas Vancouver 2010 was the first candidate city to create an independent organisation (2010 LegaciesNow) mandated with conceptualising the legacy of the Games even if they were not awarded to the city. 2010 LegaciesNow has now evolved into LIFTS an organisation that uses a venture philanthropy approach to sustaining the event's legacy and is aiming to facilitate the effectiveness of not-for-profit organisations in the country.⁶⁴ As detailed in the Multi-Party Agreement (MPA) prior to bidding and receiving the 2010 Games, the Games Operating Trust (GOT) is responsible for the management of the Legacy Endowment Fund for the 2010 Games and oversees the distribution of the money to the Richmond Oval, Whistler Olympic Park (WOP), and Whistler Sliding Centre (WSC) for operating expenses and maintenance costs.⁶⁵ The same strategic bid phase approach was taken with the Whistler Legacies Society that became the organisation that owns and operates the Games legacy facilities in the Resort Municipality of Whistler (WOP, WSC, and the Whistler Athletes Centre) following the conclusion of the Games.

London 2012 has claimed that their legacy planning for the London Olympic and Paralympic Games has been more intensive than any other previous host city.⁶⁶ This preparation included the development of an action plan to help stimulate the potential long-term benefits associated with hosting including impacting sport development throughout the country, transforming and regenerating East London, inspiring the younger generation, developing sustainable facilities, and boosting the local image.⁶⁷ This reveals a shift in legacy planning post-Games to strategically planning from the bid phase, and suggests that legacy is not something that should accrue only post-Games, but from the initial bid, through to planning and Games implementation. This change from thinking about legacy post-Games and post-bids to planning for it pre-Games is one of the most significant evolutionary adaptations in the governance of legacy within the modern Olympic Games.

Organisations have been created to stimulate legacy prior to and during the bid phase of host city candidatures even if the cities are not bestowed the opportunity to host in order to garner potential positive benefits for the local region. The Chicago 2016 applicant city committee created a living legacy in the form of an organisation entitled World Sport Chicago (WSC) which continues to help support and promote

Olympic and Paralympic sport among the youth of the city despite the fact they were not awarded the Games.⁶⁸

Legacy Decision Makers and Influencers

Early Games legacy was associated with the success of the Games in terms of the provision of facilities and programming. Key influencers/actors were the local organising committees, individual donors, and associated organisations such as the governing committees of World Fairs.

Since Sydney 2000, the inclusion of various levels of government (federal, state and municipal) as lead stakeholders has become the norm. Vancouver introduced the concept of an MPA, a binding document that stipulates the roles and responsibilities of the main Games partners during the lead up to and following the Games; a practice now mandated by the IOC. In the case of the Vancouver MPA, the governance of legacy is stipulated in section 29–36 where details about the responsibilities associated with the winding down of the OCOG, distribution of assets, physical legacy, surplus from the Games, intellectual property, the Legacy Endowment Fund, Whistler Legacies Society and Games legacy administration are laid out.⁶⁹ The Olympic Park Legacy Company (once the London Development Agency) is controlled in collaboration by the central government and the Mayor of London. For the 2012 Games, the ‘responsibility for delivering the regeneration legacy for London rests clearly with the Mayor of London’ with the help and support of local authorities⁷⁰ suggesting that multiple players need to be involved in the governance of Games’ legacy. One thing that is clear in the data is that the sustainability of Olympic Games legacy is a shared responsibility between many stakeholders. Since the OCOG is a short-term organisation and ceases to exist following the Games, stakeholders who remain for the long term should definitely be involved. What is left to be established is who should take on the lead role and to what degree should the other Games stakeholders have influence in the strategic planning, decision making and post-Games sustainability of the Games benefits.

Conclusion

Experiencing or acquiring benefits as a result of hosting the Olympic Games has existed as a concept since the proposed reinvention of the modern Games by Pierre de Coubertin. Since then, various net positive benefits have been put forth as motivation to pursue and justify the hosting of the Games. These have evolved from general benefits and impacts of the Games to sustainable long-term legacies, which have been strategically planned from the time of the bid. The growth of the Games has resulted in the increased use and importance of the event legacy concept within the Olympic lexicon, so much so that it is now a key component of the host selection process and governance of the Games.

The extent to which the discussed legacies actually happen is debatable as the bid and final report documents are self-reported by the organisations seeking to host and organise the Games and are, therefore, questionable at best. For example, Sydney was said to be a ‘Green Games’, but to what degree ‘green-washing’ occurred merits additional review and should be further analysed.

One key question that still remains to be addressed today is who has the responsibility for delivering and sustaining post-Games legacy? This shared

responsibility needs to be investigated further in order to determine the accountability and the degree of participation of other Games stakeholders throughout the legacy process.

The norms and standards that have emerged over time in relation to the concept and governance of legacy link us to the notion of institutionalisation. Institutionalisation is the process by which events and structures become established habits of social behaviour within organisations over time.⁷¹ As demonstrated in this article, many forces and agents such as the IOC, previous bidders, successful Games candidates, and other Games stakeholders have played a role in the institutionalisation of legacy within the modern Olympic movement. Although, beyond the scope of this article, the use of institutionalisation theory to further explore the formalisation (i.e. increase in characterisation of the concept through the writing down of rules, definitions, policies, and governing procedures) of legacy is needed and therefore suggested as a future step for this research.⁷²

Although Olympic legacy has been explored and contextualised in this study, there is still much research to be undertaken. One area worthy of deeper discourse analysis is that of the use of the word legacy versus the term heritage since they are sometimes used interchangeably especially in other languages (i.e. legacy in French is typically translated as *héritage*). Further research into the interconnectedness of the legacy themes is also important in order to investigate the relationships and complexity of each. In addition, specific case studies of legacy organisations will also help provide more information on the topic and allow for a much deeper analysis of the governance of Olympic legacy specifically, transparency, participation, performance and accountability elements of both the structure and the process.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Eileen O'Connor from the University of Ottawa for her helpful insight with the article and the 2007 International Olympic Committee Postgraduate Grant Program, and the Social Sciences and Humanities Council of Canada (grant number 752-2009-1807) for their financial contributions and support for this research project.

Notes on Contributors

Becca Leopkey is a PhD candidate in the School of Human Kinetics, University of Ottawa. Her areas of research are in organization theory, legacy, and the planning and implementation of major sporting events. Becca has published in several journals in the area of sport management, event management, and sport policy.

Milena M. Parent is an Associate Professor in the School of Human Kinetics, University of Ottawa. She specializes in the organization theory and strategic management of major sports event organizing committees and their stakeholders. She has published several articles in the top sport management and management journals, as well as books and book chapters internationally in both English and French.

Notes

1. Hiller, 'Toward an Urban Sociology of Mega-Events'; Thomson et al., 'Sport Event Legacies: Implications for Meaningful Legacy Outcomes'.
2. Allen et al., *Festival and Special Event Management*.
3. Crompton, 'Economic Impact Analysis of Sport Facilities and Events'; Daniels et al., 'Estimating the Economic Impacts of Seven Regular Sport Tourism Events'; Horne et al., 'Accounting for Mega-Events: Forecast and Actual Impacts of the 2002 Football

- World Cup Finals on the Host Countries Japan/Korea'; Preuss, *Economics of Staging the Olympic Games*.
4. *The International Journal of the History of Sport* – Special Issue on Olympic Legacies: Intended and Unintended – Political, Cultural, Economic, and Educational.
 5. Thomson et al., *Sport Event Legacies: Implications for Meaningful Legacy Outcomes*
 6. Hoye and Cuskelly, *Sport Governance*; Hirst, 'Democracy and Governance'.
 7. A document analysis of the bid collateral, candidature files and final reports retrieved from the Olympic Studies Centre in Lausanne, Switzerland were used as the main source of data in this study. In total, 185 documents were consulted. Data analysis occurred in the form of a content analysis using the qualitative data assessment software ATLAS.ti 6.0 which facilitated the coding and retrieval of the data by allowing the researcher to highlight themes that appeared in the archival material. These approaches facilitated the content analysis by helping to clearly identify themes and ideas in the archival material. This resulted in a greater analysis of the initial findings through the development of higher order themes, which are discussed in the emerging findings. Textual analysis was also used as a technique to help analyse the use and emergence of the term legacy within the data. All mentions of the word legacy in the data were captured and coded.
 8. Gold and Gold, *Olympic Cities*.
 9. Athens 1896 Organizing Committee, *The Olympic Games*, 128.
 10. McIntosh, 'The Olympic Bid Process as the Starting Point of the Legacy Development', 451.
 11. Gold and Gold, *Olympic Cities*.
 12. Gold and Gold, *Olympic Cities*.
 13. Chappelet, 'Olympic Environmental Concerns as Legacy of the Winter Games'.
 14. *Legacy Lives* Conference Series <http://www.pmplegacy.com/legacy-lives/overview>
 15. Cashman, *The Bitter-Sweet Awakening*; Ritchie, 'Turning 16 Days into 16 Years through Olympic Legacies'; Preuss, 'FIFA World Cup 2006 and its Legacy on Tourism'; Vigor et al., *After the Gold Rush*.
 16. Cashman, 'What is Olympic Legacy?', 33.
 17. Cashman, 'What is Olympic Legacy?'; Preuss, 'FIFA World Cup 2006 and its Legacy on Tourism'.
 18. Cashman, 'What is Olympic Legacy?'.
 19. Cashman, *The Bitter-Sweet Awakening*.
 20. Mangan, 'Prologue: Guarantees of Global Goodwill: Post-Olympic Legacies – Too Many Limping White Elephants'.
 21. Cashman, *The Bitter-Sweet Awakening*; Gold and Gold, *Olympic Cities*; Ritchie, 'Turning 16 Days into 16 Years through Olympic Legacies'; Vigor et al., *After the Gold Rush*; Lenskyj, *Inside the Olympic Industry*; Lenskyj, *The Best Olympics Ever?*; Zimmerman, *Lasting Legacies Report*.
 22. Gratton and Preuss, 'Maximizing Olympic Impacts by Building Up Legacies'.
 23. McIntosh, 'The Olympic Bid Process as the Starting Point of the Legacy Development', 451.
 24. Melbourne Bid Committee, *Melbourne's Plan*, 6.
 25. Amateur Athletic Foundation, *Serving Youth through Sport*.
 26. CODA, *Calgary Canada*. Pg. 6.
 27. XV Olympic Winter Games Organizing Committee, *XV Olympic Winter Games: Official Report*.
 28. Toronto Olympic Council, *Toronto's Proposal to Host the Games of the XXVIth Olympiad*, 24.
 29. ATHOC, *Official Report of the XXVIII Olympiad*, 313.
 30. IOC, 'What is Olympic Games Global Impact?'.
 31. IOC, 'What is Olympic Games Global Impact?'.
 32. 2010 LegaciesNow, *About Us*.
 33. Athens 1896 Organizing Committee, *The Olympic Games*.
 34. Gold and Gold, *Olympic Cities*.
 35. Gold and Gold, *Olympic Cities*.
 36. Burbank et al., *Olympic Dreams*.
 37. LAOOC, *Official Report of the Games of the XXIII Olympiad*.

38. Rio de Janeiro Bid Committee, *Rio de Janeiro Candidate to Host the XXVII Olympic Games in 2004*, 36.
39. ATHOC, *Official Report of the XXVIII Olympiad*.
40. Chappelet, 'Olympic Environmental Concerns as Legacy of the Winter Games'.
41. Chappelet, 'Olympic Environmental Concerns as Legacy of the Winter Games'.
42. TOROC, *Final Report: Volume 3*, 261.
43. Chicago Bid Committee, *Chicago 2016 Applicant City*, 11.
44. London Bid Committee, *London 2012 Candidate City*, 23.
45. House of Commons Culture, Media and Sport Committee, *London 2012 Olympic Games and Paralympic Games: Funding and Legacy – Second Report of the Session 2006–07 Volume 1 Report Together with Formal Minutes*.
46. Hart, *London 2012: Olympic Legacy Winners and Losers*.
47. Pelham, 'Sustainable Events'.
48. Pelham, 'Sustainable Events'.
49. Cashman, *The Bitter-Sweet Awakening*.
50. Toohey and Veal, *The Olympic Games: A Social Science Perspective*, 2nd ed.
51. Leopkey et al., 'Barriers and Facilitators when Hosting Sporting Events: Exploring the Canadian and Swiss Sport Event Hosting Policies'.
52. Chicago Bid Committee, *Chicago 2016 Applicant City*, 25.
53. Madrid Bid Committee, *Madrid 2016 Applicant City*, 5.
54. Brown and Massey, *Literature Review: The Impact of Major Sporting Events*; Parent, 'Developing a Framework of Evolution and Issue Patterns for Large-Scale Sporting Event Organizing Committees and their Stakeholders'; Koenig and Leopkey, 'Sustainable Development in Canadian Sporting Events: An Analysis of Legacy and Sports Development'.
55. ATHOC, *Official Report of the XXVIII Olympiad*.
56. Burbank et al., *Olympic Dreams*.
57. Amateur Athletic Foundation, *Serving Youth through Sport*.
58. Amateur Athletic Foundation, *Serving Youth through Sport*.
59. XV Olympic Winter Games Organizing Committee, *XV Olympic Winter Games: Official Report*.
60. XV Olympic Winter Games Organizing Committee, *XV Olympic Winter Games: Official Report*.
61. Cashman and Hughes, *Staging the Olympics*.
62. Toronto Olympic Council, *Toronto's Proposal to Host the Games of the XXVIth Olympiad*.
63. SLOC, *The Official Report of the XIXth Olympic Winter Games Salt Lake 2002*, 387.
64. LIFT Philanthropy Partners, *About Us*.
65. 2010 Vancouver, *Multiparty Agreement for the 2010 Winter Olympic and Paralympic Games*.
66. House of Commons Culture, Media and Sport Committee, *London 2012 Olympic Games and Paralympic Games: Funding and Legacy – Second Report of the Session 2006–07 Volume 1 Report Together with Formal Minutes*, 31.
67. LOCOG, *London 2012 Legacy Vision Presented to IOC*.
68. Chicago Bid Committee, *Chicago 2016 Applicant City*.
69. 2010 Vancouver, *Multiparty Agreement for the 2010 Winter Olympic and Paralympic Games*.
70. House of Commons Culture, Media and Sport Committee, *London 2012 Olympic Games and Paralympic Games: Funding and Legacy – Second Report of the Session 2006–07 Volume 1 Report Together with Formal Minutes*, 32.
71. Berger and Luckmann, *The Social Construction of Reality*.
72. Slack and Parent, *Understanding Sport Organizations*.

References

- XV Olympic Winter Games Organizing Committee. *XV Olympic Winter Games: Official Report*. Calgary, Canada: OCO '88, 1988.
- 2010 LegaciesNow. 'About Us', Available at http://www.2010legaciesnow.com/about_us/, 2009 (accessed September 21, 2011).

- 2010 Vancouver. *Multiparty Agreement For the 2010 Winter Olympic and Paralympic Games*, n.d, Available at <http://www.canada2010.gc.ca/role/gc/020102MPA-eng.cfm> (accessed 20 July, 2011).
- Allen, J., W. O'Toole, I. McDonnell, and R. Harris. *Festival and Event Management*. 4th ed. Australia: Wiley, 2007.
- Amateur Athletic Foundation. *Serving Youth Through Sport: The Legacy of the 1984 Olympic Games*. Los Angeles: AAF, 2004.
- Athens 1896 Organizing Committee. *The Olympic Games: B.C. 776–A.D. 1896*. Lampros: N.G., 1896–1897.
- ATHOC. *Official Report of the XXVIII Olympiad 2: The Games*. Haidefenos, GR: Liberis Publications, 2005.
- Berger, P.L., and T. Luckmann. *The Social Construction of Reality*. New York: Anchor, 1967.
- Brown, A., and J. Massey. *Literature Review: The Impact of Major Sporting Events*. Manchester, England: Manchester Institute for Popular Culture, Manchester Metropolitan University, 2001.
- Burbank, M.J., G.D. Andranovich, and C.H. Heying. *Olympic Dreams: The Impact of Mega-Event on Local Politics*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2001.
- CODA, *Calgary Canada*. Calgary: CODA, 1981.
- Cashman, R. 'What is "Olympic legacy"?' In *The Legacy of the Olympic Games 1984–2000*, ed. M. Moragas et al., 31–42. Lausanne: International Olympic Committee, 2002.
- Cashman, R., *The Bitter-Sweet Awakening: The Legacy of the Sydney 2000 Olympic Games*. Sydney: Walla Walla Press, 2006.
- Cashman, R., and A. Hughes, eds. *Staging the Olympics: The Event and Its Impact*. Sydney, Australia: University of New South Wales Press Ltd., 1999.
- Chappelet, J.-L. 'Olympic Environmental Concerns as a Legacy of the Winter Games'. *The International Journal of the History of Sport* 25, no. 14 (2008): 1884–1902.
- Chicago Bid Committee. *Chicago 2016 Applicant City*. Chicago, USA: Chicago Bid Committee, 2008.
- Crompton, J.L. 'Economic Impact Analysis of Sport Facilities and Events: Eleven Sources of Misapplication'. *Journal of Sport Management* 9 (1995): 14–35.
- Daniels, M.J., and W.C. Norman. 'Estimating the Economic Impacts of Seven Regular Sport Tourism Events'. *Journal of Sport Tourism* 8 (2003): 214–22.
- Gold, J.R., and M.M. Gold. *Olympic Cities-City Agendas, Planning, and the World's Games, 1896–2012*. London: Routledge, 2007.
- Gratton, C., and H. Preuss. 'Maximizing Olympic Impacts by Building Up Legacies'. *The International Journal of the History of Sport* 25, no. 14 (2008): 1922–38.
- Hart, S. *London 2012: Olympic Legacy Winners and Losers*, July 14, 2009, Available at <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/sport/othersports/olympics/london2012/5826787/London-2012-Olympic-legacy-winners-and-losers.html> (accessed 11 July, 2011).
- Hiller, H. 'Toward an Urban Sociology of Mega-Events'. *Research in Urban Sociology* 5 (2000): 181–205.
- Hirst, P. Democracy and Governance. In *Debating Governance: Authority, Steering, and Democracy*, ed. J. Pierre, 13–35. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Horne, J., and W. Manzenreite. 'Accounting for Mega-Events: Forecast and Actual Impacts of the 2002 Football World Cup Finals on the Host Countries Japan/Korea'. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport* 39 (2004): 187–203.
- House of Commons Culture, Media and Sport Committee. *London 2012 Olympic Games and Paralympic Games: Funding and Legacy – Second Report of Session 2006–07 Volume 1 Report Together with Formal Minutes*. London: The Stationary Office Limited, January 17, 2007.
- Hoye, R., and G. Cuskelly. *Sport Governance*. Oxford: Elsevier, 2007.
- International Olympic Committee. 'What is the Olympic Games Global Impact Study?'. *Olympic Review* (June 2006): 1–2.
- Koenig, S., and B. Leopkey. 'Sustainable Development in Canadian Sporting Events: An Analysis of Legacy and Sports Development'. In *Proceedings of the Administrative Sciences Association of Canada Conference*, Niagara Falls, Canada: ASAC, 2009.
- LAOOC. *Official Report of the Games of the XXIII Olympiad, Los Angeles, 1984 Volume 1: Organization and Planning*. USA: LAOOC, 1985.

- Lenskyj, H.J. *Inside the Olympic Industry: Power, Politics, and Activism*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 2000.
- Lenskyj, H.J. *The Best Olympics Ever? Social Impacts of Sydney 2000*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 2002.
- Leopkey, B., O. Mutter, and M.M. Parent. 'Barriers and Facilitators when Hosting Sporting Events: Exploring the Canadian and Swiss Sport Event Hosting Policies'. *International Journal of Sport Policy* 2, no. 2 (2010):113–34.
- LIFT Philanthropy Partners. *About Us*. n.d., Available at <http://www.liftpartners.ca/who-we-are/about-us> (accessed 20 July, 2011).
- London Bid Committee. *London 2012 Candidate City: Volume 1*. London: London Bid Committee, 2003.
- LOCOG. 'London 2012 Legacy Vision Presented to IOC', Available at <http://www.london2012.com/news/media-releases/2007/2007-06/london-2012-legacy-vision-presented-to-ioc.php>, 2007 (accessed 20 July, 2011).
- Madrid Bid Committee. *Madrid 2016 Applicant City*. Madrid: Madrid Bid Committee, 2008.
- Mangan, J.A. 'Prologue: Guarantees of Global Goodwill: Post-Olympic Legacies – Too Many Limping White Elephants?' *The International Journal of History of Sport* 25, no. 14 (2008): 1869–83.
- McIntosh, M.J. 'The Olympic Bid Process as the Starting Point of the Legacy Development'. In *The Legacy of the Olympic Games 1984–2000*, ed. M. Moragas *et al.*, 450–6. Lausanne: International Olympic Committee, 2002.
- Melbourne Invitation Committee. *Melbourne's Plan*. Victoria, AU: McLaren & Co. Pty. Ltd, n.d.
- Parent, M.M. 'Developing a Framework of Evolution and Issue Patterns for Large-Scale Sporting Event Organizing Committees and their Stakeholders'. *Journal of Sport Management* 22, no. 2 (2008): 135–64.
- Pelham, F. 'Sustainable Events'. *ISO Focus* (March 2011): 32–3.
- Preuss, H. *The Economics of Staging the Olympics: A Comparison of the Games 1972–2008*. Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited, 2004.
- Preuss, H. 'FIFA World Cup 2006 and its legacy on tourism'. In *Trends and Issues in Global Tourism 2007*, ed. R. Conrady and M. Buck, 83–102. Berlin/Heidelberg: Springer, 2007.
- Rio Bid Committee. *Rio de Janeiro Candidate to Host the XXVII Olympic Games in 2004*. Rio de Janeiro: Rio Bid Committee, 1996.
- Ritchie, J.R.B. 'Turning 16 Days into 16 Years through Olympic Legacies'. *Event Management* 6, no. 3 (2000): 155–65.
- Slack, T., and M.M. Parent. *Understanding Sport Organizations: The Application of Organization Theory*. IL: Human Kinetics, 2006.
- SLOC. *The Official Report of the XIXth Olympic Winter Games Salt Lake 2002*. Available at <http://www.la84foundation.org/6oic/OfficialReports/2002/2002v1.pdf>, 2004.
- Thomson, A., B. Leopkey, K. Schlenker, and N. Schulenkorf. 'Sport Event Legacies: Implications for Meaningful Legacy Outcomes'. Paper presented at 2010 Leeds Event Legacy Conference, Leeds, UK, July 14–16, 2010.
- Toohey, K., and A.J. Veal. *The Olympic Games: A Social Science Perspective*. 2nd ed. Cambridge, MA: CABI, 2001.
- TOROC. *Final Report: Volume 3*. Milano, IT: Lineastampa, 2006.
- Toronto Ontario Olympic Council. *Toronto's Proposal to Host the Games of the XXVIth Olympiad*. Scarborough, Canada: Yorkville Press, n.d.
- Vigor, A., M. Mean, and C. Tims. *After the Gold Rush: A Sustainable Olympics for London*. London: Ippr & Demos, 2004.
- Zimmerman, K. *Lasting Legacies Report*. Vancouver: VANOC, 2007.