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1. CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

This report arises from research into the experiences of previous host Olympic cities. It combines research in several thematic areas of Olympic studies with analysis and recommendations designed for consideration by local policy makers and communities. The report is written in a briefing style, and provides added context in separate sections.

BACKSTORY The modern Games were conceived in the late 19th century by Pierre de Courbertin as a festival of humanity, an elevation of universal values via the performance of sport and culture. As a result cultural festivities, now known as the Cultural Olympiad, were run in tandem with the sporting event. In the last 25 years the Cultural Olympiad has been held in the host nation over the 4 year period leading up to the Games. Likewise, the efforts of disabled athletes in games events were accepted by the International Olympic Committee as a parallel event in 1988 and are now known as the Paralympics. Since 2001 a host country must undertake to host the Paralympics with the Olympic event. This means that the Olympic event in its entirety now occupies a four year period with five weeks of competition in which the host country can be considered as undertaking an Olympic cycle.

Over time the Olympic Games have become the largest event in the world, sporting or otherwise. They attract the largest television audiences of any event and ensure a global spotlight on the host country as a result.

Hopeful countries must make a bid to the International Olympic Committee to host the Games in a bidding round lasting a few years. In the past few bidding rounds successful countries have had to prove that there will be some positive outcome from hosting the Games in the country. Hence, China’s bid emphasised ‘opening up’, while the UK’s bid emphasised regeneration of deprived socio-economic areas and increased social participation in national life.

The Olympics are not just about sport or about the three to five week event itself. It is widely recognised that for any host country there are short and long term impacts of hosting the Olympic Games. This research was carried out to identify any trends in past host Olympic cities, in the knowledge that doing so would help plan for outcomes post London 2012. The report pays particular attention to the experience of local populations and local organisations in host cities, an area hitherto lacking in analysis.

This report does not undertake an historical analysis of previous host cities. This is because in the past twenty five years there have been some demonstrable changes in how host cities approach the organisation of the Games, with the result that the Olympics of the past twenty five years have been differently managed from those that came before. The report focuses on comparing the last four Summer Olympic host cities’ experiences: Barcelona (1992), Atlanta (1996), Sydney (2000) and Athens (2004). However, where especially relevant it does use examples from previous Olympics and other major sporting events, such as the Commonwealth Games, Winter Olympics and Asian Games.

With its organizing principle being the experiences of local people, the report divides outcomes into key areas such as housing and employment, with key facts and suggestions.

Below we outline some generic aspects of the Olympics to provide background information to legacy and the hosting of the Games.
1.2 Olympics as mega event: Why they’re not just about sport

The Olympics is known as a ‘mega event’. Mega events are “large-scale cultural (including commercial and sporting) events, which have a dramatic character, mass popular appeal and international significance”. The Olympics is the biggest mega event in the world.

A hallmark feature of mega events is that they have international, national and local dimensions. The Olympic Games has an incomparable ability to affect different sectors of the host society, to cause dynamics in the local structure as a result of hosting the Games. It has been observed that “mega-projects like the Olympic Games require a tremendous investment of human, financial and physical resources from the communities that stage them”. While the Olympics are a forum to host international competition, hosting them has political, economic and social consequences in the country, and knock-on effects at a local level in the host city.

Internationally, the event offers opportunities for global participation and is hosted by a locale which aims to make the Games ‘the best ever’. In this the Games are an acknowledged political machine for international relations. Bringing representatives together from different countries may lead to diplomatic meetings and increased mutual respect. However, in their internationalism and in the heady competition they may also be described as ‘jingoistic’, with countries and the characteristics of their populations offered in sharp, cartoonish relief, and spats between rival populations becoming extreme.

Internationally and Nationally, away from the sport and ceremony, the Games are the means by which a nation is known, participates globally and seeks to rise to prominence. The exposure that the Games offer through media coverage is an unparalleled advertising opportunity, and as a result, a means by which host countries have sought to make changes in the way they are represented or perceived by others. This is known as ‘showcasing’, seeking to brand or reconstitute the host city as ‘world class’. Host countries attempt to combine elements of Olympic universalism with a specific localism that celebrates domestic ideals. However in the meeting of value systems there is a recognised possibility that in some contexts the Games may provoke social reform or change in host countries, or at least there is pressure to do so.

Nationally and Locally, hosting the Olympic event will have subsidiary effects in all sectors of the host society, although the spread or prevalence of them may depend on the size and influence of the host city in national and international life. Nationally, the Olympics create governance controversies and have ‘big men’ or charismatic leaders leading their bids. They may thus inspire changes in political dynamics and in contemporary planning frameworks in the host country. The smaller the city, the wider the Games’ impacts may be on the national population and vice versa. Alternatively, the extent of infrastructural investment will be an influence on change. However, these impacts always depend on the intentions and plans of the Games’ organizers although they are often unable to wholly anticipate the outcomes. The impacts, costs and benefits, are usually distributed unevenly.

Locally, mega events often have dramatic impacts on the cities which host them. New facilities can be built, funding and promotion of the event often promotes the city too. Jobs are created in the building of new facilities and hosting administration. In the last few Olympics it has been hoped that the mega event will have a regenerative effect on the built environment and have positive social impacts. By comparison to normal regenerative projects this can all happen very quickly:
“The mega event ... sets tight time limits on infrastructure development, creates new forms of financing investment through a combination of public/private funding and serves to legitimate this expenditure by appealing to the popular imagination.”

In this report we are primarily concerned with what has happened locally. Rather than presenting a cohesive overview of all Olympics based research, we will focus on topics important to local people. Experts have recognised that those most likely to benefit from hosting the Olympics are political elites and people with business interests. The host city’s population often comes last in a group of Olympic related winners and may find themselves to be “losers.” The IOC is also now increasingly concerned that the community benefit from the Games, have their voices heard in their planning, and have an ability to raise any issues or problems.

1.3 What is legacy? Analysis and how to read the trends

When analysts and others employ the term ‘legacy’ with relation to the Olympics, they refer to the after-effects of hosting the Games. This may involve permanent infrastructure upgrades, the creation of long-term employment opportunities, or even social change in the host nation population after the event.

Legacy effects are most usually national or local, with the exception that the opportunity for international promotion, sometimes called ‘prestige’, is one of the most likely outcomes of hosting the Games. One problem with legacy analysis is that it is difficult to prove Olympic cause and effect; outcomes tend to be both tangible and intangible. As a result analysts have usually divided legacy effects into categories in order to understand them.

Although there will be direct outcomes of the Olympics, such as the Olympic park, there are more often secondary or indirect impacts caused by the hosting of the Games. For example, improvements to transport links to host the Games may have a lasting benefit for the local population; while compulsory purchase of residential areas to build the Olympic venues may have a negative effect on the availability of housing and so on. Alternatively, there might be increases in the numbers of people undertaking physical activity linked to the Games, or improvements to parks and outside spaces that enables people to exercise more effectively. These results often divide into combinations of economic, political, infrastructural, environmental and physical legacies.

A crucial element to understanding legacy is the use of the ‘multiplier’ effect. Most often employed to understand the economic impact of the Games, the most useful studies will limit what they view as the plausible ‘effect’ of the Games. This means they de-limit rather than exaggerate benefits and outcomes. In ethos, this reservation can be applied in other areas, such as sports participation.

A distinction is also made in legacy talk between soft and hard legacies. Analysts dispute the nature of both and there is not much agreement about what they involve. The phrase ‘hard legacy’ is most often employed to refer to infrastructural development or employment and economic benefits; soft legacy is deployed to describe social impacts such as skills and educational impacts, city image and sports facilities.
In practice, dividing between hard or soft is fallible, and as organisational concepts they can only take us so far in understanding how people engage with, use and respond to opportunities. This is because ‘hard’ must become ‘soft’ to make any distinct impact. The problem lies in the assumption they are distinct when more realistic analysis would appreciate that they work together. For example, improving sporting facilities may facilitate increased sports participation; parks may be used by people; skills must be developed to take advantage of employment opportunities.

What is missing from a discussion of legacy is most often any acknowledgement of ‘people’ or the impact on them post event. For example, legacy analysis often cites beautiful physical improvements, such as in Barcelona, but does not consider spiralling living costs attributed to the Olympics as a result of the improvements which led to out-migration after the Games in 1992. This is borne out by the observation that Olympics organizers tend to assume benefits to the local population as a result of improvements to infrastructure, while research shows that those who need the changes most rarely benefit from them. They have to be mobilized to do so.

As a result, if ‘legacy’ is going to be a useful mobilising concept that retains its place at the heart of ‘Olympic talk’ it might be preferable to think of hard legacies as those which are infrastructural while soft legacies could relate to social impacts, relationships or lifestyle changes which result from them.

As a result ‘legacy momentum’, the ability of a city to maintain any positive outcomes in a lasting and meaningful way, becomes the most important concern. Each phase of development from pre-to post-Games and beyond must learn from the achievements and unintended outcomes of the previous phase; the Olympics, therefore, catalyses a continuous process of urban renewal and development that enhances a city or community’s own capacity to engage in ‘good’ city building.

The focus of this report is to address the different conceptual divisions created around the legacy phenomenon and introduce the person and social into the different elements of this legacy analysis. We take a holistic view, and attempt to avoid ‘legacy’ as a marker. We will address mostly ‘knock on effects’, reporting on what happens in Olympic host cities before, during and after the time of the Olympic event. We avoid the pitfalls of multiplier models by restraining ourselves from attributing these outcomes to the Olympics where they cannot be proven.
1.4 London’s background
A key aspect of London’s bid was an attempt to improve health and wellbeing in the East London area. The areas surrounding the Olympic Park host some of the most diverse populations in Europe. The locals face many health inequalities and regularly top government tables on UK indices of deprivation. Skill levels are quite low by comparison with the national average but most noticeably here there is polarization. Economic inactivity and levels of worklessness are high. Health inequalities are marked – the mortality rate is on average 17.5% higher than the rest of London.

The five boroughs hosting the Games are Greenwich, Hackney, Newham, Tower Hamlets and Waltham Forest. Below is a map of multiple deprivation for these boroughs in 2007.

BACKSTORY Indexes of Multiple Deprivation have been employed as models to understand the ways in which varied and multiple factors influence a person’s life. This assessment most usually includes health levels and life expectancy, and socioeconomic factors such as living and housing conditions, wages and unemployment, skill levels and education, access to services, crime rates, the environment in a local area. Taken together, the ‘deprivations’ form a percentage of the population.
1.5 London’s bid made some ambitious statements relating to the 5 boroughs and the London context in general. Through the hosting of the Olympic Games, it would:

- Maximise job opportunities through the Games
- Develop Skills
- Support local business
- Volunteering
- Reduce worklessness and child poverty
- Encourage healthy eating, sports participation, physical activity, children’s health,
- Raise life expectancy

1.5.2 As a result of hosting the Games, two years after the Games, East London should have increased resources and facilities:

- A seven minute train link to central London
- Olympic Park (is planned as an) - environmental showcase of sustainable housing and built environment
- Improved environmental features and access to historical waterways, hitherto ‘hidden’ from view
- London ExCel will benefit from the potential to grow as a location for business tourism, capturing a growing proportion of the event and conference trade especially with city airport and Eurostar (and so on)
- The Olympic Park could be added to the typical tourist visitor to London list, becoming the equivalent to Greenwich’s historic buildings
- Stratford City: consumer-based and lifestyle attraction
- Best sports infrastructure in the UK
- Possible positive housing legacy if Olympic village stock committed to social housing rather than privately sold
- If the Olympic Park stays in public ownership, one of the largest and diverse parklands in London

The challenge is to mobilise local communities to take advantage of the opportunities, by, for example, brokering free access and skills enhancement.

1.5.3 Questions to ask of the bid

- How can the Olympic park become a publicly-owned legacy of the Games?
- Will the housing in the Olympic village be available for social rented sector?
- How can local people be protected from rent increases & knock on effects?
- What is realistic inclusion? How can we more meaningfully include marginalised ‘hard to reach’ groups in society through the Olympics?
- How can we make sure that the Games result in real changes that benefit the neediest of the local population and do not further polarize communities in East London?
- What features of local life can be supported in order to promote real local ownership of the Games without mere appropriation of local cultural values?
- Are there locally-run markets to support and promote for media/ visitors to visit?
1. 6 Legacy’s legacy: the use of legacy as a policy tool for London (2012)

BACKSTORY Legacy in London 2012 is so often referred to that it would be natural to assume that it is historically central to the Games. Yet, in any other host city, ‘legacy’ has not been as central to hosting or planning the Games and in general is thought of as far more mixed and uncertain than London’s bid allows. The concept of legacy has only recently rooted itself in the Olympic cycle as a planned for outcome of the Games.

During the late 1970s there was a growing feeling that the Olympics were an over-blown and expensive affair, costing vast sums of money with no discernable result except hit and miss profits. They could also be very polluting and disruptive. The expense of hosting the Olympics had to be rationalised in some way – by fiscal prudence or permanent outcome. As a result, the idea that a city should benefit in the long term from the experience and expense of hosting the Games, without damaging the environment, has become more central to IOC requirements. This outcome has become known as the ‘festivalization’ of urban policy.

After Beijing 2008, London 2012 offers the most committed attempt to create a ‘legacy’ yet. London’s legacy promises are so ambitious that, depending on London’s successes and failures, we may find that the idea of ‘creating a legacy’ is abandoned or downplayed in subsequent Games. Chicago’s bid for the 2016 games already emphasises fiscal responsibility and prudence, which stands in direct contrast to the exuberance of London’s bid.

In the UK ‘legacy’ has become a catchword for forward-related planning since the bid was won in 2005. Much of the focus of the London bid was on creating a legacy for the future and as a result Olympic legacy speak in the UK refers to a future outcome that has to be planned for. This trend follows sustainable planning rhetoric which is very popular in contemporary UK. Sustainability refers to planning in the present which limits the negative impact of developments on future generations (Jones & Evans 2008:84). As a result, this approach will be the general reference point for legacy and London, especially in policy-related literature or research. Here we note an attempt to define the effects of the Olympics before the event – or to win the race before it has been run.

Two main strengths of the London bid were the incorporation of the Olympics into a sustainable regeneration project planned for East London, and promised social benefits to occur as a result of hosting the Olympics, such as a rise in sports participation. In this the bid perfectly encapsulated what was then the desire to integrate the Olympics into urban and economic renewal. Whether or not these results occur depends on how constructively policy is implemented and how policymakers consider the lessons from other Olympics. At the time of writing, policies relating to these outcomes are rather broadly defined or non-specific.
1.7 Bid vs. reality

The concern for local people and organisations is that there is a difference between ‘bid’ and ‘reality’. Although the media scrutinises legacy claims, it has not in general appreciated that this difference is actually acknowledged by bid teams and organizing committees (Lee 2006), perhaps because showing the inconsistencies creates a better story. Organizers have to persuade people to take on the investment and employ a range of public relation activities to sway public opinion in their favour and are likely to overemphasise the benefits (Horne & Manzenreiter 2006:13).

A bid is an attempt to win something, whereas in practice, there are different and sometimes unforeseeable ways in which outcomes are mediated (Hiller 2006:324). Athens’ first bid was “ill-conceived and unrealistic” but changed its approach with the result that Athens won the Games for 2004 (Gold 2007:269), at which point key members of the bid team were sacked and the organisation descended back into chaos (Payne 2006:260). Athens only just delivered the facilities for the Olympic Games in time, and abandoned many of the promises of sustainability to do so – partly for reasons that could not be wholly anticipated by the bid team, such as the uncovering of valuable archaeological sites (Liao & Pitts 2004). The ambitions of Sydney’s ambitious and exemplary ‘Green Games’ bid and design were openly abandoned after winning the bid (Cashman 2006; Weirick 1999:78).

It is typical that impacts that seemed guaranteed in the bid, such as infrastructural improvements, are also revised in the pre-event phase. In the bid phase, benefits are most often overestimated and costs are ‘wildly’ inaccurate (Horne & Manzenreiter 2006:13). In London, for example, there are questions over underestimated costs, such as security, the construction of the Olympic village and sports facilities. This is not at all unusual for an Olympic city. In London the controversy is over the number of housing units to be built on the Olympic site, and how they will be financed. The bid promised 4,500 homes on the Olympic site, and was linked to the Stratford City development to create the impression of some 9,000 new homes being constructed. However, plans have been scaled down and it seems likely that the Olympic village itself will only provide 3,300 units.

An LDA report has also found that the current construction conditions on the Olympic site and proposed plans do not meet the promises of exemplary sustainability standards of the bid (LDA 2008:6). The building has already commenced and because of this while current standards are satisfactory, it is judged too late for the site build to be as exemplary as promised.

It is also suggested that the Games is just too large and complex an event to manage outcomes (Brown et al 2002:164). In reality, the idea of what a successful legacy is may take an unofficial ‘cost balance’ approach. As these briefings will show, there are dynamics to be aware of and to militate against, while there are also unrealistic expectations, disappointments and euphoria.
1.8 Why look at previous Olympic host cities?

The current emphasis on 'legacy for the future' in planning rhetoric implies that what is planned will happen. But as a result we may forget that each city has its own heritage and social and economic conditions *before hosting the Games*. None is a blank slate; a population’s experience of the Games is dependent on the political climate, human rights, environmental planning and building frameworks in the host city.

Each Olympics is hosted in a unique scenario, with a different bid emphasis which shapes each Games and adds to the complexity of comparative analysis. Here there is a real problem that the different motives of each city and their global positions involve different levels of investment and infrastructural development which is hard to compare (Preuss 2004:225). And while the humanist themes of the Olympics find some continuity, what constitutes the content or focus of those themes also changes. For example, at the time of Sydney's successful bid to host the Games in 2000, 'green' issues were at the forefront of international thought on environmentalism, while today this environmental concern has evolved to 'sustainability'.

Below, a brief chart of the different contexts in which each city bid and Olympics occurred. Each host city sought to position itself regionally or internationally, as well as make improvements to the infrastructure:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Barcelona 92</th>
<th>Atlanta 96</th>
<th>Sydney 00</th>
<th>Athens 04</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GDP per head</strong></td>
<td>$18,500</td>
<td>$33,900</td>
<td>$22,600</td>
<td>$13,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic Cycle</strong></td>
<td>Declining region within EU – manufacturing based</td>
<td>Prosperous regional centre – service based</td>
<td>Mature but relatively small service – based economy</td>
<td>Growing economy within EU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Political System</strong></td>
<td>Parliamentary monarchy, devolved status for region</td>
<td>Federal democratic republic</td>
<td>Federal democracy</td>
<td>Parliamentary republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City Status</strong></td>
<td>Provincial capital</td>
<td>Regional Hub in SE US</td>
<td>Commercial centre of Australasia</td>
<td>National capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary Reason for bidding for the Games</strong></td>
<td>Regional economic development</td>
<td>Regional prestige and economic development</td>
<td>International positioning, tourism/convention</td>
<td>Tourism industry promotion and environmental improvements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


DCMS-commissioned research released in 2007 argued that there was no point looking at or ‘learning’ from the experiences of past host cities, as each has been so different. It also argues that each Games occurs only every four years, during which time wider global change occurs (DCMS 2007). Despite our own above provisos this is a rather misleading statement to make.

Although the Games events themselves only happen every four years, the bid team and planning stages take more than four consecutive years in each city and each organizing committee and host city has generated experts who carefully advise the next host city. The IOC oversees affairs and has strict and stringent guidelines for host cities which delimit ‘change’.

There remain some compelling lessons to be learnt from each previous host city, and as we will find during these briefings, some clear dynamics. The approach to hosting the Olympic Games and the incorporation of urban renewal into a tight time-related framework has been labelled a ‘catalytic approach’ following the ‘catalyst’ syndrome the Games are expected to facilitate (Veal & Toohey 2007:225). The Catalytic approach has three main characteristics:

1. The commitment to public expenditure for programmes of commercial and social renewal
2. Aims to facilitate transformation in the service and knowledge based economies of the host city/ nation
3. Incorporates the hosting of the Games into a social policy agenda to achieve social cohesion and benefit (Poynter 2008:62).

The hosting of the Olympics in Barcelona saw the beginning of this approach to hosting the Games (Liao & Pitts 2006:1242). As a result it is important to look at Games hosted since then, to assess how objectives became reality or not. Being aware of the different contexts which may have shaped outcomes is important in order to militate against over-confident expectations of what the Games will do for a city.

It is important to be aware of the similarities and differences in order to proactively consider the conditions in London. And while each city has been different, there are similarities in trends which have impacted on members of the local community in particular.
1. 9 Locals and the Games

In these briefings we will focus on the local impacts of hosting the Games. Our onus will be on what happens in the host city and how local people interact with the event and any changes for it. This is partly because London is a large city, one of the largest to be hosting the Games to date. It is also because impacts tend to be felt most by the population living in the immediate vicinity, but they do not always benefit from the positives. As a result we can say with some certainty that the East London population will feel the influence more strongly in some areas than other Londoners. Some of these impacts will be structural, some will be fleeting if they occur at all; none can be discounted.

There is a lack of information about how local people respond to the Games. This reflects the interests of experts in the field of Olympic studies, who are geared more towards making broad statements about cities and legacy than social analysis. Furthermore, more recent inclusions of the host population in London 2012-orientated literature are formed in a certain field which uses the language of planning for the future. This reveals an emphasis on ‘policy rhetoric’ rather than research into conditions.

However, the experiences of locals throughout the Olympic cycle are important, not just because they are a social target of the London 2012 bid. As we shall see, local people may suffer the most from any inconveniences or negative outcomes but are a fundamental part of the success of the event. At their best, the Games have been found to allow for a collective upsurge in goodwill and festival atmosphere; at their worst they provide the vehicle by which groups are further marginalised or forced to leave the locale.

Domestically, research shows that members of the host population will experience the Games in their city in different ways and quite possibly hold mixed feelings about them (Horne et al 2006:13). Host populations, for example, tend to analyse the Olympic legacy with a cost benefit approach, asking themselves whether hosting the Games was ‘worth it’ (Chalip 2003). Whether they think it worth it or not will reflect a combination of factors connected to their personal experience and standpoint: age, gender, social status, ethnicity, wealth, and politics differentials and others (Waitt 2003b:392). For example, those who own their own homes may be happy about gentrification as the value of their homes rises, while those who rent may be displaced by the rising prices. Analyses reveal sometimes surprising and positive outcomes according to social group.
1. 10 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: Local people
Case studies from previous Olympic cities show that successful legacy for locals:

- Involve changes made to the built environment that can be used by the local population; facilities should be responsive to local need and have an infrastructure (for example, post-Olympic villages turned into sites have facilities)
- Involve a unitary authority taking responsibility for public spaces to ensure open access and mobility for all groups
- Involve a minimum of displacement of local people
- Involve housing protection policy for vulnerable people
- Low cost housing replaces previous housing or responds to local need rather than creating high cost socio-economic wealth enclaves
- Where local organisations have been aware of the possible negative outcomes, there is a reduction of displacement; for example, homeless non-harassment protocols or rent watch organisations
- Involve the local community in the organisation of cultural events
- Pre-existing arts and cultural programmes are given a boost by the Olympics rather than being replaced by them
- Local symbols and culture are celebrated and are a priority for local ownership and experience as well as the experiences of visitors to the area
1. 11 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: KEY DYNAMICS AND TRENDS

Even given the differences between locales, there are some trends which occur in each Olympic host city. It is farsighted to be aware of these trends, as militating effectively against negatives and promoting the possibilities of the positives will far enhance the Olympic legacy and the experience of the host population. Below follow some of the most serious.

**Political Project**

The Olympics is a political project that uses the sporting event as a policy tool for economic advancement, political diplomacy and prestige, regeneration and inward investment (Virginov & Parry 2005:162). Realistically the Olympics cannot go ahead without considerable political will and those that are most successful tend to have powerful governmental level backing and financing (Lee 2006). At the same time, this means that local authorities often have to give up planning and local powers and will be marginalised from decision making at some points in the process.

**(Infrastructure) Overspend**

During or in preparation for the hosting of mega events, especially the Olympics, local organisations have invested too much money on tourist infrastructure, expecting major tourism or movement into the area, and automatic economic benefits (Hall 2006:67). This investment may come with a price tag that has to be paid off post event. This is often disappointing and unexpected. However, beautification schemes, such as upgrading local facilities or gathering spots such as parks or local centres can be successful if aimed at local community use. It is imperative that local public spaces and facilities should not be shut down pre-Games in anticipation of the provision of sports facilities via the mega venues of the Games.

**Local cost post-Games**

Local authorities may have to take up the cost of facilities or maintenance of public spaces created for the Olympic event post event. They may gain people paying local taxes or rates – for example, in the creation of housing or the Olympic Park. Inversely, it has been known for local authorities to lose rates, especially if businesses have been relocated away from the area.

**Housing availability and affordability**

There is a very likely impact on the cost and availability of affordable housing in the Olympic area as a result of hosting the Games. In the past few Olympic cities, past Olympic villages have sold for prices far out of the range of local people. They may attract investment because they are coveted for their symbolic value; also because in some cases they have been exemplarily planned. There are also effects upon the local rental market which are not accounted for by local authorities.

**Employment & skills**

Employment benefits are much over-stated in previous Olympic host cities. Post Olympics most cities see a demonstrable and sometimes large drop in employment provision. Skillling the local population as a result of the Olympics has not been proven to any great extent, especially in complex and large labour markets such as London.
1. 12 REPORT THEMES AND PRIORITY AREAS

The chapters of this report correspond with the themes of the London Olympic bid, because they assess the likelihood of some of the central aspects of the bid to actually happen. It would be remiss to carry out an analysis without being aware of the claims that are being made. Overall, the themes of this report correspond most closely to the actual experiences of host cities and the concerns of local London authorities and people.

EMPLOYMENT

We begin with a look at employment, which in Olympic research is quite a contested field. Analysts have tended to use different models, making this an area particularly prey to ‘partiality’ in research, as has been noted elsewhere. The dominant voice in this area is that of official legacy analysis teams and consultancies. Their dominant analytical mode is ‘cost-benefit’ analysis. This type of analysis weighs negatives against positives: in shorthand it asks, ‘was it worth it?’ The majority of employment literature is presented pre-Games and as a result the area is lacking in what it can tell us about post Olympic employment.

VOLUNTEERING

We follow employment impacts with discussion of volunteers, experiences and outcomes at major sporting events. Volunteering is used increasingly as a way of encouraging people into participation in national life and there is evidence that it develops skills which are suitable for the job market.

IMAGE AND REPUTATION

The most likely positive legacy of the Olympics is an opportunity for mutual enjoyment: to showcase the city and for locals to enjoy the collective goodwill and ownership of the Games. We consider the opportunity to do both by assessing tourism effects, and outcomes in terms of perception. We look at how previous host cities have brokered or leveraged the Games to introduce outsiders and visitors to the city, or to shape changes in perception. We also note and reinforce the importance of including locals in the Olympic event; de-emphasising privilege and high culture in favour of local markets, cultural organisations to guarantee a sense of inclusion and ownership in the Games.

HEALTH AND WELLBEING

In this section we analyse the likely benefits to London of hosting the Games in the field of health and wellbeing. We ask if there are any changes, and how features of the built environment may be used to increase health levels. We also note the factors which undermine general wellbeing and some of the assumptions behind the London bid which are played out in talk about ‘wellbeing’. We note that ‘wellbeing’ is a particularly hard concept to define, and as in the area of sports participation, is often beset by moralising. We then focus on three aspects of wellbeing – physical activity and health, housing and built environment, and local perceptions of the Olympics.

SPORTS PARTICIPATION

A key aspect of the London bid was the promise that people would participate more in sports and physical activity as a result of London hosting the Olympics. These were bold policy aims, as they are particularly illusory: they relate to social change and are difficult to facilitate as well as prove. However, they do follow the use of sport as a policy tool in the UK. In this section we consider the experiences of past Olympic host cities and the likelihood of any changes in levels of physical activity
as a result of hosting the Olympics. We examine the social and cultural background of sports participation.

HOUSING
Housing is the most likely negative legacy of the Olympics. Here we discuss direct and indirect effects, as this is an area in which the largest effects may be felt off-site. We look at what happens to Olympic villages. Who lives in past Olympic villages, for example, and how much money do they sell for? We look at private and public-private housing partnerships, and also rental sectors, to define trends. For many the biggest trend in housing has been the exponential rise of housing costs, and a knock-on effect on affordable housing in the immediate areas. There are also pressures on the homeless or vulnerable people in short term housing.

LOCALS AND THE COMMUNITY
Locals living in the immediate vicinity of the Olympic park and the construction of any Olympic related infrastructure feel the impacts of the Games most. We consider how locals have experienced and responded to the Games, with a particular focus on volunteer experiences and participation in the Cultural Olympiad. We make several suggestions, including avoiding the appropriation of prestige elements of local minority culture in favour of real inclusion and participation.
CHAPTER 2: EMPLOYMENT & SKILLS

Economic impacts of the Olympics are extremely difficult to assess (Short 2004:106). Research into employment creation as a result of the Olympics is contested, partly because it is difficult to predict just how many jobs can be attributed to the Olympics. Since the LA Games in 1984 it has been recognised that far from being a drain, the Olympics may provide an excuse or reason for infrastructural investment that may provide a boost to the local economy, and as a result provide employment or guarantee pre-existing jobs (Preuss 2004:25). They may also generate new trade partnerships or reposition previously weak export products (Preuss 2006:190-1). This is not an absolute certainty and this view has been strongly criticised (Baade 2006:178).

Analysts have tended to use different models to assess employment creation, making this an area particularly prey to ‘partiality’ in research, as has been noted elsewhere. The leading voice in this area is that of official legacy analysis teams and consultancies. Their dominant analytical mode is ‘cost-benefit’ analysis, often carried out before the event. This type of analysis weighs negatives against positives: in shorthand it asks, ‘will it be/ was it worth it?’ There are other forms of analysis that might be thought of as more realistic, principally to divide employment effects up so that we are clear how much labour is created in each stage of the Olympics.

It is recognised that employment opportunities may create possibilities for skilling and training people with low skill levels. While the Olympics is inconclusive (see below) on skills, and due to a very tight construction schedule is unlikely itself to provide the time for training individuals, volunteering at the event may be thought of as a way to encourage participation.

2.1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- There has been no routine assessment of the impact of the Olympics on employment
- There have been no notable skill level increases amongst any host population
- Hosting the Olympics does raise employment levels and create jobs (mostly pre-event), mainly in construction
- The employment peak related to the 2012 Olympics in construction will be in 2010 (nearly 10,000 person years of work)
- The more infrastructure invested in, the more facilities built: the more jobs are created
- The major proportion of direct Olympic employment is not usually long-term and is low skill
- Olympics should not be thought of as value-added employment opportunity
- Most jobs for local people are unskilled, temporary and in services/tourism
- Indirect benefits of short-term employment may be felt long-term, such as increased skill levels and esteem
- There is an opportunity to raise skill levels of the local population through hosting the games, especially through subsidiary effects such as volunteering and education initiatives
- The Stratford City development may sustain employment levels after the Olympics
Models used to estimate or generate employment figures often differ, sometimes producing incredibly divergent results. There were claims that over 445,000 jobs were created in Greece by the hosting of the Olympic Games in Athens, which on further inspection was an estimate based on ten years of provision between 2000-2010. This is because of the ‘multipliers’ used. Multipliers work on the assumption that “direct spending increases induce additional rounds of spending” (Baade 2006:179) but they differ in terms of what growth or effects they consider to be related or attributable to the Olympics.

**CGE** model – Computable general equilibrium – economic models responding to policy or context changes, also assume cost minimizing behaviour by general population. Most realistic because they account for alternative dynamics

**Input-Output** model – would calculate the relationships between different sections of the economy, based on a spur such as a mega-event, and the related effects

**Cost-Benefit** model – literally compares costs and profits, before assessing overall value to the economy (simple subtraction). Least realistic (doesn’t account for leakage or cost minimization)

### 2.2 Employment and the Olympics

This is an area in which host cities very readily assume benefits and increases in employment creation. This belief is partly related to the assumed spur to the economy that the Games provide and the dominance of the catalyst approach since the 1980’s. For analysts this is a contentious area.

Most of the employment growth related to the Olympics happens before the Games, in the preparation stage. As we might expect, there have been some steep losses in employment immediately after the Games, once construction is over and supporting services are not needed (LERI 2007:27). These losses almost stand against the intention to regenerate the locale or host city, as the ability to maintain the momentum of economic growth is important.

It is difficult to assess the impact of the Games on the employment sector of the host economy, primarily because there are different ways of measuring employment creation. At each Olympic event so far different models have been used.

Differences in findings are also usually linked to whether the studies have been carried out **ex-ante** (before the Games, in which case they are positive) or **ex-post** (after the games, which are rarer but more realistic) (Kitchin 2007:117). It is typical that the ex-ante studies are “optimistic in their assumptions: in the growth multipliers they use, and in their failure to account for ‘leakage’ of revenues to transnational suppliers of services. The latter represents money that is rarely spent in the community itself” (Horne & Whitson 2006:80).

Employment is also dependent on the aims of the bid team and context. If infrastructure is a priority, then more people are required to work to make that a certainty. If a city chooses to use pre-existing venues, then less employment opportunities are created as a matter of course.

Bids and planning also influence worker requirement. As the above point shows, regenerating the locale around the venue would require planners and construction workers. Raising the city’s profile would require public relations professionals with a completely different skill set.
Employment effects will depend on the city’s profile, size and the economic climate of the years preceding the Games. London is the largest job provider in Northern Europe and has a very tight labour market with a transnational scope. This will limit the overall impact of the Games in comparison to other cities.

**BACKSTORY** A key aspect of London’s bid was the creation of long term employment opportunities, especially in East London. However, it is important to be careful in estimating the impact of the Olympics on London’s labour market. A key issue with estimating work in the future in London is that the number of jobs created may be akin to a drop in the ocean compared with the overall numbers of jobs in the same sector.

However, this February the ODA published its employment strategy for the Olympic Park with reference to locals. It aims to:

- Employ between 5-10% of its labour from the five boroughs
- Train, pre-train and broker employment on the Olympic Park in conjunction with contractors and Jobseekers Centres.
- Release up to 200 new apprenticeships but overall employ over 2000 previously unemployed people
- Aim its employment schemes at women, disabled people and BAME groups.

In 2006 it was estimated that in 2010 demand would be for over 9,300 person years of work in Olympic construction (Experian 2006:18). We can contextualise these estimates by looking at the construction industry in general. In 2006 it was also estimated that in 2010, the peak year of Olympic construction, there would be demand for 280,000 person years of employment in London alone. However, these estimates were made based on construction plans in 2006 and based on the market. The current state of the sector means that the Olympics may have a greater effect than it would have done.

### 2.2.2 Number crunching

The propensity to use different models shows that the number of new jobs attributed to sports events varies wildly. This means that:

- Variance: “from 77,000 in Atlanta to 445,000 in Athens” (Experian 2006:8)
- Three different evaluative reports on Sydney assessed employment figures at 155,000, 98,700 and 90,000 respectively.
- The different methods mean that in the case of Manchester Commonwealth Games, one report puts the employment figure at 6,300 while another report puts it at 30,000.
2.2.3 One summary of impact assessments of previous Games

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Barcelona</th>
<th>Atlanta</th>
<th>Sydney</th>
<th>Athens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact as % of GDP</strong></td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No of tourists</strong></td>
<td>0.4m</td>
<td>1.1m</td>
<td>1.6m</td>
<td>5.9m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New jobs</strong></td>
<td>296,640 (Spain)</td>
<td>77,026 (Georgia)</td>
<td>90,000 (Australia)</td>
<td>445,000 (Greece)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model</strong></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Input-Output</td>
<td>CGE</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


2.3 Different job effects and contexts

The different numbers are explained not only by the use of different models but by the different types of employment that might be created by the Olympics. There are three types of employment impact generated by mega events like the Olympics:

There are jobs that are **directly** related to the hosting of the Olympics – where the Olympics committee directly employs people. The majority of **direct** employment is in construction and this is a temporary effect and pre-Games (Poynter 2006:26). At 2012, this will include the clearing of the Olympic park, the construction of the Olympic facilities and anybody employed by the Olympics.

There are other kinds of job effects:

- **Indirect employment** is employment off-site supported by economic activity generated by the investment in Games.
  
  *JOB MARKETS: Services, accommodation, administration, tourism*
  
  These are all activities in support of the Games.

- **Diffuse/ induced employment** is wider employment encouraged by the catalyst/ spur the Games provide to the local economy.
  
  *JOB MARKETS: services, information technology, administration, tourism*

The most consistent estimates of Olympic employment will only concern direct employment given the difficulties in predicting how much induced employment is involved. However, **indirect and diffuse employment benefits will be felt most post-event, whereas direct employment will be mainly pre-event** (Kitchin 2007:117).
BACKSTORY: PERSON YEARS because the type of jobs may be high in turnover and range in requirements (i.e. short term highly skilled construction), a noted preference has been to think about projected job creation in terms of person years. That is one person employed in a job all year, not the total number of jobs provided. So, at the Olympic Park estimates are that overall there will be 35,000 person years of work. And the legacy projects will add another 15,000 (Experian 2006:18).

2.4 Employment opportunities?
Although the Olympics do create employment, the majority of Olympic-related work is temporary (Miguelez 1995:157). As a result analysts suggest we should strongly question the ‘value’ of the employment created (Horne & Whitson 2006:79). It will mostly be short and sweet – and low-skilled.

- LA Games 1984: 16,520 people for 30 days
- Seoul Games 1988: 33,500 people for 30 days

The main form of job creation in the Olympics relates to the creation of infrastructure, what is built to accommodate the hosting of the Olympics. Here the major source of employment pre-event is in construction.

2.4.2 CONSTRUCTION Major work creation is in construction, where jobs will broadly fit into two skill levels – highly skilled specialist labour and low skilled labour (Crookston 2004:57). As a result there is potential for polarisation in the job market (Poynter 2006:26), especially because the Olympics has to be built to a very tight schedule and it is unlikely contractors will train unskilled workers, instead recruiting more widely (Evans 2007:315).

2.4.3 SERVICES & TOURISM some of the indirect jobs provided will be in services and especially those related to tourists and visitors. This will refer to economic activities and roles in support of the Games. As above, we should question the value of this work, as much of it could be low-skilled, badly compensated and usually temporary.

The services sector will benefit from the Games, but for a limited amount of time (Crookston 2004:56). There will be temporary opportunities, pre-, during and after the event in:

- Catering, accommodation, retail, interpreting, security and general administration (Poynter 2006).

For example, the media interest in the Games means that there will be additional visitors before the Games. Atlanta had an estimated extra 18,000 overnight stays as a result of the Olympics before the Games. Temporary work in this sector in the run up to the Sydney Games is estimated to have generated in the region of 100,000 jobs specific to the event itself.

In each Olympic round the tourism industry is expected to benefit from the Games. Attracting more long term tourist arrivals and convention business is a priority for politicians in the host city (Preuss 2004:21). This has happened in the past, especially in Barcelona (Miguelez 1995:52). However, London’s tourist sector already has a large capacity and could easily accommodate the numbers of visitors arriving for the Games and their administration, without generating new capacity. There is also the potential for ‘crowding out’ where the Olympics discourage conventional tourists from visiting the town, but this decreases when the economy is in flux (Preuss 2004).
With relation to skills, tourism is “not an effective strategy for creating value-added jobs” (Horne & Manzenreiter 2006:79). Employment/jobs in this sector usually:

- Include up to 9 of the 25 lowest paying occupations across the world.
- Are also unstable and have a high turnover rate.

However, there are also reported skills shortages in skilled positions within tourism in the UK (Experian 2006:32).

Then there is also related economic investment in the locale which may create employment (Preuss 2004:21). As for indirect employment post-Olympics, the Lower Lea Valley is unlikely to support a large base of employment in tourism post-games. Even Greenwich, a major tourist site with a cluster of attractions, only manages to receive a third of the visitors to central London attractions (Crookston 2004:56). However, the venue could be used for conference facilities and attract business visitors (see section 4.2 for expansion of this point).

**2. 5 The value of Olympic work to locals**

There is no controversy about whether the Olympics create work or not. They obviously do. The disagreement lies in the value of the work, whether it is long term and whether the Games can be said to generate any positive gains for locals in terms of providing employment or encouraging those who are long-term unemployed or workless into permanent work.

The proportion of jobs going to local workers at major sports events is under-researched (Experian 2006:9). However, Barcelona shows us that locals in the construction industry did not benefit automatically from job opportunities given a concomitant process of modernization. What are the opportunities for locals to work as a result of the Olympics?

The key to job placement is that offered **jobs must be met by skills**. Placement of locals in Olympic related employment depends on the skills available and provided by the local workforce/community.

**LONDON’S STORY**

In general, however, the boroughs closest to the Olympics have a higher proportion of the workforce with no qualifications than the England and London average (Gov. 2007:5/ Poynter 2006:27). The Lower Lea Valley is an area of high economic inactivity and unemployment (Poynter 2006). Moreover, the area is less than six miles away from a site of major job provision and creation (1.2 million), indicating that more complex factors are behind the area’s economic inactivity than lack of economic investment and work provision (Crookston 2004:54).

London’s labour market is large and the reach of its labour pool is wide (Evans 2007:315). The reality is that people will commute to work even in the lowest-paid, most anti-social sectors: jobs in an area will not necessarily be filled by locals. In London in general:

- Most of the local employment and low skilled work will be temporary and precarious.
- The likelihood is that locals will not take the majority of the work. They may take the lower income, low status, and low skilled jobs (about 1,000) (Experian 2006:27).
- Recruitment for specialist labour is trans-national in scope, meaning that skills will be met by a global labour pool, rather than a local one (Crookston 2004:61).
- International migrants may have higher skill levels than the work they are placed in; ‘transnational leakage’ is an issue here (Horne 2006:80).
2. 6. Past Host cities - Long term impacts?
Employment impact studies of past host cities have been largely inconclusive. As the above might suggest, each host city has seen a rise in work pre-event offset by a fall immediately post Games. For example, in Greece employment rose before the Olympics but immediately post Games the construction industry lost 70,000 jobs (LERI 2007:42).

However, it could be argued that the Olympics might in some cities have attracted employment opportunities in the long term by means of inward investment, or a facilitation of legacy momentum. Here, the opportunities offered by the Olympics have been channelled into different areas or industries, such as convention business. There is little information on how each city actually did before, during or after the Games, partially because the emphasis has been on over-inflating figures before the Games. Below we look at Barcelona’s experience in detail, and then briefly at how each city since then has fared.

2. 6. 2. Barcelona: Case Study
In hosting the Games, Barcelona’s organizers aimed to open the region up to economic investment and European exposure. This intention was mirrored in their plans for the city’s physical development, which would open the city up to the sea by redeveloping the rundown port area (Horne & Manzenreiter 2006:10). Barcelona’s organizers were attempting to facilitate a process of economic recovery and to attract investment to address the city’s infrastructural deficits such as decentralized business districts (Clusa 1996:107). There was a refocus on office infrastructure and convention visitors.

From the period of 1986 to 1992, there was economic growth in Barcelona. However, this process was “probably less intensive than the rest of Spain” (Clusa 1996:105). Over the same period the Madrid metropolitan region, a smaller area than Catalonia, the region in which Barcelona is based, saw nearly 2 times more investment than Catalonia (Clusa 1996:110).

Assessments of how many jobs would be directly created pre-event in construction were optimistic because a concomitant modernisation of the construction industry meant innovations in methods eliminated unskilled workers: “The volume of employment created was less than expected... technological innovation allowed enterprises to carry out the same activity with less employees...” (Miguelez & Carrasquer 1995:160). The majority of work was also temporary and for fewer workers doing longer hours. There were no opportunities for training or upskilling (Miguelez & Carrasquer 1995:156-7).

Sectors which did benefit were in public administration, hotels and restaurants and transport and communications. However, there was a global recession and over-enthusiastic visitor forecasts meant that less people were required to work than expected (Malfas et al 2004:212). These jobs were also very temporary and precarious as a result (Miguelez & Carrasquer 1995:158; 162). Yet these sectors benefited from post Olympics convention business and the re-branding of Barcelona as a mini-break destination (Miguelez & Carrasquer 1995:152). There was also evidence that businesses with ten employees or more in the metropolitan area did attract more business and were able to increase their workforce between 10-20% (Miguelez & Carrasquer 1995:155).
There were several estimates of the employment created as a result of the Olympics (Clusa 1996:107) and there is no clear outcome (Miguelez & Carrasquer 1995:155). It is tentatively agreed that Olympics-related work may have created 20,000 jobs post-event (Brunet 1995:24; Clusa 1996:107, Miguelez & Carrasquer 1995). Unemployment did rise immediately post event, partly because of a rise in housing costs which made it difficult for people to afford to stay in the area and over 250,000 people commuted into Barcelona for work or moved (Clusa 1996: 106; Miquelez & Carrasquer 1995:158). However, overall between 1986 and 1996 in the metropolitan region unemployment stayed at 15% (Clusa 1996:105). This was commensurate with the overall period of growth, decentralization and population stagnation with increased commutes from outside the region.

2. 6. 3 Atlanta
Atlanta is a shipping centre and the wholesale and retail centre of the South East of the US. It also employs more people in transport than any other metropolitan US area (Keating 2001:11).

In bidding for the Games, Atlanta aimed to attract international investment and provide private funding for infrastructural improvements. It matched a federal policy providing funding for entrepreneurial policies of urban development with private investment.

The employment attributed to the Atlanta Olympics varies wildly: from 3,500 to 42,500, depending on which study is consulted. Local people were employed by the Games in a temporary measure. In the year before the Games were hosted, the Olympics provided 33,500 jobs and a possible 77,000 overall (Roche 2000:139).

After the Games, Atlanta consolidated its position as the trade and shipping centre of the south eastern US. Atlanta’s economy saw robust growth between 1986 and 2001 and employment in retail and services grew in that time. By 2001 service jobs account for a larger percentage of Atlanta jobs than any other employment sector (Keating 2001:11). It did also attract international companies, with an increase of 30% after the Games (1,600 by 2006) and between 1991 and 1996 the Atlanta Games was thought to attract $4.1 billion into the state economy (McGuirk & Dunn 1999:24).

2. 6. 4 Sydney
Sydney’s main aim in hosting the Olympics was to compete with Japan and Singapore to establish itself as a business centre; to become the major hub of the Pacific region for convention business. And Sydney’s corporatist approach to place position was held to gain in terms of tourism. The inspired courtship of the media took a major part in the promotion of ‘Brand Australia’, which used Sydney’s beautiful natural environment to show a modern, hardworking city with a healthy lifestyle.

Official estimates were that there were 110,000 jobs created pre-event, but the accommodation arm of the services sector actually recorded a fall in employment in 2000 (Cooper & Hall 2005:65; Baade 2006:179). Post Games was most productive for tourism; there were 100,000 Olympic specific visitors during September 2000. Tour organizers also arranged trips to other parts of Australia post Games.
**Conclusions**

It seems that the Olympics is an expensive job creation exercise (Hall 2005:131). Studies are inconclusive; it is very hard to find information on post-Games employment provision. This is partly, as above, because studies concentrate on estimating employment before the Games rather than after them. The post Games studies show that the labour market is affected in mixed ways by the Games. Skills levels are also unlikely to rise, because of the tight planning frameworks (also see chapter 6). Where the Games may provide some optimistic outcomes in terms of employment are actually in the provision of volunteering opportunities, which we turn to next.
CHAPTER 3: VOLUNTEERING

Volunteering at and through the Olympics has commonly provided an enjoyable experience for local populations in host cities. Volunteering is increasingly thought of as a policy tool that provides an entry into the employment market by providing relevant skills. Each Olympics has easily achieved a large number of volunteers. For example, in excess of 50,000 people volunteered at Atlanta and Sydney, and nearly 45,000 at Athens. Although in general in the UK, volunteers tend to be white, middle-class and relatively prosperous, the volunteers at sports events by comparison tend to be younger and more sports orientated (Downward & Ralston 2006:336). The experience of young volunteers at the Manchester Commonwealth Games showed that if organized properly, they could remain volunteers after the event and may continue into employment. In fact, volunteering opportunities can be enjoyed more by the less skilled than the skilled (Downward & Ralston 2006:344).

3.1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

• Volunteering at mega-events is enjoyed by the majority of participants
• Volunteering is an excellent opportunity to involve people who do not usually participate in economic or community activity
• Volunteering acts as a spur to future participation in a wider range of activities (Downward & Ralston 2006:347)
• Volunteers benefit from increased confidence and building interfacing skills which are key for a working environment
• Volunteers from a wide age range benefit from learning or renewing skills
• Incentives are important to maintaining confidence and enjoyment
• There are barriers to participation: time, financial and childcare, as well as the fact that volunteering is strenuous and physical
• Other volunteer-reliant services such as charities often lose volunteers during the Olympic cycle

BACKSTORY Until the LA Games in 1984 volunteers at sporting events were used sparingly (Green & Chalip 2004:41). Like other major events and festivals, sports events are now dependent on volunteers for free labour, time and expertise (Horne & Manzenreiter 2006:15) and are not feasible without the support of volunteer labour (Gibson 2007:152). Volunteers add several hundred dollars per capita to the GDP a country makes hosting an event (Green & Chalip 2004:41). Thus there is much interest in building and sustaining a volunteer labour force who can work at events from one year to another (Green & Chalip 2004:42).

3.2 Volunteering as policy tool

‘Volunteering’ is a priority for the UK government, as there are several benefits purported to come from volunteering. Volunteering is viewed as a way of broadening or widening participation (Downward & Ralston 2007:347). Sports events may be a particularly good way to do this because traditionally in the UK, volunteers are white, older, middle class and relatively wealthy. Yet, volunteers at sports events tend to be younger, male and sports orientated (Downward & Ralston 2007:336). Those targeted as potential volunteers by the UK bid team are ‘hard to reach groups’, those who may not have a sustained participation in the nation’s economic and social life. Moreover, volunteering may help them enter the labour market by providing skills, life experience
and participation; indeed it is apparently a ‘compelling indirect employment benefit ‘(East London Business Alliance 2006:30).

3.3 Recruiting volunteers

Sports events have little problem attracting ‘enough’ volunteers to work at them. Most Olympic Games have easily achieved an excess number of people willing to volunteer and teams seek to keep numbers as low as possible because of the costs of training and equipping them (Romney 2004:267). For example:

- Barcelona Olympics – 102,000 people applied; 35,000 volunteers
- Salt Lake City Olympics – 67,000 people applied; 26,000 volunteers

Recruitment of volunteers often takes a nationalistic or patriotic turn and it is important that we consider the outcomes of such positions in terms of effective inclusion. Barcelona’s bid for the 1992 Games raised 102,000 signatures across Spain by asking them to support the bid and Spain by volunteering. This was in order to encourage ‘civic solidarity’, felt to be a successful motivational tool (Claupes 1995:166). In London, the challenge is to attract or broker opportunities for people who might not traditionally volunteer. The organizers of the Salt Lake City Olympics personally approached leaders of minority and ethnic groups to form an Interfaith volunteer council, and the Gay and Lesbian Alliance to ask them to send volunteers, which they did very happily (Romney 2004:261). They also held ‘volunteer slots’ on local news programmes to place volunteers.

The Manchester Commonwealth Games was the first sporting event to really channel participation towards ‘hard to reach groups’ with a ‘Pre-Volunteer Programme’ that was aimed at community participation, targeting young, unemployed ethnic minorities and disabled people. It was judged a success, with an estimated 10,000 people either volunteering after the event, or entering employment (Faber-Maunsell 2004:20-23). However, a study found that out of over 1,000 volunteers at Manchester Commonwealth Games, 26% were already formally involved in sport. As a result it might be assumed that ‘interest’ in the event is key to channelling participation (Downward & Ralston 2006:335).

The LA Games was the first to use volunteers widely, but it was found that volunteers and even staff members committed acts of petty crime and fraud (Romney 2004:286). Since then, background checks on volunteers have been very stringent. The Sydney Organizing Committee was even sued for not allowing disabled people to volunteer (Hargreaves 2002:174), meaning that the goal of widening participation must appreciate that those who do not seem to participate or are ‘hard to reach’ may face boundaries such as criminal records, illiteracy or disability that must be overcome and understood in order to encourage them to volunteer.

Barriers to participation also affect the time that must be spent volunteering; volunteers at SLC Olympics were asked to commit 17 days of their time, and the Paralympics is additionally configured time. This means that volunteering is not only a real commitment but inadvisable for those who are not fit. At the Sydney Olympics volunteers had to work for 12 hour shifts for five to six days, with one rest day over a five week period, termed ‘slave labour’ by the media (Lenskyj 2002:118-9). Volunteers must also travel to the venue and have somewhere to stay (Gibson 2007:152). So they must be able to support themselves financially during this time period. This may be why volunteers
in the UK tend to be relatively prosperous, with free time (Downward & Ralston 2007:336). There is concern about volunteer rights, because of the nature of the work (Lenskyj 2002:114-18).

However, the Manchester Commonwealth Games organizing committee took this approach: “Local arrangements were made with Job Centre Plus to allow social security claimants to act as volunteers, and this was another example of a case where standard procedures could be relaxed for the benefit of the Games” (Faber-Maunsell 2004:36). While this appears to be positive, it has been noted that this may be felt to be coercion: at the Sydney Olympics 57,000 people on unemployment benefit were told to get Olympics-related work or risk having their benefits cut. If they failed, as many of them did as they did not have the right skills, they were pressured into volunteering (Lenskyj 2002:114).

The most serious issue with recruitment is that Olympics volunteers may cease their regular volunteering activities or that the Olympics may overwhelm other charitable and worthy causes by being a greater attraction. Disabled people in Sydney saw the volunteer support for them drop over the run up to the Olympic period (Darcy 2003:745), as in other work of greater social value. Indeed, it has been argued that it is much easier to volunteer at the Olympics than carry out the roles volunteers are usually asked to commit to (Lenskyj 2002:116).

3.4 Motivations for volunteering
Kemp argues that “volunteers at mega-events are strongly motivated by a pride in their country and its culture, social contact and friendship, and a desire to feel valued and needed by society at large by being ‘employed’ even if it is unpaid” (2002:109). Feelings of supporting a country and being part of the community are strong motivations for volunteering at a mega event such as the Olympics. Volunteers share a sense of common identity and purpose and this consistently scores highly on their positive perceptions of an event (Chalip 2004:56).

When asked, volunteers tend to state that their biggest bonus is ‘helping others’; however, this is unlikely to be the only reason. Volunteers tend to rate helpfulness highly, even if they have other less altruistic reasons for volunteering. There will still be rewards that they will identify: such as a good CV, networking and socialising and even ‘bragging rights’ – being able to say that they were at an event, or part of it (Chalip 2004:51). In fact, the most tangible reward from Sydney was the idea that volunteers were ‘part of a community’ – with the sense of camaraderie, ‘shared purpose’ and ‘pulling together’ from volunteering, working and socialising together (Chalip 2004:64).

However, during the Sydney Olympic and Paralympics event, there was a severe drain on volunteer numbers. This hit local charities hard. Charities and organisations catering for the disabled reportedly lost volunteers during this period as they were unable to offer incentives comparable to the Olympics to ensure volunteers. Therefore, despite the inclusion of the disabled in the event, their lived experience was compromised as a result of this tension between ‘raised awareness’ and ‘service provision’ (Darcy 2003:745).
3.5 Experience of volunteering

There is no doubt that volunteering is enriching and a positive experience for those who carry it out. Volunteers were so motivated after Sydney that they even established a group, ‘Sydney Olympics Volunteers’ to volunteer in Athens and to ‘keep the spirit alive’ (Gibson 2007:217). Indeed, it has been said that there is now a strong volunteer ethic in Sydney because of the Games (Mason 2007:41). The volunteers were probably the most successful Sydney export, earning it the title, ‘the Friendly Games’ (Garcia 2007:255).

Volunteering is a “unique social context for cooperation and learning” (Kemp 2002:111). Volunteers join a ‘social community’ and feel themselves to be involved. They meet and socialise with people they might not otherwise mix with, sometimes living together, which encourages cooperation. A benefit of volunteering is also the feeling of ‘being needed’, or being ‘socially recognised’ by others.

Overall, volunteers ‘learn on the job’ by training and carrying out practical tasks. The large numbers of visitors to the Olympics mean that volunteers will constantly have their knowledge, skills and problem solving abilities tested, and these will be ‘employment specific skills’ (Kemp 2002:111). Indeed, volunteering may be more challenging than paid work. Skills that may be learnt or enhanced are:

- recognition, training, management, decision making, worker responsibility, avenues for worker growth, job task characteristics

Young volunteers seem to learn more (Downward & Ralston 2007:348). A study of student volunteers in Sydney and Lillehammer showed that they perceived increased competence in job skills:

Norwegian students: 79% believed they had increased their job skills

Australian students: 89% believed they had increased their job skills

Younger volunteers also felt that they had learnt more about responsibility and society. Specifically those who were unemployed felt that they were ‘contributing to society’ (Kemp 2002:112).

The case that Manchester Commonwealth Games volunteers can provide is a directly comparable model for skills set benefits. The organizing committee ran a Pre Volunteer Programme, which is already being copied by some London agencies. The programme not only targeted ‘hard to reach’ groups but they aimed to “improve the employability of participants through boosting their self-confidence and providing them with transferable skills. By December 2002 160 of the PVP graduates had progressed into employment” (Faber Maunsell 2004:21). Although there is no clear evidence that more volunteers progressed into jobs and had improved access to employment as a result of volunteering at the Manchester Games, a definite legacy was a positive attitude towards volunteering (Faber Maunsell 2004:51).
**BACKSTORY: MANCHESTER COMMONWEALTH GAMES: KEY MODEL**

- Had a Pre-Volunteer Programme: which was aimed at community participation, targeting young, ethnic minorities and disabled people (Faber-Maunsell 2004:20-3)
- It reported that the majority of its 10,000 volunteers either gained employment or volunteered for other projects.
- 2,250 volunteers gained an NVQ in event volunteering that was especially designed for the Games

After the event a database of volunteers was established for future events:

- Over 3,000 individuals have now volunteered in over 400 events post games
- Targeted the same groups and vulnerable
- Emphasised training and skilling on the job

Overall the Manchester Games legacy programme:

- Helped 220 people gain employment
- Helped 3,092 people gain a qualification
- Helped 8,743 businesses
- Supported 913 voluntary organisations
- Encouraged 2,637 people into voluntary work

### 3.6 Commitment & incentives

To attract volunteers is one thing; to keep them motivated to continue to volunteer during and after the event is quite another. Given the benefits and learning experiences volunteers commonly have, this has been a main focus. Growing as a grassroots concern with ‘keeping in touch’ post event, now this is a priority of Olympics committees and local authorities and will be especially the case in London 2012. It is recognised that a volunteer’s commitment to the event begins before it and must be encouraged and sustained. Chalip argues that “initial commitment is affected by the nature of the benefits the volunteer expects and by the sense of efficacy regarding the jobs to which he or she is assigned” (2004:56).

Confidence in the ability to carry out work to which the volunteer has been assigned is also a fundamental aspect, so training is important (Kemp 2002:110). This commitment evolves during the event, and is influenced by volunteers’ experiences of the event; their interaction with personnel and their perception of their placement (Chalip 2004). This finding is supported by Downward and Ralston’s study of volunteers at the Manchester Commonwealth Games in 2002, which revealed that volunteer motivations were fulfilled at the event if they felt happy and that their skills were utilised (2006:346). Their study found that some older volunteers were disappointed that their skills had not been mobilized effectively (2007:347). There were also signs from Sydney however that expectations of ‘professional benefits’ were too high (Chalip 2004:59).

However, Kemp’s study of volunteers during the Sydney and Lillehammer Olympics suggests the opposite, showing that volunteering is not only an effective tool for spurring initial participation for youth but can also act as an effective means of re-entry for older people. Older people, especially women who had left work to raise a family and subsequently lost confidence in their job capabilities, felt they had increased their social skills and were perhaps more importantly reminded of their job skills competence through volunteering (Kemp 2002:112). The most important issue here from both examples is to match people’s expectations and participation. This suggests there must be some
matching of skills levels to volunteering duties, or considered placement of volunteers in certain roles to accomplish a sense of fulfilment.

Although volunteers largely enjoy themselves, the challenge as above is to keep them committed. Previous ‘mega event’ committees have recognised this and offered a number of incentives.

- **Barcelona 1992**: ran language classes, courses on the country, magazine and radio show for volunteers, diploma accrediting participation, the opportunity to win tickets abroad
- **Sydney 2000**: volunteers were given the chance to take up free tickets to the Olympic closing ceremony and there was a ticker tape parade for the volunteers
- **Salt Lake City 2002**: volunteer spots on local TV, names entered to win Olympics VIP tickets
- **Manchester 2002**: offered volunteers an opportunity to gain a professional qualification, an NVQ in event volunteering, which 2,250 of them got. The ‘Pre Volunteer Programme’ became the ‘Manchester Volunteers’, providing support to local businesses, charities and organisations, sustaining the participation of the volunteers after the event.

### 3.7 Conclusions

Studies from Sydney, Manchester and Lillehammer show that the best results of volunteering are a feeling of being part of the wider community; this itself may be the most positive legacy effect for ‘hard to reach’ communities. The experiences of people in other Olympic host cities support this view. For example, the experiences of volunteers at Manchester, who were specifically recruited and some of whom were unemployed ethnic minorities and disabled people, who might more usually face boundaries to participation, tells us that the accumulated effects are worth the effort. The study showed that social capital was improved whatever the consequences (Downward & Ralston 2006:347).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manchester Games Volunteer Survey, volunteers agreed –</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15% - being a volunteer had improved their chances of employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50% - being a volunteer looked good on CV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47% - had learnt new skills and capabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46% - enhanced personal development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69% - Games had made them feel part of the wider community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.8 Suggestions: employment and volunteering

- It is crucial that local authorities educate and skill their non-skilled local residents to line up with the opportunities
- The indirect effects of the Olympics and the Stratford City development will be felt most by locals, if skill levels are raised in the local community
- The local labour market will benefit from training related to the Olympics and volunteer schemes. This will provide the ability to enter into employment – thus sustaining the benefits of the Olympics long term. But this is uncertain: it is wholly dependent on the role of the voluntary sector and local authorities to support and promote initiatives
- Volunteering may break the cycle of worklessness by encouraging participation, and it provides skills if properly managed
- Entry into different areas of participation is encouraged by sporting volunteering
- Ensure that vulnerable groups who receive volunteer support do not lose it during the event
CHAPTER 4: VISITORS & NON LOCALS: IMAGE AND REPUTATION OF THE AREA

The most likely positive legacy of the Olympics and the common reason cities bid to host the Olympics is to showcase the city: “the biggest winners of the Olympic windfall are the political regimes running the city that have the opportunity to reshape the city’s desired image” (Andranovich et al 2000, Short 2004:106). While there are debates about the ‘showcase’ effect, we consider the opportunity to do so by assessing tourism effects, and outcomes in terms of perception. We look at how previous host cities have brokered or leveraged the Games to introduce outsiders and visitors to the city, or to shape changes in perception.

4.1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- Mega events are good for ‘feel good’ civic boosterism
- Mega events do have an impact on long-term perceptions of a locale because they provide unprecedented marketing opportunity
- Iconic parks and buildings will continue to attract visitors post event
- Cities have successfully used the Games to change perceptions, and to introduce people to a new range of offers: infrastructure, tourism activity
- Perceptions of visitors positive if Games and supporting infrastructure run successfully and efficiently
- Leveraging tourism post event: as Olympics will fade, priority should be put to emphasising attractions of ‘host’ location post Games
- Local controversies over ownership and representation may distract
- Media-friendly facilitation key – good relations make a locale look good – ‘the media decide legacy’
- Successful media leveraging is usually aimed at emphasising the tourist potential of any locale
- Locals and non-locals may have very different perceptions of the Olympics – hosting the Games will feed into local history and ex/inclusion debates

4.2 Tourism

In each Olympic round there are high expectations of tourism. An assumption of any host city is that visitor numbers will increase as a result of the Olympic Games. Yet overall, research shows that results are mixed on the possibilities of growth of tourist visits to the locale as a result of the Olympics. Tourism impacts have been varied; during the event the Olympics may raise the numbers of visitors to the locale, but may equally offset other interested parties, who would have visited the city but who may avoid the ‘crush’ and inflated pricing they expect to occur during the Olympics (Roche 2000:141). This is known as ‘crowding out’ (Weed 2008).

Previous host cities have experienced little or no growth in tourism during the Olympics (Craik 2001:101). However, the valuable ‘pregnancy’ tourism, the pre-event stage referenced in chapter 2 can be ignored or not planned for appropriately; for example media coverage of a host city increases in the four years before the Olympic event, which encourages tourists and media visits. For example the 2005 DCMS impact study does not mention this at all (Weed 2008:107).
It is important to note that in most recent cases “expectations of visitor numbers have actually exceeded the actual numbers and in some cases the Games have actually reduced the number of visitors below the levels that would be normally received” (Faulkner et al 2003: 138). This has meant that the experiences of Olympic tourism by host cities have in the main been negative – there were not enough tourists and not enough spending by them to justify costs.

Tourist numbers at special events have been rising. However, tourists at these events are especially dependent on high levels of disposable income (Brown et al 2002:165). Any prediction must take into account the rising cost of travelling, living costs and the contemporary ‘credit crunch’ downturn in both disposable income and consumer spend.

However evidence suggests that there is little or no significant tourist industry at present in East London, and that any boost may attract visitors. The majority of visitors are likely to be attracted post-Olympics. However, tourist sites outside of central London usually attract less than a third of the numbers that like-for-like attractions in central London do (Crookston 2004:56).

Convention tourism (MICE) has elicited the greatest numbers of post-event visitors in previous Games. Convention tourists spend seven-fold times more than conventional tourists (Ward 2008:9). Previous cities have built well on the legacy momentum by facilitating MICE visits, particularly Barcelona and Sydney. It is also suggested that post event, any tourism leveraging moves away from the Olympics event to encourage more and varied visitors, such as the above (Weed 2008:95).

4. 3 Characteristics and Associations
Research on tourists and locals during mega-sports events suggests that the host locale and the event itself will elicit identification with a range of associations and characteristics. These are social/psychological and based on physical and infrastructure experiences.

- Emotional responses: frustration, stimulation, relaxation, enjoyment of locale, panic
- Characteristics: weather, attractions, transport, infrastructure

Characteristics promoted by Olympic cities often tie in with the Olympic brand, and the tenets of ‘Olympism’ as a philosophy. In each bidding round, the IOC advises on its interests and concerns – for example, environmentalism or multicultural diversity. Successful host cities have taken note of these themes and presented corporate packages which combined broader Olympic ideals of humanism and universalism, the IOC’s contemporary ideals with reference to legacy and delivery, and their own city-specific socio-economic contexts (Short 2004). This has been most successful in terms of image and reputation, suggesting that in London it will be on this level that the most successful legacy of the Games is found.

- Athens: ‘Welcome Home’: used its position as the traditional or historical seat of the Games to promote infrastructure investment, making the case for a historically relevant and beautiful setting with modern facilities
- Sydney: ‘Share the Spirit’: used the idea of community and openness of Olympic rhetoric, as well as the IOC’s ‘green agenda’ to promote its beautiful environment and sustainable games
- Atlanta: promoted the openness and multiculturalism theme of the Olympics in tandem with its civil rights history, utilising Martin Luther King’s ‘I have a dream’ philosophy
The London 2012 bid emphasised multiculturalism, inclusion and regeneration. Multiculturalism has been a common trend of Olympic cities (Ward 2008:133) but it is simplistic to assimilate the East London scenario to an inclusive ‘multicultural’ melee without real appreciation of its diversity, cultural or otherwise (for expansion of this point see ‘chapter 7: local inclusions). However, host cities have usually used ‘multiculturalism’ to suggest ‘culture’ or ‘cosmopolitanism’ and urbanity:

- Barcelona’s successes in attracting post-event tourism were related to its aggressive promotion of ‘cultural heritage’ – its artists, historical attractions and ‘alternative’ Catalan culture
- Sydney promoted multicultural cultures in a consumption related pattern
- Athens transformed itself from a ‘smoggy third world Argian backwater’ (Payne 2006:269-271) to a ‘can do’ place

4.4 Reputation of the locale

From the bid making process onward, the Olympics give a city an unparalleled opportunity to market itself globally (Ward 2008:122). Hosting the Olympics is one of the ways in which cities seek to become ‘sticky’, attracting and maintaining interest and investment (Hall 2006:59; Swart & Bob 2004). This, as we suggested in the introduction, is known as a ‘showcase’ effect, and is the primary reason to host the Games (Faulkner 2003; Farrell 1999). However, evidence is unclear on how valuable or real the showcase effect is. There is some validity to the argument that “the so-called ‘showcase’ effect of mega events is marginal because they generally take place in large cities that are already well-known” (Faulkner 2003:139). This is especially the case in London which is already a global brand – one of the top cities for tourism, finance and so on (Crookston 2004).

The theme of physical change has historically played a central part in the re-branding of Olympic cities. Physical characteristics – buildings, parks, transport facilities – will be noted by visitors and interest can be sustained post Games if any changes, particularly of the iconic kind, can be effectively leveraged by the locale to demonstrate lifestyle gains for locals – cultural, physical and so on (Ward 2007:133). In the 21st century in re-imaging a city, the concentration is not just on ‘bricks and mortar’ but on ‘selling lifestyle’ (Hall 2005:132). For example, Sydney marketed the city’s aesthetic as a friendly and safe place with a pristine environment (Waitt 1999:1057). But if these experiences are negative, such as Atlanta’s transport problems, then this will be a dominant aspect of the way people remember the city (Veal & Toohy 2007:235).

For East London, much of the significance of this ‘marketing’ will be in the ‘transformation’ the London bid emphasised. By focusing on regeneration the London 2012 bid was predicated on the fact that ‘change is good’. It emphasised the value hosting the Olympics could bring in terms of positive developments but did so on negative grounds: that the locale needed change and to be regenerated. It is important therefore to note that if attempting to leverage a ‘re-branding effect’, outsiders and insiders have already been given a range of negative associations and characteristics to emphasise the possible positive effects of hosting the Olympics. This means the area’s current public standing may be rather more negative rather than positive.

However, London is so large that the showcase effect may occur in the area immediately surrounding the Olympics, or more widely in the 5 boroughs or ‘East London’. Positive re-conceptualisations of the five boroughs as locale may occur away from the ‘London image’. While visitor numbers may in reality be disappointing, and international attention cannot often be sustained post event, the real opportunity comes in the ‘snapshot’ or documentary effect of the
Olympics Games. For example, Sydney was extremely successful in aggressively remarketing, refocusing its reputation from the ‘Crocodile Dundee’ of old to its beautiful environment and attractive modern lifestyle gains. ‘Brand Australia’ as it was known, did so by utilising the media, recognising that it was partially they that influenced image which plays a large part in determining legacy.

Research suggests that ‘reimaging’ strategies should be directed to two groups:

- Investors and consumers in and of the locale
- Locals who have to bear costs of change (financial, social etc) (Ward 2007:121)

4. 5 Media: do they decide legacy?

It has been argued that the Olympic ‘mega event’ is just as much a ‘media event’ as a sports event. The Olympics attracts billions of media consumers, the largest audiences in the world; its television audiences alone reached 3.5 billion for the Athens Olympics (Roche 2006:33). Media revenues also attract large amounts of money for host countries (Andreff & Szymanski 2006:6). The rise of live streaming on the World Wide Web also means the potential for less heavily mediated outputs, offering alternative stories to greater audiences (Lenskyj 2006:213; Veal & Toohey 2007:147). Event outputs and the organisation and content of ceremonies are tightly controlled by the IOC and its sponsoring organisations: the Games are a valuable ceremonial ritual and corporate sponsors also have growing control (Roche 2006:33; Hall 2006:61). It would be wise to remember that the media will report on the Olympics – before, during and after the Games – and it is they who have the major opportunity to decide, very publicly, if they were successful.

However, one of the main reasons to submit a bid is greater exposure to the media (Andranovich 2001:127) and this is not just because of the sporting or officially sanctioned events of the Games, but rather to showcase the host city. In some ways, this is a realistic expectation: the propensity to file ‘human interest’ and ‘local stories’ often results in scrutiny of the locale the media will spend most time in. It thus needs to be the case that the showcase effect works positively. For example, when British media descended on Edmonton, a city in Canada which hosted the Commonwealth Games in 2004, they renamed it ‘Dead-monton’ because of its lack of cultural activities. The name stuck.

The Olympics are prey to critical scrutiny: investigative journalism is suited to identifying out inconsistencies. It has been noted that the mass media usually take rather a simplistic approach to the Games. They portray sporting events as ‘pure’, and find ways in which they are ‘tarnished’ by events occurring around them, such as drug taking or corruption (Lenskyj 2006:207). The Olympics have a hallowed place in global consciousness as almost sacred and are replete with symbolic humanist meaning: the bigger the scandal, the ‘bigger the fall from grace’ (Cashman 1999:6).

The media are also likely to generate a ‘crisis’ atmosphere prior to the Games (Gold & Gold 2008:6). This was especially the case in Athens 2004, where an initial fear by the IOC that Olympic venues would not be ready on time, and that the ‘Greeks were chaotic’ had to be drastically revised given the successes of the Olympic event itself: “in the last few weeks leading up to the opening ceremony, some of the media began to realise they had been rushing to judgement. The self-appointed doomsayers, who only weeks earlier had been predicting disaster, finally realised that it was all working.” (Payne 2006:269). This was spun to suggest a ‘just in time’ motto. Spectacular
television footage of clear city streets and skies did seem to transform the city; unfortunately a drugs scandal involving Greek athletes almost derailed this showcasing (Gold 2007:278).

A reluctance to cooperate with the media can result in negative publicity. In Atlanta 1996 problems with communication & technology and transport raised the ire of the media and it was castigated for its failures (Gold & Gold 2007:44). Atlanta’s organizers did not realise the power of the media (Payne 2006:181) and they were also combative towards media members, with an atmosphere of secrecy (Andranovich 2001:126). There were accusations of rampant commercialism in the city, which made the Olympic event itself appear tawdry.

By comparison, Sydney’s organizers used the media effectively, inviting members of the associated and non-associated press (badly funded freelancers) for free visits pre-event, and facilitating their needs. They produced a media library, and vignettes, local interest stories, from which over-worked journalists could take information and use it, and succeeded in turning the Games into a ‘two week long documentary about Sydney’ (Brown et al 2002:177). After the Games, a survey of Americans found that 75% were more interested in Australia as a destination after watching this reportage (Gold & Gold 2007:45). Athens’ organizers also did the same, providing a footage that was an “alternative to the barrage of negative headlines” (Payne 2006:268; Weed 2004:91).

4.6 Publicity about Protest

Any protest by locals has a tradition of being mediated very heavily by organizing committees anxious to diminish any possible criticism by the IOC or media, with the result that opposition appears small or lacks credibility (Ward 2008:129). The Olympic process stifles and discourages local dissent partly to present a ‘united voice’ and to attract and welcome global investment (McGuirck & Dunn 1999:28).

Local anti-Olympics opposition has been largely trivialized by the media (Lenskyj 2006:205), sidelined as ‘unpatriotic’ (Waitt 1999:1058), or misrepresented as “young masked anarchists hurling missiles at police” (Lenskyj 2004:137). Evidence indicates that opposition from white middle class groups has had more success in making voices heard and influencing local plans for the Olympics than people in more deprived socioeconomic circumstances or suffering higher levels of social exclusion (Andranovich 2001b:165/ Lenskyj 2002/ Waitt 2003). Different members of the community have different access or ability to voice their concerns and there is a tendency to suppress local community input on any level in fear of negativity (McGuirck & Dunn 1999:28). In Sydney, even well-informed environmental pressure groups were sidelined (Waitt 1999:1058).

This is very important to note, as it will impact the local perception of authority figures, general wellbeing and the experience of living locally. Giving locals a voice to express their problems and anxieties may be very important, as suppression of these experiences leads to ill will, as in Atlanta (Andranovich 2001:127).

However, on occasion media have raised awareness of opposition, protest and any organisational controversies in past host cities (Lenskyj 2006). These controversies, often exposed by activists, have gone some way to undermine both the event and the reputation of the locale. In Atlanta corruption emerged as a legacy of the Games (Maloney 2004:240). In Sydney local media reported on aboriginal rights and inclusion, as well as the treatment of Asian minorities which attracted significant international media attention (Lensykj 2002:224-5; Lensykj 2006:209; Cashman 2004:251). In
Athens, accusations about the working conditions of construction workers, and the cover up of deaths of illegal immigrants working on the site overwhelmed memories of an improved transport system (Lenskyj 2006:213). Media coverage of Beijing 2008 has been torn between the spotlight on China’s human rights conditions, and its considerable sporting and organisational triumphs which may have an influence on Olympic tourism (Weed 2008:89).

4.7 Anti-harassment protocols – why they are needed

Moreover, as well as having their protests mediated heavily, locals have come under quite some scrutiny in Olympic cities because of anxiety about their behaviour and the image it might give of the city. This might involve worries about crime, vagrancy, vandalism, hygiene or even levels of friendliness (Shaw 2008:213-4). This is part of the tension of offering a distinctive local experience with the global tourism standards tourists expect (Garcia 2007:255).

Security levels tend to rise exponentially in host cities (Shaw 2008; Hiller 2006). This is a product of the need to defend the event from attack (Hiller 2006:323). Security personnel are usually deployed in key areas where visitors are expected to accumulate. This may lead to harassment or an increase in routine checks of the local population (Hoffman 2004:184). It may also lead to a rise in levels of crime outside the Olympic vicinity, as security forces are deployed from elsewhere. There is no evidence that crime levels rise in host cities but inversely that visitors do strain capacity and sometimes impact public order, causing upset and worry (Decker et al 2007). In fact, community concern about crime has been shown to rise during the Olympics, especially about ‘outsiders’, even though Olympic tourists are rarely disorderly (Decker et al 2007:99). This suggests it is more important to reassure the local community than visitors.

A well known phenomenon in cities that host events is the harassment of the homeless or vulnerable – whether in the form of slum clearance or mass arrests during the duration to keep the homeless off the streets (Lenskyj 2002; Shaw 2008). The homeless and unemployed have often suffered most in past Olympic host cities, to the extent that in 2000 Sydney’s Olympic organizers were required to submit to a non-harassment protocol. This partly stemmed from the experiences of and treatment of the homeless in Atlanta but in Seoul 1988 it was estimated 700,000 people were made homeless and in Barcelona over 400 homeless people “were subject to control and supervision before the 1992 Games” (Horne et al 2006:12).

In Atlanta, beautification was aggressive and purposeful: “the renovation of Woodruff Park, a favourite gathering place for the homeless, was symbolic of the new Olympic order that favoured tourists over residents” (Andranovich 2001:112). Park benches which didn’t allow people to sleep on them (called anti-homeless benches) were introduced all over the city. And there were moreover a “spate of new city ordinances that criminalized homeless behaviour. With these new ordinances, it became illegal to enter vacant buildings, beg aggressively, or even to remain in a parking lot if one did not have a car there.” (Andranovich 2001:113). A ‘Homeless Bound’ program was introduced, where the homeless were offered one way tickets out of town if they would sign a statement that they would not return (Quesenberry 1996:8-11). This included people who had been made homeless by the demolition of projects. A UN team estimated that some 68,000 people had been displaced by the Olympics, 19 out of 20 were African American.

Atlanta’s treatment of its homeless shocked the world and raised racial tensions in the city. After Atlanta’s experiences, the Olympic authorities and Sydney’s local government submitted to a
‘Homeless Protocol’ which was applied to ensure the homeless were not subject to persecution/harassment. In fact, Sydney’s organizers were good at considering pre-event social impacts, in terms of displacement, but did not, as with the rest of their policy, consider any potential legacy. However, there were reports that the aboriginal population in the local area were victimized and harassed by private security firms (Lenskyj 2002:147).

4. 8 Conclusions
A successful Olympic host city will use the spotlight that the Games shines on it to introduce visitors and residents to a modern and positive image of itself. Transport should run smoothly, and supporting infrastructure should be in place. The media will explore, most probably in the immediate locale, and will inevitably seek out interesting stories. These stories can be given to them by locals; media delight in local culture and finding a warm welcome in a backstreet away from the Olympic melee. Although protest and negative publicity has been discouraged, resolving any possible tensions by listening to the local community helps any locale hosting the Games.

4. 9 SUGGESTIONS
• Ensure that supporting and non-Olympic local infrastructure is smoothly and efficiently run
• Be a media friendly locale – to support media effectively, provide vignettes of local life
• Media seize on ‘inconsistencies’ in the Games, this will affect the local area if they find that Olympic ‘humanism’ is not being promoted in local social policy
• Promote lifestyle changes in the locale as much as the Olympic rings/ symbols
• Beautify the area in the whole locale, not just in the transport corridor, as journalists will ‘wander off the beaten path’ for a story
• Allow local residents to have a say before the Games, not just from organized groups
• Do not close local markets, meeting places or small parks/ facilities

BACKSTORY Weed’s suggestions for leveraging Olympic tourism
• What aspects of the host city/ region and country are likely to appeal to those interested in the Olympic Games and the Olympic movement?
• How can journalists be assisted to locate and research background stories or anecdotes about the Olympic host city/ region/ country?
• How can Olympic-related events be constructed to showcase the destination?
• How should photographers and/ or television cameras be placed to provide the most favourable backdrop shots of such events?
• How can sponsors be prompted and assisted to use host destination mentions and imagery in their advertising and promotions?
WELLBEING: PHYSICAL ACTIVITY, HOUSING AND LOCAL IMPACTS OF THE GAMES

In the following sections we take up one subject of London’s bid: to increase national wellbeing through hosting the Games, and to regenerate East London. As we saw in the introduction, an important minority of East London’s population is typified by low economic activity, low skill levels and health inequality. There is a high need for social housing and overcrowding is a significant problem. This is a population recorded as having multiple indices of deprivation (see map in introduction).

London’s aims stem from a growing concern with health, wellbeing and sustainability. Wellbeing has most use as an analytical term that offers insight into how social, economic and political factors work together holistically to influence a person’s quality of life. There are some basic levels of analysis that we might consider ‘wellbeing’ to include. (Indeed, to employ wellbeing properly, none of these levels are viewed as more or less important as any other):

• Health & physical wellbeing (physical activity, diet, disease & illness/ wellness)
• Lived environment (and standard of living; housing)
• Sociality and inclusion (skills, self-esteem; relationships with others; participation rates)

In the following chapters we take up these three areas and consider how hosting the Olympics may have impacts on them for locals. Unfortunately, although London’s bid targets hard to reach impoverished groups in the city’s centre, analysts generally agree that the ‘weaker’ or ‘poorer’ of the Olympic host city tend to suffer and become poorer as a result of the Games (Short 2004:107). It is accepted that “the lessons from previous Games are clear in so far as they stress that those who pay for the Games do not necessarily profit from the Games and that the poor are more affected by capacity constraints, and therefore, are far more vulnerable to eviction and displacement than are middle-class groups... hosting the Games runs the risk of deepening the social polarization in the city” (Preuss 2004:25). Moreover, London’s bid is not the first to attempt an interventionist or semi-charitable strategy through the Games (see Keating 2001 on Atlanta’s Anti Poverty Charity).
CHAPTER 5: HEALTH, PHYSICAL ACTIVITY AND WELLBEING

‘Health’ refers to a person’s level of physical fitness and disease; including for policy implementation, their standard of living, diet and nutrition and levels of physical activity. It is measured in terms of life expectancy (Doran & Whitehead 2004:93). Health is fundamental to the human experience, for example it is often seen as a marker of progress or development and the UN Human Development Index ranks it as a primary concern. As a concept, however, ‘health’ lacks theoretical insight.

To add to an understanding of the ways in which lived experience influences health, the concept of wellbeing has been employed over recent years, in response to the observation that it is not only a person’s physical level of fitness or disease that influences their health levels, but a wider interlinked range of factors referring to the lived experience of being a human. These range from diet to employment to wealth to our enjoyment of cultural activities and overall contentment (Allen 2008:5). ‘Wellbeing’ as a concept was developed by social psychologists, and today encompasses this holistic philosophy, drawing links between factors that may affect the way we live our lives and our subjective experience of them: physicality, the lived environment, economics and living standards, sociality, social status and inclusion, to name but a few.

In policy implementation UK bodies tend to categorise wellbeing as a solid unit, for example, in numbers, such as 75%. However it is important to note that it has different referents, markers and standards to people of different cultures: not only how they assess their own lives and if they are content with them or not, but also how they understand and respond to any broader social changes. Thus far there is little research - and virtually none relating to the Olympic Games - to explain in depth how wellbeing is affected and constituted culturally.

BACKSTORY Analysing wellbeing is a difficult task. Primarily, analysts attempt to assess ‘quality of life’ and contentedness: for example, anxiety or happiness levels. They try to predict at which point an individual is willing to defend or make changes to guarantee their basic quality of life. This level is referred to as homeostasis. Homeostasis is weakened by events such as losing a partner or income. As a result the ability to guard against these scenarios and to maintain strong homeostasis is clearly related to a person’s socio-economic standing (Allen 2008:22).

Unfortunately, as a concept, ‘wellbeing’ suffers from definition problems. This problem is particularly acute when it comes to measurement. While traditional measurements of living standards or poverty markers often reflect quantitative measures, theorists assessing wellbeing attempt to develop new theoretical models to encompass subjective experience. However, ‘wellbeing’ as a concept has been critiqued as inevitably referring more to a ‘western’ or ‘Eurocentric’ worldview of achievement, progress and value.

A key assumption is that the Olympic Games will inspire people to exercise more or to make lifestyle changes. A major part of the 2012 Olympic bid was the expectation that young people would participate more in sports and related physical activities as a result of the Olympics. The Game Plan, as it is known, proposed to increase participation more than one hundred per cent (Coalter 2004:93-94). And since the bid the London 2012 Games have encouraged the notion that there will be health benefits to UK residents (Kornblatt 2006:14, London 2012 2004, PwC 2005). This belief has a policy
history. Sport has long been favoured as a forum through which to encourage participation, hence the inclusion of wellbeing in the London 2012 bid.

However, there is some caution to be exercised in this country due to widely spread yet unrealistic expectations of sport as a policy device. While in the 1970’s promotion was of ‘sport for all’, an egalitarian expectation of participation, since the mid 1990’s (and especially since New Labour) funding has shifted to two performance-based priorities: children/youth and ‘winning at all costs’ (Green 2006:219). Host countries sponsor elite programmes fostering young athletes but very little of that money is translated into a full-fledged concern with changes in lifestyle via mass participation (Cashman 2006). As a result there is little evidence from previous Olympic host cities with reference to policy implementation and social change.

The need to facilitate mass sporting participation or physical activity relates to the current health status of people in East London, and the nation more generally.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>London’s starting points: health</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Life expectancy in the five borough area is lower than both the London average and UK wide average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Communicable diseases, long term health problems and disability levels are higher than the UK average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Levels of physical activity, which might promote health gains, are relatively very low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A lack of physical activity and poor nutrition are factors that have a dominant impact on chronic diseases such as obesity (Humphreys & Ruseski 2006:7). Obesity is a health inequality with severe impacts on life expectancy that can be triggered by poor diet, longer working hours, inability to find time to exercise or to afford to do so. This means that it is accepted that health inequalities have an economic component in particular (Humphreys & Ruseski 2006). There is a very strong link between life expectancy in a locality and levels of deprivation (Doran & Whitehead 2004:97), meaning that health also has a political aspect in terms of policy intervention and broader social inequality. There is thus a belief that the health inequalities found particularly in East London but also nationwide may be addressed by a qualified policy-related attempt to alter people’s diet, nutrition and increase in levels of physical activity. Sports participation lowers health inequalities (Gratton 2004:88).

In this section we consider the experiences of past Olympic host cities and the likelihood of any changes in physical activity as a result of hosting the Olympics. We examine the social and cultural barriers and factors which influence sports participation. As sporting participation varies across different countries and regions on age, gender and cultural bases, it is obvious that it is influenced by social and cultural factors. Furthermore, sport and nationalism have been historically inseparable with the result that sporting and racist ideology is sometimes uncomfortably intertwined (Hargreaves 2000:4-8).
Sports participation levels within the population are notoriously hard to predict. Trends are influenced by local social and cultural contexts which may exacerbate or facilitate participation. There has been little rigorous research on this issue, and until now, little interest in the physical habits of populations connected with the Olympic Games. Instead the majority of research has been on elite athletes and sports at the Olympics.

There are also problems with measurement in terms of what constitutes participation. Ideas about ‘participation’ and how it is measured change constantly and varies (Veale & Toohey 2005). Methodologically, official statistics on participation are questionable. For example, the Australian government considers participation to be engaging in a physical activity once a year. The UK government considers it to be engaging in a physical activity once in the last month (Veale & Toohey 2005). An increasing emphasis on physical activity sees general shifts taking place; for example current media items in the UK suggest a person has a sedentary lifestyle if they carry out two hours or less of physical activity a week.

Ideas about which activities are thought of as sporting are historically and socially determined (Laker 2002:4). As a result it has been suggested that rather than ‘sports’, we talk instead about ‘physical activity’.

5.1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- There is no basis for the claim that hosting the Olympics results in a positive and prolonged sports participation legacy (Cashman 2006, Hamlyn & Hudson 2005).
- After the Olympics there is no sustained rise in mass sports participation (Downward & Ralston 2006:338).
- It is doubtful that there are any health and social benefits for the host population (Hamlyn & Hudson 2005:882).
- Olympic events do provoke interest in sport, and people say they want to participate more, whether they do or not (Hamlyn & Hudson 2005:882).
- In some studies, a short-term (about three month) bounce in sports participation after the Olympics has been noted.
- However, other studies have noted a sports fatigue effect and a drop in physical activity and participation after them (Veal 2003, Coalter 2004b).
- Common factors influencing levels of physical activity are: gender, ethnic, social, cultural, and age differentials (Coalter 2004:79).
- People are often prevented from participating more in sports for economic reasons or lack of facilities
- There are risks to participation such as injuries from lack of expertise and the lack of relevant healthcare professionals to deal with them (Hudson & Hamlyn 2005).
- Broader sports related research suggests that social, economic and ethnic diversity influences sports participation, but appreciation of diversity is not reflected in Olympics research (Coalter 2004; Laker 2002; Gratton 2004; Horne, Tomlinson & Whannel 1999).
5. 2 Spectating and motivation at mega events

Hamlyn and Hudson propose about the Olympics that “if gain is to be had, it will be by focusing on the key issues of increasing spectator exercise, not sport, and by successfully encouraging healthy eating.” (2005:883). Do the Olympics encourage the transformation of social habits?

The majority of people will only spectate at the Olympic Games through media access: watching the events on the television or internet. Unfortunately, it has not been shown that spectating itself results in any health changes. In fact, studies show that numbers of myocardial infarctions (heart attacks) rise in the UK during sports events, possibly because of the excitement involved in supporting one’s team (Hamlyn & Hudson 2005). However, Olympic events have been found to increase interest in physical activity.

Immediate possible outcomes of spectating seem rather more negative than positive. Obviously the issue of advertising, consumption, and motivation is an important one. Debate about the impact of advertising on consumption and hence lifestyle is mixed and the debate’s complexities are exacerbated by the sheer strength of the Olympic Games as phenomenon. However, insights into how the Olympics may affect consumption suggest that the sponsorship of the Olympic event by corporations has a far reaching capacity to influence, through its global television audiences (Roche 2006:33).

There is evidence that sports events are perceived by advertising bodies as the optimum media through which to advertise their wares: “Sponsorship of sport by companies selling unhealthy products substantially increases their consumption – why else would aggressive and successful companies spend millions doing it?” (Hamlyn & Hudson 2005:883) There has been heavy sponsorship of sporting events by tobacco and alcohol brands (McDaniel & Mason 1999:484). This commercialism threatens to derail the values of the Olympics (McDaniel & Chalip 2002:6). However, sponsorship is unlikely to change; companies bargain and fight aggressively for years to sponsor the Olympics and take it very seriously as does the IOC. Advertising and sponsorship are a major source of revenue (Payne 2006:150-2).

In this case the brand or corporation associated with the Games could have a negative health effect. For example, the sponsorship of the Olympics by a fast food company could be seen as an encouragement to eat unhealthily rather than exercise (Hamlyn & Hudson 2005:883). It is warned that “Coca Cola is the abiding memory of the 1996 Olympic Games in Atlanta” (2005:883). Junk food is a favourite for spectating audiences; it has also been noted that sports and junk/ unhealthy food/ alcoholic drink are the perfect mix of hedonistic behaviour and thus consumption (McDaniel & Mason 1999:486). It is also known that the youth are a particularly easy market to reach at sports events. The older people are, the more likely they are to disapprove of the incorporation of certain brands into a sports event on moral grounds, and the younger, the more likely to enjoy the hedonism and excitement (McDaniel & Mason 1999:486).

However, given the media audiences and the power of advertising we can see that there is a clear potential to use the influence of the sports event and its role and message as an efficient vehicle to reach the youth and others and to create change. For example, in the Atlanta 1996 Olympics, NBC, the US channel with broadcasting rights, purposefully targeted women, and as a result 50% of their
audience was adult female in comparison to 35% adult males, unusual for a sporting event (Miller 1997:4). The failure to encourage and ‘advertise’ exercise during the Olympics is “possibly the most costly failure in our strategy to reduce disease in the developed world... If healthy sponsors could be found, then the same trends might change not only patterns of exercise but diet too.” (Hamlyn and Hudson 2005:883). If therapeutic exercise and use of facilities to do so are encouraged during the Olympics, there are more long-term gains to be made than encouragement of sport.

5. 3 Sports participation and physical activity

Increasing physical activity as a result of the Games is clearly a complex task. There are two key issues: the first, the provision of facilities (and funding) for physical activity. We will look more at facilities in the next section. The second is the mobilisation of motivation to achieve change in social relationships and physical activity. For anyone seeking to evaluate the impact of the Olympics on sports participation this is an area in which the complexities between the relationship between infrastructure and social habits/ infrastructural use are important. As we shall see in the next section, host cities often assume benefits to the local population simply as a result of changes in infrastructure without considering what makes people physically active.

Here we shall focus on the social aspects of sporting participation and physical activity. A positive area in terms of social relationships is that as a result of hosting the Games, more attention is given to the sporting prowess of the nation. Host cities and countries seek a ‘gold medal’ haul at all costs to maintain face and it is not uncommon for host countries to win the medals table. As a result of this interest, a marked increase in sports sponsorship occurs in host countries before the Games. And host cities often develop good and lasting partnerships between sports authorities, local authorities and local people to do so. However, very little of this money goes to the population at large. The majority of funding for sports development has gone to elite athletes because priorities are usually based on helping them win medals (Cashman 2006).

In general, while sporting legacies are thought of as positive, they are more usually mixed – for example, the year after the Olympics in Sydney there was a small increase in participation in seven Olympic sports and in nine others there was a decline (Coalter 2004:96, Veale 2003). Each Olympics has its own local and cultural setting, which influences its legacy, and may not be easily translatable when considering other countries and cultural settings.

5. 4 Obstacles to participation

People may be motivated to make changes because of the Games and interest in physical activity may rise because of major events, such as the Olympics, although participation in sports may not (Hudson & Hamlyn 2005 882-3). However the key concern is how to facilitate those changes and channel participation effectively.

Key obstacles to lifestyle changes: physical activity
- Perceived cost and/or actual cost
- Equipment
- Distance
- Seasonal variations and inclement climate
- Time and commitment (childcare, working hours)
- Physical activity aids health but encouraging sport if unskilled may pose a risk to it
People are increasingly taking part in flexible, individual physical activity which fits into their busy work and family schedules (Coalter 2004). This is also related to the cost of joining sporting facilities and being properly equipped. Moreover, there is evidence that there is a lack of funding for the relevant healthcare professionals to deal with those who exercise, and those who injure themselves. The two concerns here are lack of expertise which leads to incorrect exercising and injury, and the lack of professionals to address those concerns: either before in training or after in palliative care (Hudson & Hamlyn 2005).

5. 5 Sports and age: are there any trends?
There is little evidence to link the Olympics to mass participation in sports, yet there is more to be said for the everyday sporting activities of children and young people, whether through schools, amateur teams or recreationally, than there is about the experiences of adults. General literature shows that adults do not tend to become active in sports if they have not been involved in them from an early age (Horne, Tomlinson & Whannel 1999:121) and participation declines sharply with age (Coalter 2004:82).

The concentration of funding, even by host countries has not traditionally focused on youth and mass sports participation, or indeed, any mass sports participation. In the UK this is different because the youth have been a target. Small exceptions have been made in past Olympics by host countries anxious to reach medal targets:

- Australia. Once the bid for the Sydney Games was won, a talent search was organized in 1993. It monitored over 100,000 schoolchildren, selecting 1,315 to fund for elite training for the Sydney Games. Further sports development funding (a minority of the total sum) was made available for mass youth participation but without any evidence available of its result (Cashman 2006:175).
- Barcelona: a 'More Sport at School' programme trained over 250 teachers in physical education to aid mass participation; and a Campus Olympia programme was launched in 1993 after the Games to encourage school use of the Olympic facilities, attracting 6,500 participants in 1995 (Veal & Toohey 2007:230).

With reference to children it has usually been assumed that there will be a trickledown effect from this funding. For this reason elite academies and talent spotting programmes are becoming more commonplace. For example, there is an expectation that children will be inspired to emulate elite athletes or will benefit from interest generated in sport, or even improved facilities. There is little research to prove this is the case and no basis to think so (Coalter 2004b: 99; Hindson et al 1994:24).

However, there is anecdotal evidence that the success of athletes at the Olympics in the late 1970s inspired thousands of young Americans (particularly girls) to take up sporting activities. Today millions of young Americans participate in extracurricular sports activities (Weiss, Amorose & Allen 2000:409). Weiss et al’s study of young athletes in the US found that reasons given by young athletes for participating in sports as a direct result of the Olympics were: action, team atmosphere, social recognition or popularity, challenge and friends. Interestingly, a study unrelated to the Olympics but carried out by the English Sports Council in the UK in 1995, found that the reasons young people gave for their participation in sport were similar. They wanted to “enjoy their sport; improve their performance; and compete in fair contests” (Lee 1998:1). This has been reported elsewhere (Laker 2002:4-5).
In general, early intervention aids participation. Usually this intervention takes place through schools, where it has an educational focus (Laker 2002:6). Although sport through schools has much in common with the range of sports represented at the Olympic level, these school sports may themselves have little in common with the recreational habits or everyday sporting and physical activities of East London youth. However, school sports are often the activities sanctioned as ‘legitimate’ and socially acceptable (Laker 2002:6).

But school related sports are decreasing in popularity in the UK (Lee 1998:4) and individual physical activities not traditionally associated with ‘sport’ are rising. This is significant as sports more often associated with youth culture may be included in future Olympics, such as skateboarding and football (soccer) before or by 2012. BMX is already very popular. A recent Sport England survey on young people and sport found that in the UK, participation in individual, flexible and informal sports is rising in general. For example, numbers of children skateboarding increased by 13% for boys and 8% for girls between 1994 and 2002 (Coalter 2004:80).

There is no evidence on adults and physical activity and in the UK, as we have seen above, there is a focus on elite and youth funding. There is no researched or proven connection between the Olympics as an inspiration to motivate people into undertaking more physical activity and people actually putting that motivation into practice.

**5. 6 Culture and ethnicity: Does culture influence participation?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BACKSTORY</th>
<th>Sports participation varies within the UK according to different ethnic groups. A national survey in 2000 carried out by Sport England found that:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• For ethnic minority groups overall the participation rate in sport is 40% compared with a national average of 46%.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within the UK ethnic minorities participate at a lower level than the general population (Rowe 2000:2). But there are important variations. The survey also found out that:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Black Caribbean (39%), Indian (39%), Pakistani (31%) and Bangladeshi (30%) populations have lower rates of participation than the national average (46%).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The ‘Black Other’ group (60%) has participation rates higher than found in the population as a whole (Rowe 2000:10).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The multicultural diversity and inclusion debate is an important issue facing the Olympics and its organisation today (de Moragas 2006:10), as well as racism and stereotyping in sport, which often affects members of ethnic minority groups. The inclusion debate is key to the UK but it is also a significant historical problem with reference to the Olympics (King 2007:93; Miller 1997:7).

In the UK there are sports which ethnic minorities participate in more regularly than other members of the population but which are not included in the Olympics. For example, 8% of men with a Pakistani heritage play cricket (not an Olympic sport) compared to a ‘national average’ of 2%. The physical activities people engage in may influence participation and their interest in engaging with the Olympics. In the Olympics research itself there is little appreciation of this diversity. Olympic researchers engage in a clumsy approach to subjects such as race and ethnicity and how it influences participation. This in turn may influence their findings and reinforces stereotypes about each nationality or ethnicity.
However, sports participation does vary from country to country and is understood differently in each, so we can assume that cultural background influences levels of sports participation. Different cultures have differing preferences for sports or the value placed on them (Nakornkhet 1989:115) and this has a historical and often nationalistic basis. Some argue that Olympics sports are directly related to European colonialism (Eichberg 2000). For example, the roster of sports at the Olympics reflects a European sporting heritage, not a universal one (Cashman 2004; Miller et al 1999; Houghton 2005). The Chinese especially have lobbied to make some changes to the roster as a result. And the growing global popularity of the Asian Games for example, suggests that in countries that take part this is a valid alternative to the Olympics (Cashman 2004:127), especially as it includes a more diverse roster and some games traditional to those countries, such as kabaddi, a popular South Asian sport. However, others have argued that sports are ‘emptied’ of their cultural value and heritage by each person and country who takes them up and that consumption and cultural meaning varies (Brownell 2005).

Here are some examples which highlight the fact that attitudes towards sport are culturally specific. But they are not pre-determined or unchangeable because of these factors:

- Only 32% of adults in England take 30 minutes of moderate exercise five times a week (the recommended minimum) compared with 57% of Australians and 70% of Finns. It has been suggested that “the fact that the Finns have witnessed the same Olympics and yet exercise so much more than us means there are other factors at play in terms of participation and healthy living than the Olympics itself” (Hamlyn & Hudson 2005:883).
- In the US there has been a significant rise in children and teenagers involved in competitive sports; an estimated 20-35 million in non-school sports, and 10 million in high-school sports. The US commonly tops the medal tables.
- Pakistan has not fared as well as western countries because its traditional sports roster is not similar to that of the Olympics. There is a large imbalance in mass participation rates between men and women (discussed below), which is reflected in their medal standing (Baka, Hess and Nawaz 2004).
- In China, participation in Olympic sports is high. Although its traditional sports have been different to Olympics sports, China has campaigned to alter the ‘western’ or European bias of the Olympic sports roster and fared better as a result. The Chinese government has strongly urged its citizens to participate (Brownell 2000).

5.7 Gender: Does gender affect sports participation?

The majority of Olympics research on the differences in participation relates to gender – the distinctions between male and female experiences of sport. In general, female participation in Olympic sport has not been as frequent as male participation. This is reflected in the UK,

- Male: national average participation rate is 54%
- Female: national average participation rate is 39%.

There is clearly female interest in sport in the UK and elsewhere, shown by the fact that women tend to make up large percentages of (mostly television) audiences at sports mega events, rather than

---

1 To note: the first Kabaddi Championship was held in Canada in 1980 where it attracted 14,000 spectators.
smaller events. It is well known that sports are gender typecast, such as football and netball (Jones et al 1999). For example, Olympic sports have ‘female appeal’ (Veal & Toohey 2007:150). But why don’t they participate? In general theorists agree that “sport has long been a key site for masculine competition and exclusion of women” (Miller 1997:6).

Women have commonly been discouraged from engaging in Olympic sport for two reasons: the first is the belief that it is strenuous so may harm them in some way or that they are physically inferior to men (Veal & Toohey 2007:219; 221). This is not true: it has not been shown that there is any sport that women should not participate in. The second reason is that there is not enough money for women in Olympic sports development (Schneider 2000:434). This argument may be truer because there is less funding for female sport (Cashman 2006). This is because male competitors have been given priority and thus more funding (Schneider 2000:435). However, this is changing, with women’s sports receiving more funding lately and participation rising in general (Cashman 2006:184).

5. 8 Role models?
It is often assumed that Olympic athletes are key role models. But gender is a controversial topic during the Olympics, which may influence participation or the ways in which young people aspire to emulate athletes (Cavanagh & Sykes 2006:81-4). In general, young males are “much more likely than females to view sports people as role models” (Coalter 2004b:101).

This may be exacerbated at the Olympics: there is widespread speculation about the gender identity of athletes, sex testing is only on females, and athletes’ body shapes are scrutinised – for example – female athletes having muscles usually associated with a male physique (Cavanagh & Sykes 2006:93); or conversely the impossibly small body types of youth female athletes being associated with rises in eating disorders (Miller 1997:6). The media also tends to portray female athletes as fulfilling either the equivalent of a male comparison or as a beautiful feminine ideal (Jones et al 1999). This may interact negatively with prevailing female ideals but it is important to note that similar processes may also affect male body image. In the UK, stereotyping about females in sport is particularly held to affect ethnic minorities. For example, it is said that Asian women are portrayed as being “weak and fragile, too frail for contact sports”. Asian women have the lowest participation rates of any group in the UK (Chappell 2002:107).

In different cultural and moral settings, the desirability of females engaging in sporting activity changes (Hargreaves 2005).

• For example, in some cultures, and some Islamic countries, women are discouraged from physical activities because of values concerning dress, behaviour and morals, which affects those countries’ successes at the Olympic level (Baka, Hess & Nawaz 2004:167-8; Veal & Toohey 2007:221).

• Males have traditionally been almost sole participants in sport in Islamic countries. This may change with the emergence of elite female athletes of late, as well as innovations in sportswear and specialist training facilities.

• In China females in Olympic sport are far more successful than males, and they are a key aspect of Chinese nationalism (Brownell 2000; Dong 2005:533).

• In Australia, there has been widespread discrimination against females engaging in sport but participation is on the rise in general (Cashman 2006).
5. 9 Conclusions
Sporting activity is influenced by social, economic and political factors. Sports mean different things to a diverse population, and although organized sports are increasingly heavily engaged with as a policy tool which is planned to remediate health inequality, it seems that those sports are not commensurate with people’s preferences. Some people do not like ‘sport’ or find that there are barriers to participating in them. Instead, it is suggested that promoting exercise and healthy diet, as well as providing more funding for exercise would be a good alternative. The key to all this is funding, as health inequality stems from income and economic inequality.

Suggestions: Health and physical activity
- Focus on spectator exercise not sport
- Facilitate free physical activity for all
- Introduce a programme of pre- and post- Games mass physical activity events
- Use the Olympics as a catalyst or driver/ reward and work with pre-existing bodies in local community
- Encourage walks and physical activity to use the park
- Be cautious of relying on ‘sport’ as a policy device as funding since early 1990’s has been directed to winning for ‘elite’ sport
- In encouraging people to engage, emphasise the ‘cost-benefit’ approach to lifestyle changes (disease, health inequality)
- Encourage healthy eating during the Games
- Link symbolism of Games to morality of certain diets, nutrition
- Limit junk food advertising
- Alternative ‘local’ healthy branding arrangements during the Games?
- Consider mass public health risks, contagion and outbreaks, develop contingency plan during the Games
CHAPTER 6: BUILT ENVIRONMENT AND HOUSING

In this section we look at any changes in the built environment of Olympic cities, especially in terms of housing. While improvements to the built environment have a great potential to be positive models for the future, housing trends in past Olympic cities have not achieved the same aims. Housing is perhaps the most likely negative legacy of the Olympics and conversely the area where assumed benefits are most over-blown, probably because of the usual building of ‘Olympic villages’.

Here we discuss direct and indirect effects, as this is an area in which the largest effects may be felt off-site. We look at what happens to Olympic villages. Who lives in past Olympic villages, for example, and how much money do they sell for? We look at private and public-private housing partnerships, and also rental sectors, to define trends. For many the biggest trend in housing has been the exponential rise of housing costs, and a knock-on effect on affordable housing in the immediate areas. There are also pressures on the homeless or vulnerable people in short term housing.

While each Olympics city has been different in terms of funding or planning, it is important to look at the dynamics of each. We should also note that monitoring is heavily reliant on the socio-political approach within the host city/country and how these debates fit into pre-existing awareness of housing problems or concerns in that locale. Atlanta, for example, has been widely reported on while there is little information about Athens.

6.1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- Sustainable developments can be exemplary: Olympic parks are designed to be exemplary and may facilitate inclusion because of their concern with mobility and health
- Olympic Games are best planned when considering the long-term needs of a city (IOC 2007:1)
- Olympic villages: are designed to be premium accommodation for elite athletes, which may influence their future residency.
- New Housing via Olympic villages does not equate to housing provision for locals. Olympic housing is usually high cost, creating a socio-economic enclave that is not usually occupied by local residents
- “Sports related regenerative projects require the demolition of at least some low-income housing to make way for facilities, infrastructure or development” (Weed 2004:36)
- Because of planning timetables, Olympic developments may be only ‘shades of green’ (Prasad 1999:83; McGuirk & Dunn 1999:27)
- Experts: housing is most likely negative impact of hallmark events(Gold 2007:6):
  “There is irrefutable evidence that, in the absence of appropriate policy measures, hallmark events had a negative impact on housing, particularly on low-income private renters, who were least able to afford adequate housing” (Lenskyj 2000:143)
- Housing is often considered an ‘indirect impact’ of the Games (usually private investment) (Andreff & Szymanski 2006:186).
- Rents and house prices increase exponentially
- Greatest knock-on effect is on those living in low-cost accommodation (Gratton 2001: 176, Preuss 2004:24)
• Beautification is a contentious issue during the games and tends to upset locals; it can sometimes be aggressive and suggests the changes are not meant for their consumption (Gold 2007:276)
• The biggest impacts may be post-event:
  "Following the event, longer-term displacements often occur. In the majority of cases, these events have been used to initiate and propel urban redevelopment plans. Long-term redevelopment planning occurs with the hallmark event acting as a catalyst, and communities — usually those of the urban poor — pay the costs in terms of displacement, negative effects on health, the breakdown of social networks, and the loss of affordable housing” (Olds 1988; Hall 1992)

6.2 Sustainable Developments: Built environment and public spaces
The environment around us influences the way we live our lives, sometimes facilitating or hindering our mobility, safety or levels of physical activity. It has an undoubted impact on wellbeing: issues such as unsuitable and overcrowded housing or pollution directly affect health. Regeneration projects are focused on the ‘built environment’ but at their core is consideration of economic and social problems too – for example, in the regeneration of housing stock a key concern is also with providing employment (Jones & Evans 2008:84). However in London, the possible economic and social benefits far outweigh the improvements to built environment and have been used to justify the sustainability motto (Evans 2008:312).

Here we look at the public realm, open, public or housing spaces accessible by the population, targeted in regeneration projects.

In the UK, the term ‘sustainable development’ is often referred to in policy or employed when discussing attempts to improve quality of life. The UK favours the idea of sustainable development over ‘wellbeing’ but the emphasis often shifts between social, economic and environmental goals, according to fashion (Darnton 2004; Kornblatt 2006; DCMS 2007). Theoretically, sustainable development concerns equity: planning for future generations to limit the effects of the current population on the next (Jones & Evans 2008:84). This is part of a ‘moral’ obligation (Prasad 1999:83).

Olympic bids trigger urban transformation on varying scales and improvements in the built environment are a usual outcome of the Olympics (Short 2004:108). The Olympic Games have even improved hygiene and general health and safety in some host cities, for example, in Barcelona there were major improvements to sewage systems (Liao & Pitts 2006 1242). They also involve beautification schemes in areas expected to attract visitors, which may displace locals or impel public funds into certain areas rather than others (Gold 2007:278).

In Athens and Barcelona there were major improvements in transport, as new metro and tram lines were built to link the main Olympic sites with other districts which improved the quality of life (Liao & Pitts 2006:1244; Symes 1995:124). The improvement of Athens’ service infrastructure, including the building of a new air terminal, hotels and plazas, could be said to be its major positive legacy (Liao & Pitts 2006:1244). In Sydney the hosting of the Paralympics engendered consideration of disability and mobility which meant real changes to transport planning and delivery (Darcy 2003); however, there was no traffic calming or any ease of congestion (Punter 2004:432).

6.3 Olympic sites: why here?
Each Olympics of the past twenty five years (and many before that) reveal that bid teams have targeted certain areas for development. Sometimes under the guise of slum clearance and today ‘regeneration’, the main impact here is that funds are diverted from social housing projects and social investment (Gold & Gold 2007:32). In the past few Olympics cities, choices for Olympic village sites have characteristically been highly diverse or working class neighbourhoods with mostly low income occupancy. Historically, Olympic host cities have chosen areas which occupy a place in the city as places and communities which have been somewhat marginalised from the mainstream or centre of city life. They are either physically or socially peripheral and more usually both. Despite the language of emptiness and dereliction that occupies the planning rhetoric for the Games, there have in fact been people living in, working in and using these ‘brownfield’ or ‘empty’ or ‘run down’ sites, who have suffered displacement as a result. In these cases displacement is direct.

For example:
- Poblenou in Barcelona – was a working class neighbourhood, also a brownfield site;
- Atlanta – the Centennial Park was built on the site of the oldest social housing projects in the US with a low-income African American population;
- Sydney’s Olympic village was built on a brownfield site, which had been used as the state abattoir. This site was situated in a neighbourhood with high rental density and high residency of what might be described as vulnerable groups, for example the elderly and people with disabilities;
- Athens - upgrade of the neglected north-west section of the Greater Athens area. This was a mixed brownfield site with a quarry, waste dumps and army barracks. As the government already owned half the land, there was argued to be little disruption in Athens, but there were allegations that the construction of the Olympics meant the displacement of the Roma community who were not landowners and had few rights.

London 2012 reveals a similar approach: compulsory purchase orders were made but they were limited as the location was partially a brownfield site. Up to 1,000 people were asked to vacate, 425 from residential dwellings. Many were re-housed very satisfactorily: the key problems were that those who were moved were split up, resulting in the dispersal of a local community, and that they then went to the top of local authority housing lists, with the result others may have had to wait longer to be re-housed or were placed in housing of less suitable stock. Some of the businesses are still reporting a wait in compensation in late 2008.

In the modern Olympic era the development of sites and villages has become the responsibility of public–private partnerships. This corresponds to an entrepreneurial model which became popular in the early 1980’s which sought to profit from the Games, by combining the event with urban development (Waitt 1999). This corresponded with a broader rollback of government funding in western/ liberal democracies for social projects and an encouragement of entrepreneurial development partnerships (Montclus 2007): “given the direct participation of private capital in planning ventures, city agencies are behaving like private real estate developers. A blurring has thus occurred of the distinction between public provision for social goals and private production for economic opportunity and individual profit” (Waitt 1999:1063). It is important to note that Olympic cities are social and historical products – strategies for public private partnerships are historical and have evolved in each city very differently (IOC 1996:2).
However, sustainability and ‘green issues’ have been at the forefront of modern Olympic bids. Unsurprisingly, given its prevalence in contemporary planning rhetoric, a major part of London’s bid for 2012 was a focus on sustainable living, and preservation of the planet’s resources (LDA 2008:5). LOCOG’s approach is: “Being ‘sustainable’ means providing for peoples’ current and long-term needs, improving quality of life while ensuring a healthy and thriving natural environment.” LOCOG hope to leave a sustainable lifestyle legacy to combat climate change: reducing waste; enhancing biodiversity; promoting inclusion and healthy living. This sustainability concerns both lifestyle post-event and the construction of the Olympic site, which the LDA have recently announced they are happy with, but do not think is exemplary as promised (2008:6). However, like Sydney, bid promises do not wholly become Olympic realities. By the time Sydney began to build its stadium it had openly abandoned many of its very ambitious ‘green games’ targets (Cashman 2006).

6. 4 Planning and development

As we have noted, the Olympics tend to re-focus or centralize planning and urban development. Because of their organisation, the Olympics can have impacts that are unfortunate or problematic, mostly due to the fast turnover, deadlines and mega-aspect of the event:

- Subsidising of private sector interests at cost of public concerns
- Dilution of local planning powers
- Limitation of public participation in the development process
- Homogenisation of community opinion
- Local authorities ‘locked out’ of decision making; or tokenistic involvement
- Domination of corporate/private needs in infrastructure planning
- Domination of Olympic needs with the impact that a 16 day event influences city planning for a long time
- Use of event to legitimate unpopular decisions

But they are also an opportunity for positive change and design excellence (Punter 2004:410). More positive impacts of these planning tendencies have included:

- Speeding up of necessary city development
- Wide scale extensions to transport links and increased services
- Improvements in transport mobility for disabled people (modernisations, design changes)
- Changes to the built environment facilitating mobility for disabled and less mobile people
- Increased access to outdoor spaces for people with limited mobility (families, wheelchair users)
- Environmental changes, such as the planting of trees or improvement of passageways (such as sidewalks, benches)
- Attractive regeneration of rundown or derelict sites
- New public and green spaces
- ‘Reclaiming’ of lost non-spaces by residents (such as no-go areas)

(Adapted from Dunn & McGuirk 1999; Cashman 2006:232; Preuss & Solberg 2006; Punter 2004; Preuss 2006)

6. 5 Olympic Parks, recreational facilities and public spaces
Each Olympic host city has built or upgraded sports facilities and open spaces to host the Games. This is a responsibility: sports facilities have to be of the highest quality; the Olympic village has to house at least 15,000 people and provide transport infrastructure capable of transporting thousands of people (Preuss 2006:191).

In terms of sustainability and legacy, the real success of these facilities and open spaces will be measured by how they are used by the population after rather than during the Games event. Olympics planners have in general assumed benefits from ‘hard’ infrastructure will translate to locals automatically, where in practice, these benefits have not happened (Vigor 2006:14; Evans 2008:315). This is partly a corollary of the problem that “the pressure to provide such infrastructure gets confused with the pride of presenting the city to the world and therefore there is a risk of overestimating the need for permanent structures” (Preuss 2006:192). However, iconic buildings and structures do attract visitors post-Games and continue to do so as long as they are maintained.

With relation to the facilities built to host sports events, a legacy is “only thought of as positive if the venues are sustainable and used by the community” (Cashman 2006:179). For example, there is often an assumption that hosting the Olympics will mean larger and better facilities. This suggests the need for such facilities and the costs involved in their maintenance will inevitably determine their post event use. Sometimes facilities are just too big. However, experts suggest that nations hosting the games may capitalise on the possibilities if they have sports participation as a priority and facility after use (Cashman 2006:83). There is a tension here between elite sports facility and accessibility for the general public (Hiller 2006:328).

There are always fears about ‘white elephants’, the products of large expenditure that cannot be used or disposed of. They also have high running costs post event (Hiller 2006:326). With reference to the Olympics, the most likely white elephants are and have been large stadiums and facilities too big to be fit for purpose, with high costs and as a result under-used post event. This is known as the ‘winner’s curse’, the fact that bid cities make spectacular bids and then have to build facilities that aren’t needed (Preuss 2006:190). The most famous Olympic ‘white elephant’ of modern Olympic Games has been the case of Sydney. However, like London’s own white elephant, the millennium dome, Sydney’s initial struggles seem to have been resolved and its Olympic park legacy is more mixed and positive than commonly supposed.

6.5.2 Sydney

Sydney’s experiences prove the point that planners cannot totally anticipate or control the outcomes post-Games. Sydney was the first Olympic bid to introduce sustainability and sport as cohering developments, following the IOC’s new environmental policy, but did not achieve its ambitious targets (Cashman 2006:215; Liao & Pitts 2006:1243). The Olympic Park and village were built in Homebush Bay, formerly the site of an abattoir, brickworks, armaments depot and waste dump, and the largest saline ecosystems, including wetlands, remaining in Sydney (Burchett et al 1998:515). A significant part of the Olympic bid was to clean this site, which had become toxic and polluted due to a history of very mixed use, and the organizers worked with Greenpeace to do so and to high environmental targets. However, the plan that won Sydney its bid working with Greenpeace was abandoned due to costs (Weirick 1999:76-8). The ecosystem of the area and biodiversity was vastly improved. However, the tight timetable meant that its ‘green credentials’ in
decontamination were questioned (Liao & Pitts 2006:1244; Veal & Toohey 2007:242) and developing technologies in the 1990's may have been more experimental than now (Prasad 1999:87).

In Sydney while planners “believed that the games would leave the city with positive outcomes in terms of larger and better-equipped sporting venues” (Cashman 2006:178), most (sports) facilities in the Park proved to be too large. Perhaps this reflected that fact that after the first eco-friendly bid was abandoned due to costs, there was a ‘mishmash’ of planning (Weirick 1999:80). Today most venues related to the Olympics are publicly run, and are a drain on the New South Wales government who are committed to supporting them, but for an uncertain amount of time. However, after some initial user problems and under-usage of facilities, the Olympic Park is a recreational focus for those who live locally (Cashman 2006:191).

- The Sydney Olympic Stadium is now used infrequently for sporting events, as it is too big (Coalter 2001)
- The mountain bike course was closed by 2002 because of insufficient demand (Cashman 2006:180).
- The water sports site is popular and has become an internationally renowned venue because it is the only man-made watercourse in the Southern Hemisphere. It is also a focus for community recreation. Its most popular activities are rafting – with over 140,000 patrons between 1999 and 2005. It is now financially self-supporting (Cashman 2006:180-1).

Here there is a valuable distinction to make between Sydney and London. The natural environment around Sydney, with its beaches and easy access to countryside and recreational activities, is very different to that of East London. This would suggest the possibility for high usage in London where there might not have been in Sydney. Sydney’s park was also beset by a lack of regular transport to the Park except for large events post-Olympics.

As well as the development of the Olympic Park there were also over 30 new beautification projects of public space outside the Park operating under a ‘City Spaces’ scheme that converted and refurbished public, cultural and recreational spaces and facilities, and supported public art projects (Punter 2004:430). The project was led by the Mayor of Sydney to inspire design excellence in the private sector, a real example of how the Olympics might make valuable changes to the design and development infrastructure, previously bogged down by bureaucracy and more attuned to rapidly accommodating the workforce rather than good design (Punter 2004:430-433). The City Spaces project was critically judged to be the most successful infrastructural legacy of the Games:

“The City Spaces Programme delivered an important democratisation of space – a reclamation of pedestrian space from traffic and the provision of a wide range of accessible high-quality public amenities (sports halls, swimming pools, and cultural venues) which respond more to the needs of city residents and workers than to international tourists” (Punter 2004:441).
6. 5. 3 Other Olympic sites

- The Barcelona development opened up a formerly industrial area to the sea (Montclus 2007); the marina and public beach are both popular attractions and well-used recreationally where they were not before (Liao & Pitts 2006:1243).

- The Barcelona Olympic village training centre is now used as a multi-sports centre and a swimming pool was built there in 2000. In 2001 the centre was used 130,000 times (Carbonell 2005:6; Marshall 2004:41).

- Sports priorities were not a focus in Atlanta, most venues were temporary and the stadium was converted into a baseball arena (Essex & Chalkey 1998).

- Atlanta’s Centennial Park, built for the 1996 Olympics, is a 21 acre landscaped park with 650 trees: while it was contested land, the Park is of environmental benefit to the city (LERI 2007:81).

- The Centennial Park opened up an area of the downtown, connecting business developments with the city (Poynter & Roberts 2008).

- There was beautification of some public spaces, with varied results (see homeless protocol) and widening of sidewalks and pedestrian plazas, as well as the planting of trees (Hoffman 2004; Veal & Toohey 2007:236).

- In Athens Olympics projects were accumulated in four districts. A 530 hectare brownfield site was converted into Europe’s largest park for sports and recreational use (Liao & Pitts 2006:1244).

- However, according to news reports despite plans of sustainability the facilities built for Athens are reputedly crumbling and dangerous by 2008. Many of the original ‘green plans’ cited for its construction and post event sustainability were abandoned because of time and cost constraints. The LDA have recently cited this outcome as a realistic fear for London (LDA 2008).

London 2012?

With those provisos, the most realistic legacy for London post-2012 Olympics may be the Olympic Park, a 2.5 kilometre squared space of parklands and public spaces designed to encourage biodiversity and ecology. Aside from the built facilities, there will be areas for sports and physical activity; new cycle and footpaths re-connecting the Lea Valley with the Thames for the first time; public spaces for festivals and arts; wetlands and the restoration of historical waterways.

The Olympic Park may be constituted as the key legacy gain in terms of built environment, facilitating a change in behaviour or use of recreational facilities.

(we see the) “Olympic Park as becoming a hub for east London, bringing communities together and acting as a catalyst for profound social and economic change. It will become a model of social inclusion, opening up opportunities for education, cultural and skills development and jobs for people across the UK and London, but especially in the Lea Valley and surrounding areas”.

Although Olympic park plans are controversially still in development and evolving while the park is already in construction (LDA 2008:6), there is much potential to facilitate lifestyle changes. There have been real successes relating to other Olympic parks and developments.
6. 6 Olympic Villages

A key assumption with reference to the Olympics is that Olympic villages provide new housing for, and are gifts to, the community. This belief is a corollary of the fact that Olympic villages must provide accommodation for athletes very near the event facilities.

The belief also results from the relentless promotion of bid teams who seek to rationalise the expense of the building work by equating it with ‘new housing’. In this country the numbers of new housing provided for the 2012 Olympics has been misleading, especially as the number of homes at Stratford City have been included as part of the overall total. Instead of the 9,000 homes cited in the bid, press releases in 2008 suggest we should more realistically expect less than 3,500 units to be built because of financial rescaling. There is still no agreement about how the overall totals of affordable housing provided by the Olympic village will pan out, due to costs and global economic insecurity about credit and as a result investment in the development of land, and no guarantee that these and some of the surrounding land will not become gated developments.

Due to a variety of factors Olympic villages have not always been geared toward providing for the local communities in which they are based. First and foremost, Olympic villages are designed with the needs of elite athletes in mind. They may also be exemplary in terms of design and in some cases be very different from traditional housing forms in the local area and as a result, need in the local area.

6. 6. 2 Public and private

Each Olympics thus far has made plans for the development and redevelopment of Olympic villages the responsibility of private/public partnerships; with the exception of Atlanta (Veal & Toohey 2007:232). This follows the disastrous fundraising attempts of Montreal’s Games. The City of Montreal undertook to receive no federal government economic support, and only managed to raise 5% of funds from the private sector. The City of Montreal only balanced the Olympics bill in 2005, at which point it was announced that some of the facilities, especially the iconic tower, would need millions worth of repairs. As a result, although a public-private partnership bid for the Sydney Games, the Olympic village (the main expenditure) was financed privately (Weirick 1999:78-9).

However, Athens too failed to raise little money from the private sector and took on the major part of the burden of funding the Games (Weed 2008:160).

Often Olympic related housing has fallen into the private sector, or is developed and then sold after the event with the aid of the private sector. Private corporations have historically taken over any housing built for the Olympics and the dominant trend is that housing in the Olympic village has been sold on before or after the Games at heightened prices. Obviously London must buck this trend in order for its housing to have any benefit for the local community, such as constructing family units to reduce overcrowding. The most important aspect of the Olympic park and any outside related development is that an accessible infrastructure is created which sustains community liaison and meets the needs of residents. This has an explicit impact on locals.

Another issue to consider is that in some cases local housing has been demolished to build Olympic sites (Weed & Bull 2004:36). Primarily it has been low income occupancy, or slum housing. If demolished, as it was in 1988 in Seoul and in 1996 in Atlanta, it has not been reconstituted in exactly
the same way – that is an issue as the original tenants or locals of the area cannot afford, or are not invited to move back into, newly regenerated housing stock.

For example, Barcelona’s Olympic Villages in the Poblenou became an enclave of high end flats, and introduced middle class accommodation into a working class area: “Most of the 6,000 flats sold for prices up to US$400,000, well out of the grasp of ordinary Barcelona citizens” (Parkin & Sharma 1999:174). This was also the case in Atlanta and other cities.

It is not unusual for Olympic housing schemes to be unpopular (Gold 2007:7). And, while mixed tenancy housing developments are often seen as a contemporary role model and a plan for the future London 2012 Olympic village, they have their problems too. For example, studies of new housing developments in East London show mixed tenancy developments are a source of tension (Bernstock 2008). There are new pressures on transport and mobility, and overcrowding of local supporting infrastructure such as schools or stores. This is because there is often a time-lag between the development of new housing units and the provision of supporting services, such as schools and doctors surgeries, and local stores and community centres.

There are also tensions between the different users of these mixed use developments, between social renters, private renters and private owners, and the development of openly mixed provision of different size and standard accommodation does not help (IPPR 2006).

For example, new developments must provide ‘public space’ under contemporary planning agreements, but this public space has a cost: it must usually be financially maintained by the residents of the developments. It is not so much ‘public’ as ‘shared’ with service charges. As a result, while older standing locals perceive newer tenants to benefit more from opportunities, newer tenants, who have to pay service charges to maintain public space, also have problems with longer-standing residents and their behaviour, such as outbreaks of vandalism (IPPR 2006; Shelter 2008).

6. 7 General trends

Below we discuss some indirect impacts of the Olympics on housing in host cities before going on to look in more detail at case studies. Housing impacts are considered not only in terms of what new housing will provide via the Olympic villages. In general local authorities have failed to consider the indirect impacts of the Olympics on housing, such as short and long term rent increases by private landlords. Those most at risk from this trend are vulnerable, low income or illegal citizens, who are rarely able to speak out about what is happening to them. Even if new housing replaces old, it is rarely of the same kind, which means that more people are at risk of displacement, or found alternative housing, sometimes in distant locations.

BACKSTORY The term gentrification was coined in order to describe a dynamic noted in London in the 1960s which has continued to this day. Gentrification is described as a movement of young middle class professionals into housing and areas usually occupied by the working classes (Hamnett 2003). Housing is the key area on which gentrification touches, although it also involves the movement of people with different social, economic and political status to the traditional population. This may also influence schooling, politics and local services in the area. Contemporary critics have argued that regeneration necessarily involves gentrification, although gentrification invokes a process of displacement of the original population.
6. 7.2 Rises in housing costs
Olympic host cities usually see rises in house prices due to an expectation of inward investment, a belief in regenerative abilities of the Olympics to change the neighbourhoods around it, value and kudos accruing to the Olympic area as a site of some symbolic worth, and a process of gentrification in areas surrounding the Olympics.

Just how much house prices rise and why they might do so is a matter of some debate. Most analysts seem to agree that the rise in house prices puts pressure on the local market, some are divided on whether this is a good thing or not, perhaps caught in the uncertainty offered by the regeneration-gentrification paradox. Affordability is the major loser here.

However, rising house prices are problematic because they tend to have an impact on the prices of private rentals and the propensity of socially registered landlords to continue to rent their homes to social tenants. Private rentals are more lucrative, especially with rising rent costs in an area. It has been found that even if rises in house prices cannot be linked to the Olympic Games without question, then there are considerable rent rises in the local area in the lead up to the Olympics and during the Games.

The impacts of these rises are short term and long term:
Short term: landlords evict tenants because they seek to make money out of short term higher rents during the event (grossly exaggerated weekly rents)
Long term: the price of rents may escalate as a result of increased interest in the area

People do not just displace to cheaper accommodation elsewhere because of these pressures; instead it has been shown that homelessness rises because of them (Shaw 2008:215).

6. 7.3 Evictions & displacement
As a result, each modern Olympics has displaced people – whether from their homes or accommodation. There are several issues:
• Relocations are usually made (to move people away from the development)
• Like is rarely replaced with like (i.e. mixed income occupancy does not provide as many houses for low income or social renters as before; re-housing of public or housing association tenants in areas far away; not the same amount of public housing as there was before in the area):
• Governments/local councils do not understand the knock-on effect in the private sector – i.e. rental increases by private landlords, which is legal under rental notice agreements, so becomes ‘invisible’
• Will usually be short-term evictions by landlords seeking economic gain
• Growing awareness of the need for a protocol for non-harassment of homeless people by local authorities
• Mixed-income housing developments replace public housing developments, usually resulting in out-migration:

These displacements can be traumatic for the people who are moved, and who have depended on their neighbours, and their local environment. Although the housing may sometimes be of better quality,
“while many would see such redevelopment as a positive benefit that enhances the environment and image of the city, for those communities that are displaced the experience can be traumatic... in many cases, although these communities are living in comparative poverty and are usually relocated to improved housing elsewhere, such relocation is often to distant and unfamiliar suburbs far away from other families with whom friendships have existed for generations, the result being the destruction of working and social networks and, in some cases, entire communities” (Weed & Bull 2004:36).

This dynamic really epitomises the potential for legacy plans to be wholly mixed. Beautiful houses do not always equate to beautiful homes or working and integrated communities.

6. 7.4 Resistance, Protest and Social Pressure

Housing impacts can have extreme results, to the extent that there has been widespread political mobilisation and changes in voter patterns spurred by the Olympics and displacement of local communities (Newman 2002:30). However in general it is difficult to know the full extent of vacancies or evictions, because:

- Laws governing issues such as rent control, or notice periods make them invisible
- In the areas where the Olympics are sited there are often vulnerable groups – i.e. illegal immigrants, illiterate migrants, people at risk – who cannot publicise their presence, let alone publicise their protests against development
- People are unable to mount a lawful protest, due to tenancy laws, despite their displacement
- Protest is ineffective due to lack of access to politicians – there has historically been a connection between politicians and land developers
- There is such a positive vibe about the Olympics, that people feel social pressure to conform and not complain – or at least, their complaints are not registered by the media, etc

6. 8.3 CASE STUDY Barcelona: Olympics 1992

Barcelona is considered the best-case ‘regeneration games’ and a benchmark model for other organizing committees to follow (Gold 2007:41). Barcelona offered the attractive regeneration of a run-down industrial port site, one that had been neglected for years (Maloney 1996:192; Gold 2007:40). Overall, work was spread between four sites and the Olympic facilities were distributed across the city (Veal & Toohey 2007:225). Regeneration was a priority and a private-public development project: “A total of 36.8% of the Olympic building work was promoted by the private sector, and one-third of this was funded with foreign capital. Private investment focused on housing, hotels and business centres. The high level of private investment was sparked by expectations of improvement in the city’s attractiveness” (Roldán et al, 1992).

Urban development after the Games harnessed their potential:
1. Renewal of seafront section – this was done with public funds
2. Harnessing of post-Olympic impetus for private confidence in transformation of the urban structure, leading to private investment in development (Brunet 2008)

6. 8.3. b House prices and cost of living

However, with relation to housing for locals, although critical opinion has been largely positive as to regenerative potential (Gold 2007:41), Barcelona might surprise for those who believe in its successes. Although there was no formal social impact assessment carried out after the Games by
the organizing committee, critics believed there had been serious social costs (Weed 2004:36). Between the award of the Games in 1986 to Barcelona and their staging in 1992, the city saw rapid economic growth. There were increases of nearly 25% in employment and 45% GDP per capita, coinciding with some decrease in residential occupation, which was associated with an increase of 98% in the average price of new housing in the metropolitan region (Harris & Fabricus 1996:39).

Working class communities were moved to develop Barcelona’s waterfront, without consultation (Weed & Bull 2004:36). The new housing associated with the Olympic villages was 49% of all new housing in the municipality, but 26% of the metropolitan area. Before the Olympics there had been promises that the ‘Nova Icaria project’ Olympic village apartments would be used for subsidized housing for people of low income. However, they were sold on the open market (Hughes 1992:39-40; Horne & Manzenreiter 2006:12). This was a substantial amount: there were 6,000 new housing units in the Olympic Village in the Poblenou too, but each sold in the region of $400,000 which was far beyond the prices working class locals could afford to pay (Parkin 1999:174). Olympic housing was judged unsuitable for “the needs or ability to pay, of those needing homes” (Symes 1999:124).

In general terms, studies found that the residential housing market in the city had ‘escalated’ in price between the award of the Games in 1986 and staging of the games in 1992, by about 250%, a huge increase in local terms (Parkin 1999:173). Moreover, there was less funding for housing after the Games as a result of debt incurred in the hosting of the Games. In fact, there was a massive decline in the construction of publicly financed housing for low income families: between 1981 and 1985 this form of housing accounted for 50% of new housing construction in Cataluna but, by 1991, only 6% (Parkin 1999:173).

This placed more pressure on disadvantaged groups, and the rate of out-migration from the city of Barcelona reached 16,000 in 1992 – over twice the 1986 figure (Parkin & Sharma 1999:174).

6.8.4 CASE STUDY Atlanta: Olympics 1996
Atlanta’s Olympic Games are notorious for their controversial housing legacy. Although little regeneration and building work took place, the fallout over private-public interests and the mass displacement of the poor and homeless as a result of the games attracted much attention. Atlanta should be considered important because its failures should have influenced Olympics planners since, especially in the consideration of a ‘non-harassment’ protocol of homeless people.

BACKSTORY There are two important historical contexts to Atlanta:
One: the withdrawal of federal funding for social services or traditional economic development in the early 1990’s. Instead, cities were urged to seek local growth using entrepreneurial techniques (Andranovich et al 2001)
Two: History of concern about Atlanta’s inner-city neighbourhoods and their largely poor, African – American population (Hoffman 2004: 159)

A key to the redevelopment of the area developed into the Olympic grounds (known as ‘Centennial Park’) was that it lay on coveted land, in the centre of Atlanta. It was the site of the oldest public housing projects in the US, which had been a substantial barrier to the regeneration of the city, and plans by upmarket developers, businesses and tenants to transform it into a high income business district. Coca Cola had its headquarters next to the projects, and over the years there had been
attempts to tear the housing down by businesses such as Coca Cola which had met resistance from
the black civil rights community. However, the Olympics “refocused attention on the public housing
community” (Andranovich et al 2001:109). As a result, there were fair allegations that this was a
particularly nasty form of ‘slum clearance’ and many people lost their homes.

6. 8. 4. a Olympic Village and housing

Atlanta’s Olympics were organized at a time when there was little funding available for urban
renewal. However, organizers were able to package Olympics based redevelopment with the
‘Housing and Urban Development’ federal funding packages which encouraged private-public
partnership and fundraising (Andranovich et al 2001:17). There were two major development
groups, yet the City of Atlanta was not consulted on the redevelopment. Dependence on private
funds saw a failure to raise the necessary money and the group fell apart along local and sectional
interests.

Controversies with reference to racial divisions and fraudulent dealing of redeveloped land bogged
the organizing committee down. As a result, redevelopment was only very basic. A charitable group
widened and rebuilt sidewalks, planted new trees and lawns, installed historic street lamps but in
the end ran out of impetus and money (Hoffman 2004:174). Local people were not happy that this
‘charitable group’ was composed of the same people who had made large numbers of people
homeless, and often refused to cooperate.

Urban restructuring privileged business interests (Short 2004:107) and the policy for regeneration
encountered condemnation. There was not an Olympic village per se, although some facilities were
built. There were two sites: it was decided that “the problem of slum housing was to be solved by
deconsolidating the concentration of urban poor in the projects, and by carefully monitoring those
who were allowed to move in” (Hoffman 2004:188). It was considered so important to separate
areas of downtown from the urban poor that a moat was proposed (Andranovich et al 2001:106).
Demolition of housing occurred in two locations – one a public housing estate close to the city
centre and the other a rundown industrial and housing area (Gold 2007:44). In the first there were
allegations that the demolition of housing was secretive: “1200 units of public housing were levelled
in 1993 and later replaced with 900 units of new mixed –income housing” (Andranovich et al
2001:106). This new housing was a gated community, “effectively replacing poorer tenants with
more affluent residents” (Gold 2007:44). The second became Centennial Park.

Moreover, the UN found that there was purposeful de-tenanting of the housing projects before the
re-development, rendering the displacement “invisible” (UN 2007:129). Even though this has been
debated, they did not track residents of the housing projects, so there was no way to discover who
and how many had been displaced (Quesenberry 1996:8). There were 4,170 lost housing units in
total. However, an estimate based on the fact the projects housed families revealed that if each unit
housed an average of only four people, the Olympic legacy programs would have displaced as many
as 16,680 residents (Burbank et al 2001:112). This even had an impact on voting patterns in Atlanta,
as the city lost older low income African Americans who were replaced by young professionals
(Newman 2002:30).
Those who did benefit from Olympic housing were local students (Lenskyj 2000:96). Georgia Tech, which had not been allowed to offer rental accommodation to students before agreed to purchase the Olympic village for use as undergraduate housing (Kelly & Patton 2005:136). The village leased quickly its first year and was fully occupied with a waiting list, it was thought because of the cache and novelty value of it having been the Olympic village (Kelly & Patton 2005:141).

6.8.4. b Housing (and human) costs
The properties in the development that replaced the public housing were mixed income and were sold off to for-profit investors which ‘led to rampant gentrification’. In 2004 prices ranged between $280,000-400,000, which would make them premium properties in Atlanta (Hoffman 2004:182). Although there is debate about how much house prices rose in Atlanta (Short 2004:107), “while private corporations prospered, Atlantans had to face skyrocketing rent costs as demands for Olympic housing rose” (Senn 1999:252)

Less than 8% of original tenants found homes in the mixed tenancy development, not just because of their costs, but also because there were very strict new credit and criminal record checks which “excluded many who most needed these units” (UN 2007:129). People with criminal records simply could not move in under a ‘zero tolerance’ policy (Newman 2002:31). After the Games it emerged that 62% of people in the projects had found replacement housing “however, many of these are in Section 8 units in which tenancy is less secure and quality is worse than public housing” (Andranovich 2001:111).

Moreover, a ‘homeless bound’ programme offered homeless Atlanta citizens a free ticket out of town if they did not return (Quesenberry 1996). Benches in parks were replaced with ‘anti homeless’ benches that prevented people from lying on them. A single room occupancy residence and three homeless shelters were closed. One estimate was that 68,000 people were displaced by what happened in Atlanta, and that 19 out of every 20 were African-American. What happened in Atlanta and the controversy and tension raised in the community as a result of the treatment of locals shocked the world. The next city to host the Olympics, Sydney, had to submit to a non-harassment protocol as a result. The end assessment was that: “Plans for the post-Olympic period suggest that substantial benefits of the park will be realized by the city, the quasi – public authorities, and the private interests whose agendas have long included the redevelopment of this area.” (Andranovich et al 2001:108).

6.8.5 CASE STUDY Sydney: Olympics 2000
Sydney’s bidders worked hard to develop environmentally-conscious housing and were also the first organizers to consider social impacts before the event, although they failed to do so afterwards. This was more indicative of a failure to consider legacy plans in more detail. There is a mixed picture, mostly due to dispute over how badly the market was affected – there were exponential house price increases in the area but some argued that was reflected in other Australian cities at the time.

6.8.5. a, Olympic village
In contrast to previous Olympics the site selected was surplus government land, and not an established residential area (Searle 2005:44). The government did not evict or relocate people to
build Olympic facilities and the former Olympic village became ‘Newington’, a new suburb with medium density, middle income housing, and planned along sustainable lines. It provided 5,000 new housing units (Searle 2005:44).

Newington was located in a place of ‘socio-economic disadvantage, with relatively lower incomes, higher proportions of dwellings being rented and very high rates of unemployment”. It was a “high socio-economic enclave’ in an otherwise depressed local government area”. Before the event, a social impact study revealed that local authorities were anxious about the social problems that might result from the ‘tremendous social disparity’ (Cashman 2006:222-235) and the organizing committee provided limited funding for a team to help the homeless (Lenskyj 2000:144).

Despite these concerns, as with other previous host countries, the former Olympics village in Sydney was successful in general, attractive to middle income earners and safe and appealing in terms of its environment (Cashman 2006:237). Part of its success was thought to be that it was promoted as a great suburb and place to live, rather than being the former Olympic site. The area benefited from a re-imaging as “Sydney’s new heart” (Waitt 2003:107). However, the sale of the houses at a premium returned a profit of $.25 million (Cashman 2006:237).

6. 8. 5. b, Housing costs

However, in the area surrounding the Olympic Park there were some negative impacts. Sydney offers a mixed picture because of the tendency of Olympic cities and sites to attract investment and interest and as a result to have a heavy toll on housing affordability. Firstly, the area, a low income area, saw a ‘greatly accelerated gentrification corridor’ in the area leading from the centre of Sydney out to Homebush Bay (Gratton & Henry 2001:175). House prices rose exponentially and the key concern was that the Olympics exacerbated housing unaffordability. While middle income earners had found new housing, lower income earners suffered from increased vulnerability: “Many of the people living in the area before the Olympics were on Commonwealth (federal govt) benefits – for unemployment, sickness, disability, and aged persons, and more often than not were single people” (Gratton & Henry 2001:175).

Sydney also saw examples of other development scenarios, namely landlords evicting tenants for ‘renovations’, relocating them outside the city in cheaper areas, illegally converting hostels or raising the rent (Lenskyj 2002).

The government failed to take a preventive approach to pressures for increased rents and evictions as a result of the games, refusing to enact legislation to control housing affordability. Prices were already rising but were propelled by the games. This represented a move into the area by middle income professionals and an eventual move out by lower income earners or those on government benefits who were hit worst by the rises in rent, or at least could not guard against them. While some would argue that house prices had risen at the same rate in other Australian cities over the same time period, the unethical behaviour of private landlords, and the failure to control it by the government, represented a lack of insight into the behaviour of the private market, despite the successes of the village.
6. 8. 6 CASE STUDY Athens: Olympics 2004

There is little information available about Athens as there is no monitoring of house prices, etc by any agency in Greece. It is generally agreed that the Olympics had little impact on house prices and that compensation for relocation was appropriate (COHRE 2007:12). Athens’ biggest success was in the beautification of its public and tourist spaces. Tourists and visitors were impressed by the delivery of extended and beautified passageways throughout the city; and significant modernisations to transport which reduced traffic and congestion (Gold 2007; LERI 2007). Museums and cultural attractions were renovated and received increased funding (Gold 2007:279).

The Olympic sites were spread over the city and were mostly greenfield (Gold 2007:272), which was a missed opportunity to develop other sites. Criticisms also dwelt on the fact that the ‘spread’ lacked planned focus or reasoning (Weed 2008:167). The Olympic village site was chosen in order to upgrade a neglected area of the north-west of Great Athens, which would mean an upgrading of brownfield sites: a quarry, waste dumps and army barracks. This was also because the government already owned half the land, “thereby reducing the need for compulsory purchase” and for local displacement (Gold 2007:275). The area as a whole was under-populated and there were hopes that migrants would be encouraged to move in (Liao & Pitts 2006:1244). After the Games the village was to be self-financing, with the accommodation sold after the Games to middle-class families (Coaffee 2007:160).

There were three Olympic village sites in this area, with plans to accommodate 17,428 participants. The villages were to be built to high environmental standards, with solar power, water management systems, planting of indigenous species and landscaping. However the plans were too ambitious and building work beset by problems, such as archaeologically valuable ruins which delayed building, and cost over-runs (Liao & Pitts 2006:1244). In the end these ambitious plans did not come to fruition, as the organizers ran out of time, barely delivering the basic Olympics facilities. Environmentalists were very critical of the lack of sustainability in the construction and delivery of the Games because of the timing and delivery deadlines (Gold 2007:279-90).

There were allegations that the construction of the Olympics on these sites meant the displacement of at least 3,000 of the Roma community who were not landowners and had few rights under Greek law (COHRE 2007:14-15). One case involved 40 Roma families moving because a parking lot had to be built (Shaw 2008:215). Witness evidence (supported by media reports) cites the large numbers of vulnerable people (‘beggars’ and ‘drug addicts’) driven away from the city as a result of the Olympics but there is no ‘concrete evidence’ available (COHRE 2007:13).
6.9 Conclusions
Each Olympic city has chosen its Olympic site on the basis that it is land fit for re-development. Unfortunately, this seems to imply that those living, working on or using the land are also fit for this type of intervention. Ambitious plans to redevelop, ‘clean’ and upgrade brownfield sites to provide new possibilities for people in facilities, attractive outside spaces and housing must be thought to be largely positive. However, ‘slum clearance’ of areas of low income with high crime rates, another trend of Olympic related development, cannot be thought of so positively.

The organizers of the Olympics are able to carry through large-scale redevelopment, which might otherwise be contested or more rigorously scrutinised, because they are a showcase project which has to be built on a grand scale and to a very tight timescale. Planning powers are often handed over to the organizing committee of the host country to do so, which means little consultation of local leaders. However, organizing committees have usually been composed of local elites, so the interests here are seen somewhat as parallel. There is though, a truth that public spaces have usually benefited from upgrades - from the retention of sunlight to the restoration of historical passageways and waterfronts to the widening of pedestrian spaces - as a result of these centralized powers. As we see from Atlanta and Sydney, much depends on local politicians and their ability to privilege local opinion rather than corporate or market-led interests.

It is unfortunate that not one of the modern Olympics has not displaced or negatively impacted anyone in the housing sector. Obviously this is again a matter of planning and priority: and it is also a reflection of the fact that intended regeneration seems inevitably to involve gentrification.

6.10 Suggestions: built environment
• Recognise that hard infrastructure does not automatically translate into ‘soft’ social gains or use
• Resolve uncertainties relating to the guardianship of the Olympic park facilities
• Local authorities must make more of the park and its facilities; consider post Olympic use
• A successful scheme will be linked with long-term plans for the host city and resource mobilisation plans to incorporate the Park into the fabric of the locale
• Use the Paralympics to inspire design and make changes to the built environment that encourage mobility
• Introduce guided walks and patrols to keep the park safe and community-orientated
• Consider real beautification schemes in the locale away from the Olympic park, not those which just impress visitors and displace or upset locals
• Provide community centres or supporting infrastructure close to new developments
• Downplay the distinctions between different tenants of new developments if the housing is to be ‘mixed tenancy’
• Keep the community informed of possible moving or housing options
• Measure indicators such as numbers of socially registered landlords and rent increases
CHAPTER 7: LOCAL INCLUSION: LOCALS AND THE OLYMPICS

In this section we address the experiences of people living in the area around Olympic sites and in Olympic host cities during the Games. Although we have had a focus on local experience so far, here we look at social inclusion. We consider how locals perceive the Games and Games related organisation, and what kind of factors influence their awareness and feelings towards the Games. Then we also consider the experience of locals during two events that have great potential to be particularly inclusive: the Paralympics and the Cultural Olympiad.

7.1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- Local perceptions of the Games and its organizers are worked out long term
- Ideas about the Olympics easily change or can be mixed – negative feelings pre Games may change to positive feelings post Games
- Locals tend to assess the Olympics in terms of personal cost and benefit, asking whether the Games were worth it
- Younger people cope better with the inconveniences and are more inspired by the Games than older people
- Locals may suspect that local elites and organisations do not have their interests at heart and are quite capable of seeing through bid rhetoric
- Locals will be more inconvenienced by the Games than any other group and possibly suffer in terms of impoverishment
- Locals in the vicinity of the Olympic villages have been harassed, victimised and displaced
- The Paralympics and Olympics do raise interest in models of inclusion but there have been no real structural advances in the everyday living conditions of marginalised or vulnerable groups
- Crime rates and security are impacted by the Games: as security attention is mobilised toward event areas, it is lost from others
A crucial aspect of wellbeing is ‘inclusion’, encouraging the participation of ‘hard to reach’ groups in the economic, political and social structure of local and national life. It is important to consider the possibility that some members of the diverse East London population may perceive themselves to be outside ‘mainstream’ culture. East Londoners have high levels of multiple deprivation, which suggests that they have shared feelings of exclusion or may experience barriers to participation in the social and institutional local fabric.

Particular groups may be targeted as ‘hard to reach’ with varied success; young men, women, children, ethnic minorities, the elderly and the disabled. Low income groups are also at particular risk in the area of wellbeing, as having a low income in general lessens ability to protect against negative life events. Moreover, being unemployed may have knock-on effects such as poor self-esteem and lack of purpose in life. However, this too is culturally defined. The residents in the vicinity of the Olympic Park (particularly women), have high numbers of residents with low economic activity, and there is little research to suggest why. Family and traditional arrangements based on cultural practices could be involved here. Yet, women and their low participation rates have been an area of some concern more widely in cultural and social life in the UK.

There are two groups who may find these risks worsened: the disabled and the elderly. Females and the young are often targeted in policy provision for wellbeing, whereas the elderly have been neglected (Allen 2008). This will be a policy issue, because although an increasingly ageing population also have disability and mobility and serious health issues. The elderly and the disabled also tend to suffer from wealth inequality. Although serious mental illnesses have not usually been included as part of wellbeing, this is a key issue with the elderly. In general depression is a serious problem (Allen 2008:13-17). Loneliness, isolation, low level mental health problems, even suicide, are realistic outcomes (Allen 2008:20).

7. 2 Winners and losers?
It is unfortunate but generally agreed that each host city has its winners and losers. Middle classes, political elites and tourists may gain from infrastructural reforms, economic investment and social activities and interest in the city as a result of the Games. By comparison, the city’s poor tend to suffer and sometimes become poorer as a result of the Olympics (Preuss 2004:23; Short 2004:107).

As with people who have disabilities or mental health problems, some will suffer more than others from any possible negative outcomes – the poorest, the most elderly, minority ethnic groups, those in worst physical health, and those without an active social or community life (2008:21).

Yet there is knowledge of these problems. Ownership and inclusion are therefore important subjects. The way to analyse inclusion is to look at how those groups are included within official Olympic rhetoric, how they participate in the Olympics and how the act of hosting the Olympics affects the host community. The sustainable development aims of the Olympics should and are expected to extend to people’s lifestyles and social inclusion. The goals of the Olympics are inclusive and participatory. Although they are hard to qualify, in some cases the Olympic Games may act as a catalyst to promote social changes and policy development beyond the norm (Black & Bezanon 2004:1245), its values of humanism elevating the ideals of policymakers. Small social changes have also been noted in perceptions of various minority groups, such as disabled people (Hargreaves 2005, Preuss 2004:22).
However, during the Olympics, a converse tendency to appropriate diversity for cultural promotion or to ‘look good’ has equally been noted. There are also allegations that ethnic minorities have been ‘cynically targeted’ in previous Olympics, for example, Sydney, to seem multicultural (Lenskyj 2002:78). Surprisingly for local authorities, who often assume that their communities are tired of being consulted because of low response rates, local people tend to think that their experiences and wishes are being ignored (Bernstock 2008; Cashman 2006:239; Darcy 2003:750).

7.3 Opportunities to participate?

In general, the evidence is that local people are motivated to take up opportunities offered at the time of the Olympics, or presented on behalf of the Olympics to them. Kornblatt argues that the “increased civic pride and health – are potentially large (impacts), and may apply right across the UK” (2006:1). These may be more cultural than economic. Sports governing bodies are very concerned that locals attend the event to give them a festival atmosphere and heavily rely on them to do so (Preuss 2008:396). The active and positive participation of locals is thought to showcase city life and give the Games a community spirit that is entirely ‘grassroots’ and cannot be generated otherwise (Preuss 2008:399). We have already seen that well-attended festival and cultural events elicit positive outcomes for any host city based on the perceptions of ‘outsiders’ such as the IOC, governments and perhaps most importantly, the media. The same can be said for local people. However, with relation to the Olympics, there are some outcomes that may be expected.

In previous host cities there has actually been a lot of goodwill towards the Olympics, despite various issues connected to inconvenience, pollution, noise and traffic/ congestion. People bear quite positive attitudes towards the Olympics as an event and remember it fondly, even if they display apathy or are ‘sick of it’. Most ‘grumbling about inconvenience’ happens before, not after the Games.

Research suggests that locals perceive the Olympics differently to non-locals and visitors and may assess the Games on a personal cost-balance approach, which is hard to predict (Cashman 2006:241). However, they are unlikely to have knowledge of the ‘full picture’, lacking an overview or knowledge of sometimes secretive planning processes or lack of time to investigate (Preuss & Solberg 2006:401).

People living in proximity to the Olympics will inevitably be inconvenienced by several factors relating to their hosting. Social impact studies of the Sydney Olympics found that the closer the Games got, the more inconvenience suffered and irritation of the local community with the Games grew (Waitt 2003:200). This suggests that locals may as a result hold a negative image of the Olympics and any organisations associated with it, including local authorities:

- construction of facilities
- traffic and transport timetabling changes/ heavy usage/ congestion
- noise/ environmental pollution
- level of scrutiny by media
- culture shock to outsiders and untraditional cultures
The following chart sets out some outcomes – both positive and negative – that might be expected amongst the host population, with particular attention to psychological and social outcomes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Impact</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social/ Cultural</td>
<td>Increase in permanent level of local interest and participation in types of activity associated with event</td>
<td>Commercialization of activities which may be of a personal or private nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strengthening of regional values and traditions</td>
<td>Modification of nature of event or activity to accommodate tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Potential increase in crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Changes in community structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Social dislocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological</td>
<td>Increased local pride and community spirit</td>
<td>Tendency towards defensive attitudes concerning host region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased awareness of non-local perceptions</td>
<td>Culture shock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Festival atmosphere during event</td>
<td>Misunderstandings leading to varying degrees of host/visitor hostility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>Increased awareness of the region as a travel/tourism destination</td>
<td>Acquisition of poor reputation as a result of inadequate facilities, crime, improper practices or inflated prices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased knowledge concerning the potential for investment and commercial activity in the region</td>
<td>Negative reactions from existing local enterprises due to possibility of new competition for local manpower and government assistance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Preuss & Solberg 2006:398)

However, research also suggests that some of the community are more likely than others to take a ‘socially altruistic’ approach, coping with the changes positively believing that they are in the interests of the greater good. A social impacts study carried out in Sydney showed that:

- Those more likely to accept any inconveniences with equanimity included: younger people, families and ethnic minorities who took up and enjoyed the sense of inclusion and community spirit the Games offered (Waitt 2003).

And in the period immediately before the Games (despite the irritation mentioned above) gathering euphoria and community goodwill has been noted: this was certainly the case in Sydney (Waitt 2003:195/204). This is often referred to as ‘civic boosterism’, and can be propelled forward by parties, local cultural events and activities laid on to include locals as a compliment to the event.
Overall, although there might be problems in the lead up to the Games, it appears that local perceptions of the Games (at least after the event) have been largely positive. It has even been suggested that the Games can generate ‘psychological income’, a feeling of wellbeing (Preuss 2006:392; Kornblatt 2006). This was certainly the case in Athens, where a nail-biting finish of the Olympic venues and a successful delivery of the Olympics boosted self-esteem amongst Greeks, long used to international perceptions of themselves as disorganized, a smoggy third world backwater (Payne 2006:269-271; Tzanelli 2004:436).

7. 3. 2 Sydney: Case study
A longitudinal study of Australian wellbeing (the ‘Australian Unity Index’), makes measurements on levels which include awareness of terrorism, volunteering, relationships, community as well as employment, housing and so on. In the years since its inception in 2001, it has found that levels of wellbeing in Australia are good in general, with high satisfaction levels and a deep belief in progress and betterment. This relates to the ‘gold standard’ of satisfaction those in western countries are supposed to achieve.

The Unity Index’s quarterly measurements show changes in wellbeing are influenced by events such as terrorism attacks, crime rates or credit crunches. However, these events may have unexpected impacts: in 2004/5 the Tsunami in SE Asia actually resulted in increased wellbeing levels rising. People combined efforts to raise money and to volunteer to help: carrying out one’s moral duty by volunteering scores high on wellbeing factors. Moreover, wellbeing in Australia reached an all-time high during the Sydney 2000 Olympic Games (Index 13:11). This seems to provide evidence for the notion that the Olympic Games provide a civic boost to morale and unity, a ‘feel good effect’ (Craik 2001:93).

Change is also possible: local perceptions of the Olympics can become more positive during and after the event. For example, Salt Lake City (2002) was tarnished by bidding and corruption scandals in the lead up to the Games yet with a last minute shift in philosophical direction towards the promotion of humanistic ideals and the Olympic brand rather than the city image, local opinion also underwent a sea change. After the games, over 60% of the locals felt the Games had been a success, and local groups used to negative publicity such as the Mormon Church felt that their reputation had improved dramatically (Payne 2006:187). In terms of enjoyment, those organizing the Games and local activities should recognise that hosting the Olympics is both a moving target and an evolving agenda that will take years to assess.

7. 4 Value for money?
For locals the most likely negative perception of the Games appears to be financing and budget. For locals, worries about ‘taxpayer’s money’ and ‘social injustice’ are usually strongest concerns (Preuss 2008:401). This relates to an unofficial or local ‘cost-balance approach’, as people ask whether the Games will be worth the expense and what they might have gained from the result. If people are particularly trampled on in the organisation of the Games, or if the local sponsorship is too heavy without perceived benefits, then any outcomes might be perceived as particularly unfair and unjust.

For example, although the Commonwealth Games held in Manchester in 2002 are thought to have had very positive legacy effects in terms of employment and regeneration, those in their immediate vicinity “protested that they were ‘paying the price’ when grassroots facilities and services faced
closure” (Giddens 2006:927-8). Locals had mixed opinions: realising that they would probably not be able to move into the new houses provided by the regeneration scheme, but approving more generally of the attention this formerly forgotten area received (Giddens 2006:931).

The social impacts study in Sydney and the opinions of locals in Manchester indicate that if people are to cope positively with the change in socially altruistic ways, they have to feel that the Games will help them in some ways – whether or not this is purely out of enjoyment or with deeper material benefits, such as a new job.

This suggests that proximity to an event, and policy relating to local inclusion will inevitably influence opinions. These reactions can go to extremes. Although Atlanta’s organizers wanted to showcase a friendly, progressive city, they were so anxious not to show the world their poor downtrodden inner city neighbourhoods that they succeeded in harassing and alienating people living in those neighbourhoods (mostly African–Americans living below the poverty line). For those people there was considerable ill will borne towards Olympics organizers and racial tensions rose in those neighbourhoods as a result (Maloney 2004:239-240). However, for those in the wider metropolitan area of Atlanta, the Olympics were perceived entirely differently, as a great success (Andranovich et al 2001b:141).

And, while the Olympics is seen as the great humanist festival, the experience of opposed locals shows that questioning it results in the generation of public values that are far from universalist inclusive ideals. While the sporting element of the Games are the perfect simulacrum of (white frontier) Australian identity for some (Farrell 1999:66) opposition or protest from local residents was silenced as ‘un-Australian’ (Waitt 1999; 2003b:392/ Toohey 2003:72), suggesting that this is partly an explanation for the positive responses of ethnic minorities in Sydney about the Games. Equally in Barcelona, the ‘cult of Catalonia’ (Olympic successes) became politically incorrect to question and the impact on the local community was de-emphasised (Coaffee 2008:143).

7. 5 Local culture, local people, local inclusion

BACKSTORY Dynamics of inclusion and exclusion, and the way in which people gain access to resources and are conversely denied access to them, is an area of intense historical and sociological debate. The growth of social inequality in ‘developed’ countries has been well-noted, as has the attendant impact on the health of their populations (Navarro 2004:1). One of the problems is where to locate the causes of social inequality: with income or skills? Individually based or with the community and levels of participation, or with political representation? And, how can it be reversed?

While people in marginal groups have not been a notable subject of Olympics – related research, the displacement of the African American community in Atlanta and more generally that of low income working class communities in Olympic host cities, tells us that there is much to guard against in terms of displacement and the building of further pressure in terms of costs and congestion. Throughout this report we have had a focus on local people. In what follows we explore two very different but related activities and analyse them for their potential for inclusion and social change, the cultural Olympiad and the Paralympics. Both have been marginal to the hosting of the Olympic Games. The Cultural Olympiad has been neglected in favour of sporting activities, and the Paralympics has struggled for official recognition from the IOC.
However, the experiences of disabled people have been covered, albeit sparingly, in research connected to the Olympics through the Paralympics. The experience of the disabled, who may suffer multiply, is a key area which more patently highlights the issue of realistic inclusion and the facilitation of participation for all groups.

7.6 Case Study: Disabled people and the Olympics: the Paralympics?

In recent years organizing committees have sought to use the Olympic Games and the Paralympics as a forum to encourage the integration of disabled people within society. This is positive, as disabled people suffer economic activity and mobility problems; discrimination against their disabilities; stigma and social isolation; misunderstandings of and a medicalization of their conditions (Hargreaves 2002:178). Controversy surrounding definitions of disability mean that claims to be disabled come under some scrutiny in general. For example, the historical disqualifications of intellectually disabled people as ‘not disabled enough’, or a media focus on the assistive technology aiding disabled people in mobility which represents them as ‘cyborgs’ (Darcy 2003:748). Taken with controversy over disability definition, this suggests that they are not quite human and do not achieve on their own but with ‘help’ which implies a ‘cheat culture’. This fascination is patently absurd when we consider that all humans use assistive technology: from the trainers athletes wear to the spectacles or contact lenses that many do.

As a result of the Paralympics as an event and parallel awareness campaigns, the Paralympics’ organizing body has done much to draw attention to the inclusion of socially marginalized people in general. The positive images of successful Paralympics athletes are empowering and draw widespread attention. Indeed, the Paralympics may have an ability to reach people precisely because it is not the Olympics. Those who may avoid the Olympics on grounds such as costs, corporate branding, crowds and elitism may choose instead to attend and support the Paralympics for anti-corporate reasons, community spirit, its lower costs and overall, to promote inclusivity and ‘cheer people on’. Most noticeably since the triumphs of Sydney, the Paralympics has attracted tens of thousands of spectators. Sydney’s Paralympics attracted the largest viewing figures ABC had ever had. Signs from recent Paralympics suggest that empathy and shared feelings of ‘humanity’ are a realistic outcome during the Games (Landry 1995:124). This is a real opportunity to raise awareness of inclusion within the community.

Evidence from Sydney is that as a result of initiatives to raise awareness, such as a programme in schools and television adverts, disabled people in the general community reported that approaches towards them by schoolchildren improved, and that to a lesser extent became less patronising amongst the general population. This has been noted of volunteers at other Olympics too (Roper 1990). Volunteers were also trained in ‘disability awareness’, a transferable skill.

Although the modern Paralympics has moved towards a social model of ‘disability’, that accepts disabled people for who they are (Hargreaves 2002:174), the continued dissemination of ‘mixed messages’ is a concern. During the Sydney Paralympics there was little consultation of the disabled community; instead they were informed of events. Several lawsuits were launched against SOCOG, the Sydney organizing committee, for discriminating against disabled people on issues such as not allowing disabled people to volunteer and lack of access. As a result amongst the general disabled community there was cynicism about the uses of the ‘disabled message’ by SOCOG in general. There
is a valuable lesson here, that ‘informing’ or ‘publicising’ people is not the same as ‘including’ people.

Further, while Paralympics discourse promotes the shared ‘humanity’ and increased awareness of disability during Paralympics events, it promotes a particular and some argue, discriminatory concept of disabled people, which is based in an ‘ableist’, patronising and non-ableist vision of disability. This is partly because of the spectacular triumphs of elite disabled athletes who are portrayed in the media as ‘overcoming anything’. This viewpoint diminishes the consummate professionalism of disabled athletes as compared to able-bodied athletes (Hargreaves 2002:202). It has also been argued that these phenomenal successes give an unrealistic impression to the able-bodied population about disabled people, of an ‘I can do anything if I put my mind to it!’ motivation, which is not the lived experience of a disabled person trying to participate fully in the community, nor references the many barriers to participation a disabled person faces (Darcy 2003:747-8).

Although the Paralympics could not be said to be a social watershed, in Sydney disabled people reported that they did spur positive change in perceptions of disabled people and policy intervention. However, most importantly, there was no real structural or socio-economic change in the day-to-day lived experience of being a disabled person: “For many people with disabilities in NSW the Games has had no material impact on their lives, they live in a continued state of unmet needs and will continue to do so long after the Games are just a memory” (Darcy 2003:752). Participation in the community, whether in the economic market or wider social bases, did not increase.

The lack of real structural adjustment in the experience of disabled people at the Sydney Olympics is echoed across the board in other Olympics host cities. The experience of people with disability emphasises the multiple factors of the different contexts and challenges that able bodied people will also face in gaining access to job markets, education and skills and improved health and lifestyle.

7.7 Case Study: Cultural Olympiads

Throughout this report we have considered the theme of inclusion, ownership and representation. Here these themes continue by taking a look at past Cultural Olympiads as a potential source of enjoyment for locals and visitors, relatively unexploited by past host cities. Cultural Olympiads are arts and cultural festivals run in tandem with the Olympic Games and Paralympics. They were initiated to reflect ‘true Olympism’, to dignify the Games and to reinforce the Olympic spirit (Gold & Revill 2008:59). Each organizing committee has a responsibility to organize them, and they are required to: “Promote harmonious relations, mutual understanding and friendship among the participants and others attending the Olympic Games” (IOC 1995:30).

Cultural Olympiads are not always deployed to represent their host communities – they often fulfil the opportunity for ‘history, party and show’ that the Olympics as event suggest. They are intimately and purposefully linked with ‘modern patriotism’ and usually combine local interests with the Games’ wider cultural requirements, acting as ‘tourist brochures’ (Gold & Revill 2008:60). Mostly, host cities have taken the opportunity to ‘showcase’ the locale, as such they have emphasised aspects of what might be called the ‘city brand’ (Hinch & Higham 2003:193). However, the Cultural Olympiads have all suffered from a lack of funding (Gold & Revill 2008:75).
Since Barcelona 1992, they have been held in the four year period before the Games (Miles 2003:8); however, they have usually been subordinate to the physical or sporting aspect of the Games (Veale & Toohey 2007:70). In general, the “ideal of uniting sport and art has not been achieved” (Gold & Revill 2008:81). A study of the last few Cultural Olympiads reveals that the Games are not adequately showcased as a cultural event, and there is little mention of the Olympics in the festival (Moragas 2004:233). This is an oversight, as it is also recognised that there is a strong demand for cultural events during the Games and media will seek out cultural events run during the Olympics to give insight into the host city and to alleviate Games-related boredom (Moragas 2004:233).

One criticism of the Cultural Olympiads that has held true over the years is that while they are a real opportunity to showcase local culture, they fail to appreciate local cultural diversity. This is not surprising as organizing committees are usually drawn from the establishment and have a particular view of the locale and the nation to promote (Gold & Gold 2008:7). Controversies over the Cultural Olympiad show that local communities will have views about what should be promoted and how to adequately incorporate their views. This may particularly be the case with people who feel themselves to be marginalised by the mainstream or nation state, or to have suffered racism and discrimination. The Olympics are often accused of giving out a rather jingoistic message, which repels or is disinteresting to some (McDaniel & Chalip 2002:5). They are certainly most concerned with national identity (Short 2004:108).

Barcelona was the first city to incorporate the Cultural Olympiad into part of a cultural policy programme, and cities after it followed suit, with varied success. Here we examine the approaches of Barcelona 1992 and Sydney 2000. Both Olympiads, with different approaches to local people, perhaps exemplify the possible outcomes.

7.7.2 Case Study: Barcelona 1992

Barcelona was the first city to run a four year Olympiad, with a different theme for each year:
- 1988 Gate of the Olympiad; 1989 The Year of Culture and Sports; 1990 Year of the Arts; 1991 Year of the Future; 1992 Year of the Games
- Exhibitions, festivals, performing arts, folklore events, debates, heritage

Barcelona planned to host a four year Olympiad to “develop its cultural infrastructure, demonstrate the richness of its cultural heritage, and make the city more attractive for visitors” (Gold & Revill 2008:75). In this it followed truly regenerative themes. Rather than incorporate new content, the city took the opportunity to showcase local cultural and art forms in Barcelona, and to use the money to support pre-existing arts and cultural organisations and exhibits (Moragas 2004:233).

Barcelona is in Catalonia, a region of Spain with a history of separatist politics and cultural insularity. There was little cultural diversity within the city, but a shared sense of exclusion and distinct from the Spanish mainstream (see backstory). Catalonia was and remains a region with a significant political separatist movement campaigning for independence from Spain. Moreover, Barcelona’s organizers had to manage competing local discourses about nationalism and localism. During the hosting of the Games, efforts were made to assert a sense of local ‘Catalan’ identity (Mar-Molinero 2000:40; Llobera 2004:4).
Key local political issues were:

- Campaigns against the mass or packaged tourism in the area introduced under Franco (Miles & Borden 2003:8).
- Debates over which images should be represented: Barcelonan, Catalanian, or Spanish? (Pi Sunyer 1995:36)

In the end those who promoted the Cultural Olympiad presented it as a revitalisation of Catalan culture tied in with the city’s regeneration, but did not make any connection with ‘history’, ‘politics’, or the popular Olympics, thus avoiding possible controversy.

The festival’s organizers were also careful not to promote it as a tourist activity even in light of aims to increase tourism. Instead it was presented to Catalanians as a domestic rebirth. Catalan was included as an official language of the Games and the Catalan flag, ‘the senyera’ (previously outlawed under Franco), was sponsored and made widely available, outnumbering Spanish flags (Pi Sunyer 1995). Reportedly, locals felt strongly involved and that they had represented a hitherto neglected Catalan identity to the world.

However, there were still local appropriations, protests and resentment by other Spaniards of the festival’s overwhelmingly ‘Catalonian’ message - 40% of the Spanish population outside Catalonia resented the Catalanian presence being quite so strong, perhaps because of separatist politics (Hargreaves 2000:8). Other outsiders enjoyed the specifically ‘local culture’ and the flags flying everywhere, without much idea of the history of the area and the significance of the flags to locals.

**BACKSTORY** Barcelona’s local context and history suggests that memory, nationalism and local culture are inherent to the success of the Olympics for locals. Barcelona’s organizers went against the requests of the IOC in offering the Olympics to locals in homage to Catalonia. But in an era of democratisation, promoting openness and remembering local culture would prove to be extremely important to local people.

Like London, Barcelona already had a connection with the Olympics, but in this case it was less joyous than problematic. In 1936 the city was to host the ‘Popular Olympics’, an anti-fascist Olympics to compete with Hitler’s Games in Berlin 1936 (Murray 1992:29. The Popular Olympics had mass popular support with 60,000 participants and were heavily connected to arts and culture, with a festival element. Yet on the day before them the Spanish Civil War broke out and they did not take place (Veal & Toohey 2007:224). The Civil War was led by Franco who was successful and became a fascist dictator who led Spain until his death in 1975. During this time hundreds of thousands of people ‘disappeared’, especially if they were opponents of the regime.

During Franco’s dictatorship the city was a communist bastion and offered his regime its most consistent opposition. As a result, Barcelona’s locals had a long memory of fascism and repression of local culture under Franco and opposition to the Spanish government (Veale & Toohey 2007:224).

There were added potential controversies. Jose Samaranch, the President of the IOC at the time of the Games, was from Barcelona. However, rather than being a local hero, he had held high level jobs in Franco’s dictatorship (Pi Sunyer 1995:44, Veale and Toohey 2007:224; Shaw 2008:65).
7.7.3 Case Study: Sydney 2000
Sydney continued the idea of having a different theme for each year preceding the Olympics:

- 1997 - ‘The dreaming’, designed to showcase aboriginal art and culture
- 1998 - ‘A Sea Change’ – emphasising the eras of migration to Australia
- 1999 - ‘Reaching the World’ – performance tours by Australian artists
- 2000 - ‘Harbour of Life’ – on site Sydney exhibition of Australian and international artists

The Olympiad had a budget of $21.5 m, but ran into funding problems after the first year and had its budget cut, meaning that the festival dwindled towards the actual Games (Garcia 2007:244). The first year, ‘the Dreaming’, was the first major celebration of aboriginal culture to take place in Australia. This festival was called a ‘cathedral of high art’, because it only included established and celebrated aboriginal artists (Gold & Revill 2008:77). Moreover, it included a boomerang as the central symbol of the Games, with little inclusion of aboriginal people (Eichberg 2004:65; Hall 2005:131).

Over the four years the Cultural Olympiad’s themes continued to celebrate ‘high culture’ with small additions of exotic ‘multiculturalism’ (Garcia 2007:237). It was “principally concerned with constructing and promoting images and representations of Australianness that will assist the symbolic and material sale of the Games” (Hinch & Higham 2003:104). Seen as an opportunity to change people’s perceptions of Australia, the festival worked in tandem with tourism promotion of ‘Brand Australia’, re-launching Australia’s image as a modern, business oriented and cosmopolitan country, rather than a backward place full of Crocodile Dundees (Brown et al 2002:177). In order for it to promote Sydney to a global audience, it styled ‘multiculturalism’ as ‘cosmopolitanism’, which reflected the hope of the bid team that Sydney would become a financial centre and global capital.

This engendered selectively presented aspects and images of Sydney, termed as ‘high culture’ rather than celebrating all aspects of local culture. As a result there were clashes between the interests of official Olympics sponsors and actual and potential sponsors of local arts organisations (Veal & Toohey 2007:70).

The end appraisal was that Sydney’s Cultural Olympiad was successful in attracting international attention, but in attracting local attention, encouraging participation and supporting inclusion it failed: “In terms of long-term community and cultural development there was little opportunity either to share the spirit for citizens of the cultural Olympiad or to define the cultural and artistic content” (Jarvie 2006:69).

**BACKSTORY** The plight of Australia’s aborigines is now increasingly well known. Historically subjected to harassment and abuses by the government and mainstream, with very low standards of living and high health inequality, key political issues at the time of the Games were the Australian government’s refusal to apologise for its past treatment of aboriginal people, and widespread stigma and racial discrimination. In the realm of arts and cultural performance aboriginal critics argued that they had been stereotyped and marginalised in mainstream festivals and representations (Gold & Gold 2008:7). As a result, for the Cultural Olympiad to celebrate only the ‘rewarding’ aspects of aboriginal culture seemed not an inclusion but instead an appropriation of this marginalised culture (Miller et al 1999; Garcia 2007:241). It followed a well-recognised global trend which only celebrates ‘exceptional’ people or cultural products from marginalised communities as talents.
There were no real life changes for aboriginal people. Cashman argued that “Although the Games may have promoted a greater awareness of Aboriginal culture there was... no increased engagement with aboriginal life by the non-indigenous majority” (2006:223) However, he also states that “it is naïve to expect that the cultural presentation ... could convey social and political messages which changed the way that people think” (2006:224). We suggest this outcome was a result of the celebration of ‘high art’ rather than everyday culture.

7.8 CONCLUSIONS
The Cultural Olympiad has had successes but been neglected in favour of sporting activities, despite the fact it is an IOC requirement. The likelihood is that the 2012 Games will be equally mixed and recent comments by critics have been that the 2012 Cultural Olympiad is disorganized. However, there is a great opportunity here. Cultural Olympiads and related festivals are firstly the optimum opportunity to showcase local culture to others. Secondly, and perhaps most importantly, an opportunity to promote inclusion of all local groups, and to involve them in the Olympics, given that many of them may not be able to afford tickets to the Games, nor are certain of being employed by them, but have to bear the inconveniences of hosting them. There are two key issues here that could be resolved: volunteering and community representation – Cultural Olympiads can actually facilitate both of these acts.

While Cultural Olympiads and festivals may not ‘change the way people think’ and result in little life changes for the local population, they could be far more attuned to the issue of incorporating local ideas, rather than merely appropriating the cultures of previously discriminated against groups, such as in Sydney. Barcelona offers an example of how to do so.

Studies show that local people benefit from festivals and the celebratory aspect of the Games; so here local authorities can fill the gap in official Olympics organisation by promoting and holding their own cultural events which celebrate local diversity and the participation of local artists, musicians and cultural forms. Official rhetoric will take a certain view of London and the UK that may contradict or sit uncomfortably with people’s views about their locale. The question is how can organizing groups support and champion the diverse population of East London so that they have a positive view of the Games and want to participate, so reaping the rewards of doing so?

Allowing people to celebrate but also be discriminating about their experiences is also crucial. Providing a forum to let locals have a voice, no matter how negative it may appear, will help them come to terms with what the Olympics represents and means to them. It cannot hold true that the Olympics will be a wholly positive experience for everyone: there are too many clashing interests in such a diverse city and locale. But encouraging and enabling a democratic community dialogue and engagement will help facilitate the idea (and hopefully the reality) that the Games, hosted and partly paid for by London, truly do belong to Londoners.
7.9 Suggestions: Local people and the Games

There are some key areas of inclusion that could be met to facilitate participation and local ownership:

- Provide a forum for protest, don’t marginalise it. Allowing a critical voice makes time for reflection before the Games begin
- Listen to the local community: are their local facilities, markets and meeting places suffering because of the Olympics? Are they being shutdown pre or during the event?
- Those who live in the city have to undergo discomfort of changes, it is they who need to be persuaded that there were subsequent benefits
- Local ownership and representation is very important to local people. It will help them enjoy the event, rather than viewing it as an ‘elite’ activity that doesn’t belong to them and is not being hosted for them
- What would local residents like to see showcased as part of the Olympiad?
- Include and listen to locals about their cultural festivals and values
- Promoting needs of tourists may not sit well with local residents
- Support local markets, community organisations and entrepreneurs
- Emphasise the enduring qualities of the change in locale (park, environmental features)
- Alternative activities during the Olympics season put on by local authorities will not only promote the locale but increase local enjoyment of the event:
  - arts, music and cultural performances by local groups in places away from the Olympic grounds will be popular and help to enhance the ‘festival’ atmosphere
  - Put on cultural events, alternative parties and focus points to promote community cohesion and to boost civic enjoyment of the event outside its walls
- ‘Sharing the spirit’ and ‘feeling valued’ are sometimes difficult emotions or feelings for hard to reach or marginalized groups to experience, but they can be enhanced by events and fully participatory structures, such as job or employment brokerage, skills support and learning experiences tied into the Olympics
- Consult the disabled community on how to represent and approach disability to avoid alienation
- Broker opportunities not just for the youth but for the elderly and disabled
- Ensure that supporting volunteer services are not depleted as attention is refocused towards the Olympic Games in general and incentivise all volunteer areas through Olympic association
- Lead ‘disability awareness training’ for volunteers and outreach and education in schools
8. APPENDIX Olympic acronyms and organisations

5 Boroughs
An umbrella organisation of the five ‘Olympic boroughs’, charged with brokering opportunities for the local authorities (Newham, Tower Hamlets, Hackney, Waltham Forest, Greenwich)
http://www.fiveboroughsvision.co.uk/

British Olympic Association (BOA)
The BOA provides the pivot around which Team GB revolves prior to, and during the Olympic Games. Selects the team and is independent from and not funded directly by British government.
www.olympics.org.uk

Centre d’Estudis Olímpics Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona CEO-UAB
An Olympics research centre, with a library and research; concentration on Barcelona Olympics
http://olympicstudies.uab.es/eng/

Department of Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS)
The lead Government department charged with delivering the Games, in particular the legacy plans. Its stakeholders are LOCOG, ODA, Mayor of London and BOA

Games Monitor
An anti-Olympic organisation in London 2012 with interest in other Olympics; carries out a mediacwatch and local observation
http://www.gamesmonitor.org.uk/

Government Office for London (GOL)
The Government Office for London represents central government across the capital, delivering policies and programmes in the London region on behalf of eleven central government departments, and represents London’s views to Whitehall. Primarily negotiate Local Area Agreements
www.gos.gov.uk/gol/

Greater London Authority (GLA), Mayor of London, London Assembly
Created by the Greater London Authority Act 1999, the Mayor and the London Assembly constitute a unique form of strategic citywide government for London. The Mayor has responsibility for delivery against programme objectives relating to the wider legacy of the Games in London and for ensuring that appropriate regional policies are delivered through the Olympic programme
http://www.london.gov.uk/mayor/olympics/

Greenwich Local Authority
http://www.greenwich.gov.uk/Greenwich/2012Games/

Hackney Local Authority
http://www.hackney.gov.uk/x-olympics.htm

International Olympic Committee (IOC)
A committee with an international membership which administers the Games
LA84 Foundation
Offers a digitised and free of access source of research and information on the Olympic Games.
Concentration on sporting events
http://www.la84foundation.org/

London Development Agency (LDA)
The London Development Agency (LDA), London’s agency for enhancing economic sustainability, employment and infrastructure. Land holder for 2012 Games and responsible for post-Games use and legacy, social/ economic regeneration and maximising the Games’ economic benefits.

Newham Local Authority
http://2012games.newham.gov.uk/2012Games/

Organizing Committee of the Olympic Games
Each country must have an organizing committee. The London Organizing Committee of the Olympic and Paralympic Games (LOCOG) is responsible for preparing and staging the 2012 Games. They are responsible for fundraising for the Games and will let most of the contracts for services to deliver and run the Games

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COOB</th>
<th>Barcelona</th>
<th>1992</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACOG</td>
<td>Atlanta</td>
<td>1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCOG</td>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHOC</td>
<td>Athens</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOCOG</td>
<td>Beijing</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCOG</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Olympic Delivery Authority (ODA)
The public body responsible for developing and building the new venues and infrastructure for the Games and their use post 2012 The Olympic Delivery Authority (ODA) is the public body responsible developing and building the new venues and infrastructure for the Games and their use post 2012 and delivering transport infrastructure and services to support the games.
Together LOCOG and ODA are London 2012.
www.london-2012.co.uk/loco/ oda

Sport England
Sport England is the government agency responsible for developing community sports
http://www.sportengland.org/index/about_sport_england/about_who.htm

Tower Hamlets Local Authority
http://www.towerhamlets.gov.uk/data/discover/data/olympics/index.cfm

Waltham Forest Local Authority
http://www.walthamforest.gov.uk/index/2012games.htm
9. BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alexandridis, T 2007 ‘The Housing Impact of the 2004 Games in Athens: Background Paper’ COHRE Mega-Events, Olympic Games and Housing Rights Project. RUIG-GIAN.

Allen, J 2008 ‘Older People and Wellbeing’ UK: IPPR.


Bennett, J & Morris, J 2006 ‘Gateway People: The Aspirations and Attitudes of Prospective and Existing Residents of the Thames Gateway’ UK: IPPR.


Bohnstedt K & Muller N 2005 ‘The Implementation of Ethical and Social Standards in Youth High-Performance Sport on the Basis of Olympic Ideals’ The Sports Journal 8: 1:


COHRE 2007 ‘The Housing Impact of the 2004 Olympic Games in Athens: Background Paper’ Centre on Housing Rights and Evictions, RUIGGIAN.


Darnton, A 2004 The Impact of Sustainable Development on Public Behaviour, Report 1. DEFRA.


DCMS 2007 Our Promise 2012 London: DCMS


Gulden, A 2005 Housing Impacts and the Olympic Games: A Comparison of Atlanta 1996 and Salt Lake City University of Wisconsin: Madison


Miller, T, Lawrence, G, McKay, J & Rowe, D 1999 ‘Modifying the Sign: Sport and Globalization’ Social Text (Globalization?) 60 (Autumn). Pp: 15-33


Parkin, J and Sharma, D 1999 Infrastructure Planning. UK: Thomas Telford Press

Peck, S ‘2012 Games could see skateboarding debut’ The Telegraph 09/06/2007


Preuss, H & Solberg, H 2006 ‘Attracting Major Sporting Events: The Role of Local Residents’ European Sport Management Quarterly 6 (4): 391-411


PwC 2005 Olympic Games Final Impact Study. UK: Price Waterhouse Cooper & DCMS.

Quesenberry, P 1996 ‘The Disposable Olympics Meets the City of Hype’ Southern Changes 18: 3-14.


Shaw, C 2008 Five Ring Circus: Myths and Realities of the Olympic Games. Canada: New Society Publishers


Syed, M ‘Skateboarding Ramps up its bid to be an Olympic Sport’ The Times 09/06/2007


Von Hoffman, A 2004 House by House, Block by Block: The Rebirth of America’s Urban Neighbourhoods US: Oxford University Press


10. ENDNOTES

i Roche 2000:1

ii Girginov and Parry 2005:160-162

iii Kidd 1992 cited in Horne & Manzenreiter 2006:15

iv Swart & Bob 2004

v McDaniel & Chalip 2002:5; Hall 2006:63

vi Andranovich et al 2001:33; Cashman 2006:217

vii Faulkner 2003:139

viii Farrell 1999

ix Houghton 2005

x Brownell 2004:58

xi Payne 2006; Lee 2006

xii Short 2004:108

xiii Poynter 2008:56


xv Cashman 2006

xvi Andranovich et al 2001:1

xvii LERI 2007:18

xviii LERI 2007

xix Hiller 2006:324


xxi Evans 2008:318

xxii LERI 2007:8

xxiii Weinhold 2008:192