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Abstract

This thesis evaluates the legacy/impact of the London 2012 Games for a non-hosting sub-region – Leicestershire, principally through evaluations of four legacy-programmes (i.e. the Workplace Challenge, Get Set, Sport Makers, and Games Makers programmes), drawing conclusions about lessons learned from the Leicestershire 2012 legacy experience.

The selection of Leicestershire as a non-hosting sub-region reflects the fact that little is known about the legacy/impact of the Games in such contexts. The nature of Olympic legacy evaluation is considered as a complex, wide-ranging, and multi-staged process. This thesis thus focuses on two main areas: i) conducting a systematic review of the literature (covering the period 1996-2011) to explore and establish an understanding of the concepts of ‘Olympic legacy’, and evidenced legacy/impact of hosting the Olympics in previous Games; ii) assessing the extent to which the London 2012 Games had impacted on the changed legacy outcomes for Leicestershire through realist evaluations.

Together with realist evaluations, analytic logic models and the assessment of additionality approaches are adopted in this study, focusing on the four legacy-programmes evaluations, wherein quantitative and/or qualitative methodology are utilised in order to identify the causal mechanisms that produced the anticipated/unanticipated effects in their specific contexts.

This study is an empirical example of the application of the realist evaluation and assessment of additionality. It also produces an evidence base for policy analysis in order to inform stakeholders’ thinking regarding sustaining the legacy of the Games and any future major sporting events by identifying lessons learned for non-hosting contexts.

Key words: Olympic legacy/impact, the London 2012 Games, systematic review, realist evaluation, additionality, logic models
Chapter 1: Introduction

The London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games were the biggest sporting events in UK history. The commitment to creating a lasting legacy across the UK was set out by the London Bidding Committee, and in particular by Lord Coe in his presentation to the IOC Session in Singapore in July 2005 (The Olympic Board, 2006). A legacy plan and a comprehensive evaluation framework were subsequently developed by the government to ensure staging a successful and inspirational event and to achieve a legacy in sport, health, education, tourism and business (DCMS, 2009). In order to achieve these ambitions, there were a number of Games-related initiatives, programmes, and projects\(^1\) delivered not only in London but also across the nation to maximise the benefits of the Games.

In Leicestershire (around 100 miles north of London), a group of local stakeholders\(^2\) envisaged London 2012\(^3\) as a unique opportunity for Leicestershire to raise its profile, recognising the potential for the sub-region\(^4\) to use the Games as a catalyst to drive forward economic, sporting and social development. Subsequently, a partnership based steering group and a detailed strategic plan were developed. Loughborough University was commissioned to evaluate the legacy/impacts of the London 2012 Games for Leicestershire, by means of a dedicated research studentship.

1.1 Defining key terms: ‘Olympic legacy’ and ‘Olympic impact’

As this thesis has a central concern over evaluating legacy/impact outcomes of the London 2012 Games for Leicestershire, some brief comments are warranted on clarifying the meanings of key terms ‘Olympic legacy’ and ‘Olympic impact’.

---

\(^1\) Throughout this thesis the term ‘programme’ is used to refer to a collection of ‘projects’ grouped together by providers under a collective name. The term ‘initiative’ may refer to a programme or a project depending on the context.

\(^2\) Including the Chair of the Leicestershire 2012 Steering Group, Vice Chair of the Leicestershire 2012 Steering Group, the Director of Leicester-Shire & Rutland Sport, the Chief Executive of the Leicestershire County Council, and the Chief Executive of the Leicester Primary Care Trust.


\(^4\) The term ‘sub-region’ refers to Leicestershire; The term ‘region’ refers to the administrative region of the East Midlands covered for example by the former East Midlands Development Agency (emda).
Chapter 1 Introduction

Discussions surrounding the Olympic Games have moved from the benefits and costs (in economic terms) for the host city and nation, to the impacts that are created from the Games (in more general economic and social terms), to the legacies that have been generated from hosting the Games (covering a wider range of the Games’ outcomes). The concept of Olympic legacy employed in this study follows the interpretation provided by the IOC (2012) that

“The terms ‘legacy’ and ‘impact’ are used, often interchangeably.... is commonly used to describe the effects of a policy, programme or project on ecosystems, society in general and / or on the economic system.....” (p.4)

The term ‘Olympic legacy’ in this study is assumed to be interchangeable with the term of ‘Olympic impact’. To be specific, legacy/impact is defined here as ‘the effects of a programme or initiative on society and/or on the economic system’. It consists of elements of the nature of results and the time. For example, although the word legacy is somewhat misleading - suggesting some generally positive effects, we consider that, here, Olympic legacy/impact can represent both negative and positive effects. As regards the time period that Olympic legacy covers, there was a high degree of similarity, traditionally, in the earlier bid documents (or final reports) where it primarily meant ‘heritage’ of the Games. However, as argued in the systematic review in Chapter 4, Olympic legacy may not only occur after the Games but can happen well before the actual event. In particular, in the case of the Olympics, the seven year preparation period will already have left some impact on the hosting nation (some researchers even suggest that it has positive impacts on the unsuccessful bidder as well, e.g. see Bruckner & Pappa, 2011). In this respect, this study focuses on the effects generated before the Games and a short-term period after the Games finished.

In summary, firstly, following the development and evolution of Olympic legacy evaluation, there are some factors, discussed above, that justify the reasons for selecting the particular terminology employed in the title of this study. Secondly, the term legacy was not mechanically applied here under the influence of convention; instead, it seems logical to keep the term as it was widely used in the UK’s 2012 related policy and strategy documents at both national level and sub-regional level. Therefore, as an evaluation of the 2012 Games in this context, reference to evaluating the Games’ legacy seems appropriate.

---

5 The detailed discussion of Olympics’ legacy, and its related terms are presented in Chapter 4: systematic review of the Olympic legacy context.
1.2 Analysing Olympic legacy / impacts on a non-hosting sub-region: the research context

In the literature, the Olympics, as a mega sporting event, has already attracted a significant amount of interest in relation to studying and investigating its related ‘factors’ with many authors focusing on economic impacts of the Games (Baade & Matheson, 2002; Blake, 2005; Kasimati & Dawson, 2009; New South Wales Treasury, 1997), but relatively fewer considering evidence of social impacts of the Games (in terms of, for instance, sport and health or volunteering, e.g. Giannoulakis, Wang, & Gray, 2008; Truno, 1995). However, existing studies of the Olympics have been traditionally focused on the host city alone or a host nation as a whole. Studies in relation to identifying Olympic legacy for any non-hosting regions have been rather limited, and it can be argued that, without exploring the Games’ effects in a broader territory of the host nation, the results seems unsystematic and unbalanced. This study, investigating legacy/impacts of the Olympics in a non-hosting sub-region, aims to address this gap in the literature.

It was evident that, from the point at which London had won the bid to host the 2012 Games in 2005, there was an increasing corresponding development in policy making for the London Games, which provided a foundation to create a possible legacy of the Games for the UK before, during and after the Games. (This is in contrast to what has been argued in the Olympic legacy literature which suggests that no previous Olympics had planned the Games’ legacy well ahead in advance; see Chapter 4). Initially, as with previous Games, two organisations were created that were the key bodies overseeing the Games: the London Organising Committee of the Olympic and Paralympic Games (LOCOG – broadly responsible for planning the event itself) and the Olympic Delivery Authority (ODA – responsible for planning the physical infrastructure required to host the event). Subsequently, the government and LOCOG embarked upon legacy action plans and an evaluation framework for the systematic and scientific pursuit of successful events, with the Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) publishing a range of documents, most notably Before, during and after: making the most of the London 2012 Games (DCMS, 2008a) and London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games Impacts and Legacy Evaluation Framework (DCMS, 2009); and LOCOG their sustainability plan for the Games Towards a one planet 2012 (London Organising Committee of the Olympic Games and Paralympic Games, 2009). In addition, in order to ensure that the whole country was involved in and benefited from the
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Games, the Nations and Regions Group (NRG) was also set up to work closely with LOCOG and local government stakeholders. At the regional level, the East Midlands 2012 Delivery Group, as part of the NRG, subsequently formulated policies for championing the East Midlands; at the sub-region level, a Leicestershire Steering Group for the London 2012 Games, consisting of multiple agencies, was also formed to provide the strategic direction and co-ordinated action for Leicestershire on matters relating to 2012 Games inspired activity (see Figure 1.1 for the London 2012 Games Delivery Structure). Importantly, in early 2010, a total of £416,000 funding from emda (the East Midlands Development Agency) and local authorities was gathered to support the Inspire Leicestershire programme to operate over three years. Inspire Leicestershire – a small team with dedicated human and financial resource capacity – was a conduit for strategic sub-regional planning and support for all 2012 Games related activities. The significance of this programme cannot be underestimated, as it was seen by the stakeholders as a key mechanism for ensuring London 2012 Games legacies and benefits could be maximised for Leicestershire; and it was unique to the sub-region within the region (and was subsequently identified as unique nationally, see Chapter 9). Thus ensuring the effectiveness and operational function of this programme, summarising lessons learned for future activities, and producing an evidence-based benchmark for other parts of the region and nation on legacy outcomes, were seen as important aspects by local stakeholders. The Centre for Olympic Studies and Research (COS&R) at Loughborough University was thus commissioned to evaluate the legacy and impact of the London 2012 Games for Leicestershire, supported by a research studentship co-funded by the County Sport Partnership, Leicester-Shire & Rutland Sport (LRS), Children & Young People (CYP) Legacy, and Inspire Leicestershire.

The Inspire Leicestershire strategy for the 2012 Games was developed in 2009, and aimed to deliver on the seven areas outlined in Table 1.1. The seven ‘visions’ encompassed the seven foci of interest related activities, including business, sport and physical activity, health and wellbeing, children and young people, culture, volunteering and visitors economy. The groups responsible for leading each strand are also identified and presented in Figure 1.1. It is worth acknowledging that these visions and operational and development targets were created with limited (for some strands even without) consultation with the leading groups (discussed in Chapter 9).
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Table 1.1 Inspire Leicestershire 2012 legacy visions

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Inspire Leicestershire businesses to compete for and win contracts and sub-contracts to supply goods and services to the 2012 Games;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Inspire increased participation in sport and physical activity and commitment to supporting excellence in sport through Leicestershire;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Inspire more options and choice for people in Leicestershire to think about physical activity, diet and nutrition, improving their health and fitness and reducing health inequalities;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Inspire children and young people in Leicestershire to engage in sport, arts and culture, learning and volunteering;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Inspire individuals and communities in Leicestershire to play an active role in the Cultural Olympiad, celebrating their cultural identity, cohesiveness, creativity and heritage;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Inspire more people in Leicestershire to become volunteers creating a strong legacy that will result in lasting benefits to local communities;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Inspire teams and visitors from across the world to come to Leicestershire – whether to train in some of the country’s best facilities or experience the area’s diverse cultures, its rich heritage and beautiful countryside.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: (Inspire Leicestershire, 2009)

Two factors in particular characterise this study. First, the creation of the Inspire Leicestershire programme demonstrated a significant emphasis at the sub-regional level on promoting Olympic legacy, and as a consequence, there was an interest in investigating whether or not, and to what extent it positively/negatively leveraged the London 2012 effect in Leicestershire. Second, and as a consequence the key stakeholders were minded to provide maximum support to the research, and to cooperate with the researcher, which proved to be a significant benefit in starting up the research project, and later on during the data collection.

With this in mind, the exploration of Olympic legacy outcomes in a non-hosting sub-region and its policy implementation process was regarded as having the potential to provide a useful point of comparison with the host region impact in future research projects, and to provide insights into good practice in legacy evaluation.
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Figure 1.1 London 2012 Games delivery structure
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1.3 The scope of the research project and the thesis

As discussed above, there were seven policy remits that were developed by the Inspire Leicestershire programme for maximising the London 2012 legacy for Leicestershire, including business, sport and physical activity, health and wellbeing, children and young people, culture, volunteering and visitors economy. In respect of this research project\(^6\), there were seven\(^7\) specific legacy-programmes that were proposed as priorities for collecting empirical evidence by the Inspire Leicestershire Team Director, Shimul Haider (see Table 1.2). However, given the limitation of the length of this thesis, only four of the seven selected legacy-programmes are presented in detail here. They are the Workplace Challenge programme, the Get Set Olympic education programme, and the volunteer programmes Sport Makers and Games Makers. Detailed evaluations of these programmes can be found in Chapter 6, 7, and 8.

One of the intended consequences of this thesis is thus to provide an exemplar of research into Olympic legacy outcome evaluation, examining three dimensions (i.e. sport and physical activity, educational and volunteering legacy) by conducting primary research on those four legacy programmes in Leicestershire.

Table 1.2 Selected seven projects for the research project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leicestershire 2012 legacy strategy theme</th>
<th>Business</th>
<th>Sport &amp; Physical Activity</th>
<th>Visitor Economy</th>
<th>Culture</th>
<th>Children &amp; Young People</th>
<th>Volunteering</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Selected 7 projects for the research project</td>
<td>Compete For</td>
<td>Workplace Challenge ✓</td>
<td>STEAM Data</td>
<td>My Games My legacy</td>
<td>Get Set ✓</td>
<td>Sport Makers ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Games Maker ✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The selected four case studies which are presented in the thesis are ticked

\(^6\) A mix of primary and secondary research on the proposed seven case studies was conducted for the research project purposes. The results of those programme evaluations, and a final report for the sponsor can be found at the following website: [http://www.inspireleics.org.uk/meta-evaluation.html](http://www.inspireleics.org.uk/meta-evaluation.html)

\(^7\) Due to the availability of 2012 STEAM data was uncertain and dependent on funding at the time of finishing the overall research project, it was not possible to provide an estimated tourism impact of the Games for Leicestershire based on a secondary analysis of the STEAM data. Thus the proposed seven legacy-programmes evaluation was reduced to six.
1.4 Research aims and general principles of the evaluation

The aim of the thesis is to evaluate the legacy/impact of the London 2012 Olympic Games for Leicestershire as a non-hosting sub-region. Specifically, the thesis focuses on an analysis of the nature of evaluation of Olympic legacy (by conducting a systematic review of the literature regarding Olympic legacy context). It also aims to identify the Games’ impact at local level principally through evaluations of four legacy-programmes (by adopting a realist evaluation research framework), and to draw conclusions about lessons learned from the Leicestershire 2012 legacy experience.

It should be noted that the evidence and substantive content of the thesis was gathered from Oct 2010 up to Oct 2012; therefore, developments after this date are not included in the analysis. It should also be noted that it is beyond the scope of this study to investigate the development and long-term impacts (3-5 years after the Games) of legacy programmes and initiatives.

The principle objectives and the scope of the research project were formulated by Inspire Leicestershire and Professor Ian Henry (supervisor of the thesis and Director of the Centre for Olympic Studies and Research, Loughborough University) before the start of the research studentship. The principle evaluation framework and research approaches adopted in this study were in line with the impacts and legacy evaluation framework of the 2012 Games proposed by DCMS (2009).

Specifically, the principal theoretical frameworks adopted for this study were meta-evaluation and realist evaluation. While the meta-evaluation framework was selected as it is suitable for a comprehensive evaluation project, providing theoretical guidance on data synthesis and analysis, as well as scrutinising the quality of evaluations, the realist evaluation framework serves to offer a persuasive set of insights into how to identify the mechanisms for change triggered by an intervention (see Chapter 3 for detailed discussion of theoretical framework and key principles). For each of the legacy programme evaluations, the use of logic models was employed to identify how a programme’s delivery was expected, what mechanisms were put in place to proceed to outcomes, and how desired outcomes could be achieved. In addition, the evaluations took into account the additionality issues which aim to assess to what extent the Games had boosted interest and thus increased outputs which would not otherwise have occurred.
In order to achieve the research aims outlined above, a number of more concrete objectives were defined:

[1] To conduct a systematic review of the literature (covering the period 1996-2011), in order to explore and establish an understanding of the concept of ‘Olympic legacy’, evidenced legacy/impacts of hosting the Olympics in previous Games, and whether there is any difference between hosting region and non-hosting regions;

[2] By conducting either primary or secondary research of the selected legacy-programmes, to evaluate the extent to which the 2012 Games had impacts on the social legacy outcomes for Leicestershire (Only primary research on the legacy-programmes are presented in the thesis. Evaluation of other research on the legacy-programmes were included in the final report for the sponsors);

[3] To apply a realist analysis framework to identify underlying contexts (including political, economic, social and cultural contexts), and to understand the generative mechanisms and their relationships to outcomes, with a long-term aim to develop an explanation of the relationship between contexts, mechanisms, and outcomes on legacy;

[4] To produce an evidence base for policy analysis which provides a national exemplar of research into sub-regional legacy outcomes from the 2012 Games;

[5] To identify the lessons learned about the maximisation of the legacy benefits of the 2012 Olympics for the non-hosting sub-region.

1.5 Thesis structure

Chapter 2, the policy context of the London 2012 Games in the UK and Leicestershire, begins with outlining the overall strategies of the London 2012 Games at the national level, and describes its operational structure. It then, with specific attention to the themes of sport, children and young people, and volunteering, summarises their related London 2012 strategies for nation and Leicestershire, and legacy activities for Leicestershire.

The theoretical basis of the study is presented in Chapter 3. Four key elements of the framework for policy analysis and evaluation adopted in this study are introduced, namely realist evaluation, meta-evaluation, logic models, and additionality. The strengths and weaknesses of each of these elements, and other relevant concepts are examined in order to explain the rationale behind the selection of the four frameworks.
Chapter 4 presents the results of the systematic review of the literature (1996 – 2011) on the subject of Olympic legacy/impacts. Seven themes in relation to Olympic legacy/impacts emerged from this review, including urban regeneration, volunteering, social impact (more broadly), economy, tourism, sport participation, and legacy. A description and thematic analysis of the identified sources are provided, in order to inform the methodological design of the study, and to form the basis of the analysis of the legacy gains in the later chapters dealing with case studies.

Chapter 5 outlines and examines the methodology adopted for the study. Following a discussion of the study’s ontological and epistemological assumptions, this chapter continues with a more detailed discussion of the rationales for choosing a critical realist research paradigm and subsequent implications for theoretical adequacy. The focus then turns to the discussion of the study’s research methods. The key methods employed in the study include case studies, document analysis, semi-structured interviews, and questionnaires. Their suitability, strengths and limitations are discussed and evaluated. This is followed by a discussion of validity and reliability claims.

Chapters 6-8 present the findings of the three case study legacy themes: sport, children and young people, and volunteering, by evaluating four legacy programmes (i.e. Workplace Challenge, Get Set, Sport Makers, and Games Makers). In each chapter, a common structure is adopted. Firstly, the legacy themes and their corresponding representative legacy programmes are introduced. Analysis of the empirical evidence of each of the legacy programmes is presented, and the application of their logic model is discussed. It then moves on to specifically consider the London 2012 impacts and how the issues in relation to additionality have been addressed. Findings are then used to support the realist evaluation analysis.

Chapter 9 focuses on the London 2012 related activities and strategies in other regions of England, and lessons learned, and provides not only a summary of the London 2012 related activities and policy strategies across nine English regions in order to examine the uniqueness of the Inspire Leicestershire, the Leicestershire 2012 Steering Group, and their delivered activities; but also by analysing the interviews conducted with the key stakeholders of the Leicestershire 2012 Steering Group, the strategic benefits of the Steering Group and a number of lessons to be learned about how to maximise the benefits of the staging of mega-events for non-hosting sub-regions are discussed.
In the final chapter, the empirical contributions made within chapters 4 and 6-9 are brought together to review the impact of the London 2012 Games for Leicestershire and to identify the contribution to knowledge which the thesis claims to have provided, including identification of the limitations on the claims which the study can make, together with themes and approaches for further work in this field.
Chapter 2: The Policy Context of the London 2012 Games in the UK and Leicestershire

2.1 A context description of the London 2012 Games

As we noted in Chapter 1, the London 2012 Games were the biggest sporting event that the UK had ever hosted. The government committed itself to a number of the ambitions set in the bid document, and notably that hosting the Games would leave a lasting sporting, social and economic legacy for the country. It was claimed by the government that the legacy plan (in particular, the commitment to sporting and community legacy) for the London Games was more central to London's bid than it had been to any previous host city bid, and some commentators argued that this had been decisive in the award of the Games to London by the IOC in Singapore in July 2005 (House of Commons, 2007).

While the top priority for the government was to host a successful Game, it had also been put under pressure to justify the cost of staging the Games and ensuring achievement of a lasting legacy. Subsequently, building on the LOCOG strategy produced in 2007 Our Promise for 2012 (LOCOG, 2007), the Labour Government finalised a detailed London 2012 legacy plan that provided a framework for guiding organisations and individuals across the UK to fulfil the legacy ambitions (see Table 2.1 below). In December 2010, after the general election, the Coalition Government restated their plans for the legacy from the London Games, with slight wording changes and effectively the merging of some points (DCMS, 2010). The four areas focused upon were: sport, the economy, community engagement, and East London regeneration.

Differences between the two governments’ proposals are thus limited. In relation to sport, the Coalition Government focuses on grass roots participation and particularly for the young. This however is dealt with in the Labour document under ‘Children and Young People’. Interestingly the concern with sporting excellence is given more emphasis by the Labour Government document. The Coalition also stresses ‘Community engagement’ but both documents, identify economic / business legacy and regeneration of East London (with Labour placing emphasis on sustainable development in East London / the Olympic Park). In addition both documents neglect somewhat the legacy of the Paralympic Games.
Table 2.1 The national strategy of the London 2012 Games

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Labour Government’s five promises</th>
<th>The Coalition Government’s legacy plan:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sporting:</strong> making the UK a world-leading sporting nation;</td>
<td><strong>Sport:</strong> harnessing the UK’s passion for sport to increase grass roots participation, particularly by young people – and to encourage the whole population to be more physically active;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Children and young people:</strong> inspiring a generation of young people to take part in volunteering, cultural and physical activity;</td>
<td><strong>Community Engagement:</strong> promoting community engagement and achieving participation across all groups in society through the Games;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Business:</strong> demonstrating that the UK is a creative, inclusive and welcoming place to live in, visit, and for business;</td>
<td><strong>Economic:</strong> exploiting to the full the opportunities for economic growth offered by hosting the Games;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>East London regeneration:</strong> transforming the heart of East London;</td>
<td><strong>East London regeneration:</strong> ensuring that the Olympic Park can be developed after the Games as one of the principal drivers of regeneration in East London.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Olympic Park:</strong> making the Olympic Park a blueprint for sustainable living.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: adapted from (DCMS, 2008a, 2010)*

The £9.3 billion cost of the Games was significantly higher than forecast in the bid document (£3.4 billion)\(^8\) (House of Commons, 2003, 2008). The money package included four cost areas specific to the Games: costs of staging the Games, cost of providing venues, security costs, VAT and a contingency allowance. Concerns were expressed about whether all the aspirations for the Games could be achieved; and whether the £9.3 billion price tag could be justified.

London 2012-related activities were delivered not only in London but also across the nation. The concept of a *UK* Games hosted in London had been stressed over and over, as the government had recognised that the benefits of hosting of the Olympics should flow to the whole nation. Most of the funding of legacy programmes/initiatives delivered at the nationwide level (e.g. *Places People Play*, a Sport England initiative) were largely funded through the National Lottery as one of the main ‘good causes’ – arts, charities, heritage and sport. The National and Regional Groups (NRG) were then responsible for identifying benefits across the country. In the East Midlands, the region worked to coordinate and broker the delivery of London 2012 activities via a range of local and regional partners.

---

\(^8\) The cost of the Games was initially estimated to be £1.8 billion by Arup in 2002 (House of Commons, 2003). The figure increased to £2.4 billion in 2003 (House of Commons, 2008), and to £3.4 billion in the final bid document.
As one of only two regions in England that had no Olympic or Paralympic venues, the East Midlands’ vision for the London 2012 Games was set to use the Games as a catalyst to inspire local people and businesses to change lives. A wide range of activities took place across the region following the bid to host the Games. A Regional Management Board was established with those organisations and representatives from the Government Office for the East Midlands, East Midlands Tourism, Culture East Midlands, the Learning and Skills Council, a local authority representative (John Sinott, Chief Executive of Leicestershire County Council) and a representative from Loughborough University. The regional strategy of the London 2012 Games emerged during 2006/07, after the appointment of a Regional Coordinator (with the post being jointly funded by emda and Sport England and based at the Regional Development Agency), and a Creative Programmer (recruited by and hosted at Culture East Midlands) to work predominantly with the Cultural Olympiad. The areas focused upon by the region included economic, sporting, and social legacy.

At the county level, County Sports Partnerships (CSP) were charged with forming groups that reflected the stakeholder priorities and themes agreed at the regional level. The groups generally comprised local authorities, a business representative, a tourism representative, a lead on volunteering and, in some places, a health lead. Emda made a small grant to each CSP to assist with their 2012 activity and two counties realised that to maximise fully the opportunity they needed to allocate dedicated resources to the agenda. Leicestershire was one appointing a full-time Legacy Director and a full-time Legacy Coordinator while Derbyshire also managed to appoint a part-time Coordinator.

The 2012 Games hosted in London had been seen as a unique opportunity for Leicestershire, using the power and spirit of the Games, to inspire local people and create a lasting legacy. Thus Leicestershire County Council and Leicester City Council applied for funding for the Inspire Leicestershire project which included two full-time staff to work on the 2012 agenda. In early 2010, a group of Leicester and Leicestershire local authorities and stakeholders formed a Leicester and Leicestershire 2012 Steering Group to provide strategic direction and co-ordinated action for Leicestershire on matters relating to 2012 Games-inspired activities. Inspire Leicestershire acted as a conduit for the Steering Group, and provided support for all 2012 Games-related activities across the sub-region. A more localised strategy was

---

9 In East Midlands, these were formed in 5 of the region’s 6 counties (Derbyshire, Leicestershire, Lincolnshire, Northamptonshire and Nottinghamshire with the exception being Rutland which was incorporated in a joint CSP with Leicestershire).
subsequently developed after some core partners identified the elements of the regional strategy that most resonated with them and their communities. The strategy was developed around seven core themes: business, visitor economy, sport and physical activity, culture, children and young people, health and wellbeing, and volunteering.

From the above observations, in sum, there are three key implications that may explain the uniqueness of the case of Leicestershire for promoting the 2012 activities. The first implication concerns the features of the state policy – the government’s support and LOCOG’s focus on ensuring the legacy of the Games would be developed in London but also in the whole of the UK, and the creation of the NRGs – which both characterise London 2012’s policy and organisational structure system while at the same time have implications for the regional level. Therefore, under these national motives, governmental policies (together with a wide variety of legacy programmes and initiatives) regarding the 2012 legacy were developed.

A second significant factor in the success of maximising the London 2012 legacy for Leicestershire is that a general recognition of London 2012’s unique opportunity to raise the profile of Leicestershire was shared between a group of key stakeholders at an early stage (right after the bid announcement). Subsequently, actions, e.g. increasing local interest in London 2012, lobbying local authorities for funding support, motivating potential partners and actively bringing them together, were carried out, which in turn attracted buy-in from key sub-regional public agencies.

A further significant factor that may be considered as crucial to the whole Leicestershire legacy project was an awareness of the importance of establishing a small dedicated legacy team with human capacity and resources to commit to delivering 2012 related activities. In addition, financial support for the Inspire Leicestershire project, which was secured at a very early stage (thus while the dramatic funding cuts hit public sectors in 2010/11, the team were still operating), proved to be critical. Having formed this legacy team, a number of ‘home-grown’ 2012 programmes and campaigns (in particular the sport-related, children and young people-related, and volunteering-related activities listed in the following sections) could then be developed and could seek to add value to legacy outcomes for the sub-region.

The following sections of the chapter outline the detailed London 2012 legacy strategies, a scope of public sector legacy activities so far identified, both at the national level and sub-
regional level across the three legacy themes (i.e. sport, children and young people, and volunteering) upon which this thesis has focused.

2.2 Sport participation legacy

Taking into account the current and previous Government legacy strategies, the sport theme-related legacy includes the following areas: community participation, sporting facilities, elite sport, and international sport development. Given its relevance to the focus of the thesis, only the community participation related legacy strategy is outlined below.

2.2.1 National and sub-regional legacy strategy for sport participation

As discussed above, the success of the London 2012 bid was widely attributed to its visionary emphasis on the Games’ potential legacy of sport by all sectors of the community. However, having learned from previous Games that there was little or no evidence that a lasting increase in participation in sport had been achieved by hosting of the Games, the government believed that detailed planning that aimed to achieve this needed to start as early as possible (House of Commons, 2007). Sport participation had thus become one of the key policy priorities for the government. This involved increased funding for sporting organisations (Sport England, 2011a)(e.g. Sport England’s funding from government increased from £32 million in 1997/98 to over £113 million\(^\text{10}\) in 2010/2011) (Sport England, 2011a), ambitious targets for increasing participation (e.g. getting two million people to be more active by 2012\(^\text{11}\)), and detailed planning strategies and initiatives (see Table 2.2). Those actions demonstrated the government's commitment to maximising public engagement in sport.

\(^{10}\) Although the funding dropped to £95 million in 2011/12, and further down to £86 million for the year 2014/15, it might due to the general budget cut during the recession period (Sport England 2011a).

\(^{11}\) This target was terminated after the 2010 general election.
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### Table 2.2 Sport participation legacy strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Previous Labour Government’s sport participation priorities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategy</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Using the power of the Games to get more people from across society, planning more sport.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coalition Government’s sport participation priorities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategy</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Boosting participation in grass roots sport; - Increasing participation in wider physical activity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leicestershire sport participation priorities&lt;sup&gt;12&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategy</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Inspiring participation in sport and physical activity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Sources: adapted from (DCMS, 2008a, 2010; Inspire Leicestershire, 2009)*

### 2.2.2 Leicestershire sport participation legacy initiatives

In support of the Leicestershire 2012 legacy ambitions to increase participation in sport and physical activity, in addition of delivering the London 2012 initiatives designed by the government and national sport organisations, some other London 2012 featured programmes

<sup>12</sup> The established detailed action plan was later scrapped by the delivery board due to its deviation from reality.
were also developed and delivered in the sub-region. The following summarises the London 2012 legacy actions in relation to the sport participation theme running in Leicestershire:

- **Gold Challenge**: started from early 2011, it was part of the £135 million government initiative through National Lottery reforms to motivate local people to participate and test themselves in multiple Olympic and Paralympic sports, and raised funds for charity by the end of 2012.
  - The local responsible organisations included: LRS, Inspire Leicestershire, and local authorities.
  - Related work included: organising local Go Challenge events, e.g. Monica's Gold Challenge, 2012km fund raising event; giving support to schools and workplaces to organise their own Go Challenge events

- **Sportivate**: this programme aimed to get more 14-25 year-olds regularly participating in sport activities in the community by responding to their needs and working closely with a range of relevant providers to provide a framework of activities. LRS received funding to deliver the Sportivate programme across Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland, with a target to inspire 6,400 young people to get involved in sport.
  - The local responsible organisations included: LRS, Local Sport Alliance, and local authorities;
  - Funding was distributed in the following way: 80% of funding was available for the 9 LSAs; 20% of funding was available in an 'Open Fund' for clubs or organisations that would be delivering projects across the county rather than in one specific area.

- **Walk4Life Miles** (formerly 2012 Active Challenge Routes): this was a national physical activity programme and delivered in the sub-region, to encourage people who were not currently active to find a place nearby where they lived to go for a short walk. The programme was discontinued by the current government.

- **Free Swimming**: this was a national £140 million fund initiative launched by the previous government to encourage local authorities to open publicly owned swimming pools free to the over 60s and to under 16 year olds, and to rejuvenate and maintain pools. 2012 Free Swimming initiative was available during key school holiday programmes in 2012 (summer term and autumn term) for young people 16 and under who live in the city. The programme was discontinued by the current government, but reintroduced at Leicester city by Leicester City Council in 2012.
• **Sport Unlimited**: this was a national initiative that began in 2008 and finished in March 2011. It offered young people the chance to attend 'taster' sessions of sport over 8 to 12 weeks, which was superseded by Sportivate. It went live from April 2008 until April 2011, with 12 CSPs Trailblazers involved in delivering activities. LRS was one of 12 the Trailblazers.

• **LRS Oldest Athlete Event**\(^{13}\): This was a sub-regional evening event delivered by LRS, and won an Inspire Mark. It was held in September 2010 to celebrate the achievements of sports people, volunteers and physical activity participants from across Leicestershire, Leicester and Rutland. In 2012, this event was re-held in the Link Hotel, Loughborough University, to celebrate the lifetime achievements of local long standing participants. As a result, it was anticipated to inspire others through local communities to enjoy the health and wellbeing benefits that resulted from regular participation in sport and physical activity.

• **Workplace Challenge**\(^{*}\): The Active Together Workplace Challenge programme was a free online competition between businesses that allowed participants to log their activities and level of participation over the length of the programme. A series of local sporting events and mini-business sporting competitions were organised.

### 2.3 Children and young people legacy

As presented above, the children and young people legacy theme was embedded under the ‘headline-theme’ of “promoting community engagement and participation” in the current government’s London 2012 legacy plan. However this was treated as a single legacy strand in the context of Leicestershire 2012 legacy strategy and the previous government’s 2012 strategy. After teasing out other factors, the strategy plan and the activities in relation to the theme of children and young people legacy centred on the following areas: *sport participation, volunteering, Olympic and Paralympic values education, and culture*.

#### 2.3.1 National and regional legacy strategy for children and young people

The aim of this theme of the Games’ legacy was to inspire the next generation of young people to play sport and engage in volunteering and cultural events, as well as using the Games to enhance the education of children and young people. The following table

---

\(^{13}\) London 2012 related programmes and initiatives which were developed and only delivered in the sub-region are marked with *.
summarises the related legacy strategy that was provided by the Labour government, its successor the Coalition government and the Leicestershire 2012 Steering Group, with key actions in each of the areas. Some of those initiatives and programmes cut across the above identified sub-themes (see Table 2.3).

2.3.2 **Leicestershire children and young people legacy initiatives**

Activities in place to help deliver a children and young people legacy in Leicestershire included:

- **School Games**: this was a national initiative led by Sport England and delivered by the Youth Sport Trust that included competitions for pupils with disabilities and special educational needs. All schools were given an opportunity to participate, with pupils competing against one another in school and district competitions, county festivals and at national events. There were four levels to the School Games: Level 1 was intra-school competition; Level 2 was inter-school; Level 3 was county festivals of sport; and Level 4 was a national event. In Leicestershire, there was a Local Organising Committee, with 16 members on board to support that, organising and delivering the Level 3 Festivals, including Super-Series Finals and the School Games Championships 10th July 2012 Leicester Grammar School.

- **Get Set**: this was a nationwide London 2012 official education programme, developed by LOCOG with support from the Department of Education and other London 2012 sponsors. It was a flexible cross-curricular programme, and offered a range of learning resources for teachers to use in the classroom, in assembly and in wider activities, that were designed to introduce children and young people the Olympic and Paralympic values and the London 2012 Games. The programme also provided opportunities for reward and recognition through the Get Set network, with visits from athletes, tours of the Olympic Park and tickets to the Games among the opportunities available to schools that demonstrate their commitment to the Games and the Values. After the London 2012 Olympics and Paralympics Games, the British Olympic Association and the British Paralympic Association announced that they would partner together to keep the Get Set programme sustained.
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Table 2.3 Children and young people legacy strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Previous Labour Government’s children and young people priorities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategy</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Inspiring a generation of young people and offering them opportunities to learn new skills, try different activities and enjoy being part of their communities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coalition Government’s children and young people priorities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategy</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Delivering the commitment made in the bid to inspire a new generation to play sport; - Encouraging and enabling people to play a more active part in society; - Engaging and inspiring the next generation of performers and audiences for culture and the arts; - Using the Games to enhance the education of children and young people and to promote social inclusion.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leicestershire children and young people priorities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategy</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Inspiring children and young people in Leicestershire to engage in sport, arts and culture, learning and volunteering.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: adapted from *(DCMS, 2008a, 2010; Inspire Leicestershire, 2009)*
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- **National School Sports Week**: this was a national wide programme delivered by Lloyds TSB and Youth Sport Trust. It was a week-long celebration of sport in primary and secondary schools. It aimed to use the power of the 2012 Games to inspire more young people to take part in and understand the value of sport.

- **Flames- Lighting the Way**: it started as a sub-regional project, won Inspire Mark, and now developed into a national programme developed by the British Heart Foundation in partnership with Loughborough College and delivered in association with the British Heart Foundation National Centre at Loughborough University. The Flames used a model of sports leadership and volunteering to support the delivery of health based physical activity sessions to children and young people both within school and the community. The aim was to establish an active legacy for children and young people and enrich learning for young leaders in Further Education and sixth form colleges.

- **Musubi**: this was an Inspire Mark programme that delivered in the region. The project was established based on the fact that the Japanese Olympic Committee had selected Loughborough for their pre-Games training camps. It featured a programme of Japanese themed activities including sport, ancient and modern culture and language. Action included: a Musubi day (comprising a range of activity from instrument performance to language, customs and sport), and Japanese athlete school visits.

2.4 Volunteering legacy

2.4.1National and sub-regional legacy strategy for volunteering

At the sub-regional level, this strand was one of the seven Leicestershire London 2012 legacy strategies; at the national level, volunteering-related vision and activities were included in the promise “to demonstrate the UK is a creative, inclusive and welcoming place to live in, to visit and for business” that was set out by the previous government (DCMS, 2008a: 1); and it was grouped under the sub-theme of “promoting community engagement and participation” by the current government. The following table outlines the volunteering legacy strategy and its related key actions that were set out and delivered respectively by the previous government, the current government and the Leicestershire 2012 Steering Group.
Table 2.4 Volunteering legacy strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Previous Labour Government’s volunteering priorities</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategy</strong></td>
<td><strong>Goals</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Bringing the UK together through cultural and volunteering activities.</td>
<td>- Using the London 2012 Games to inspire more people engaging in volunteering work and help other people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coalition Government’s volunteering priorities</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategy</strong></td>
<td><strong>Goals</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Encouraging and enabling people to play a more active part in society through e.g. volunteering.</td>
<td>- To get more people volunteering for their local communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leicestershire volunteering priorities</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategy</strong></td>
<td><strong>Goals</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Inspiring more people in Leicestershire to become volunteers creating a strong legacy that will result in lasting benefits to local communities.</td>
<td>- To increase volunteering opportunities that builds capacity within the voluntary sector.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: adapted from (DCMS, 2008a, 2010; Inspire Leicestershire, 2009)

2.4.2 Leicestershire volunteering legacy initiatives

There were a number of volunteering related legacy initiatives and programmes delivered in Leicestershire, including:

- **Games Maker**: this was the official London 2012 volunteering programme, which aimed to recruit 70,000 volunteers to assist with delivering the Games. Each volunteer was required to commit to three days of training and a minimum of 10 days volunteering for the Games. Providing grants of up to £250 per volunteer towards travel and accommodation during Games time volunteering, test events and training.

- **Sport Makers & Inspire to Lead**: it was recognised that a connection can be made between the Sport Makers programme and the Inspire to Lead and Leicestershire Buddies Leadership Programmes. Sport Makers was a national initiative that aimed to recruit and train 40,000 sports leaders who would be deployed to organise and lead local level sporting activities. Every leader would commit to at least 10 hours of volunteering. Inspire to Lead (Leicestershire Buddies Leadership) was a project that aimed to develop opportunities in Leadership for disabled people with a particular
focus on young people between the ages of 14-25 years. It consisted of creating and developing sustainable placements within the local community.

- The local responsible organisations included: LRS and Inspire to Lead programme team;
- Related action included: a mentoring programme to support the young people in their placements; an extensive training programme which consisted of Mentor training, leadership qualifications.

- **Medal Maker**: this was a volunteering programme aimed to recruit a pool of students to support the official Team GB Preparation Camp at Loughborough University. It was awarded the Inspire Mark. The role of those volunteers were various. They worked within the following main areas: communication, IT service, customer service, sports venue helper, activities required by the BOA, and Torch Relay.

- **Sport@VAL**: this sub-regional volunteering programme won the Inspire Mark; it recruited, trained and supported volunteering workforce. Other action included for example organising a sports conference Building Capacity and Planning for the Future, held on May 2012 at Leicester Tigers.

### 2.5 Conclusion

This chapter reviewed the policy context for London 2012 at both national and sub-regional levels in general, and more specifically, outlined the key aspects of the policy developments for leveraging the London 2012 legacy in the three analysed themes, i.e. sport, children and young people, and volunteering. Four key themes emerge from this review of the policy context: i) central government involvement in planning a successful Games in general, and in creating a lasting legacy for the nation after the Games in particular; ii) an emphasis on the construction of a Games’ legacy at an early stage at national, regional, and sub-regional levels; iii) dedicated human capacity and funding resources were put into place at both the national level and in Leicestershire, together with the creation of government intervention and sub-regional ‘home-grown’ campaigns in relation to the Games; iv) the legacy priorities set out by the previous government and the current government were generally in accordance with each other, in particular, the focus of the Games legacy plan for Leicestershire featured local strengths and the means to overcome challenges. Taken together these themes afford a further analysis of what the social impacts of the Games have been, particularly in terms of
sport, volunteering and children and young people development; and what lessons can be learned about how to maximise the benefits of hosting the Olympics in a non-hosting sub-region.

To sum up, empirical investigation requires an identification of the impacts and implications that the selected four legacy-programmes had made at local level, together with an exploration of the extent to which those activities were directly attributable to the Games, as for example, was the case of Workplace Challenge programme. Before doing so, a detailed literature review of the context of Olympic legacy in general is required which provides an evidence synthesis on relevant topics where gaps in knowledge might be identified.
Chapter 3: Theoretical Framework

3.1 Introduction

Evaluation research has grown exponentially in volume and diversity since the 1970s. A watershed in evaluation as a research domain occurred when attempting to conduct evaluations for social programmes where issues such as unpacking of the ‘black box’ (Suchman, 1967) and the ‘paradigm wars’ began to surface. When it comes to social programme evaluations, providing a straightforward answer to decision makers no longer seemed possible, given that they were operating under a multiplicity of social constructions (Pawson & Tilley, 1997). All social programmes involve forms of interplay between individuals, institutions, communities, and different levels of government agencies. The complexity of the relationships and interaction between these key actors makes it harder to tease out real cause-effect relation between inputs, outputs and outcomes (Pawson & Tilley, 1997).

Classical evaluation models (e.g. experimental evaluation) seem not to adapt to the specific peculiarities of multicultural social contexts and as such they cannot provide a real insight into the underlying causal mechanisms that produce ‘treatment’ effects. Rather, their capacity to produce the accumulation of knowledge and to support generalisation is limited. However, in response to these difficulties, Pawson and Tilley (1997) have developed a relatively new approach to evaluation which they term ‘Realist Evaluation’, as an appropriate tool for resolving the complex structure of cause-effect relationships in social context. A detailed discussion of their approach is provided in a later section of this Chapter.

Another significant research framework adopted in this research project was that of meta-evaluation. The emergence of meta-evaluation was considered as a product of the movement of the demand for evidence-based policy/practice in which it reinforced the need for scrutiny of the quality of evidence and thus for the demand for evaluators to ensure the quality of their methods and analysis (Chen, Henry, & Ko, 2013). The framework itself provides, on the one hand, recommendations in relation to how evaluation studies should be designed to produce technically adequate, useful and cost effective results; on the other hand, it serves to enhance the accountability of evaluators themselves, controlling potential evaluator bias, and increasing evaluation credibility.
Most government interventions will have some kinds of impacts (whether positive and/or negative). When it comes to evaluating the effects of a particular programme/initiative, there is an often neglected need to consider the issue of additionality. Assessing additionality has been seen as a crucial element in understanding the net impact of policy interventions (BIS, 2009; HM Treasury, 2003). It requires examination of the additional impact arising from an intervention which would not have occurred in the absence of the intervention, allowing us to evaluate the actual achievements against the objects/targets of programmes/initiatives.

This chapter therefore aims to introduce the above three sets of key tools in policy analysis (i.e. realist evaluation, meta-evaluation and additionality); to highlight the strengths and weaknesses of the various frameworks. Although the meta-evaluation approach introduced here has been dealt with in a limited manner in the legacy programme analysis chapters, we consider that the approach has a significant contribution to the overall research project and thus is included in the thesis.

3.2 Evaluation

3.2.1 Background and history of evaluation

Given the complexity and ambiguity of the policy analysis and the programmes/initiatives evaluation, an early exploration of some of the key terms used in this study is warranted.

In policy studies literature, public policy is referred to ‘the public and its problems’ (Dewey, 1927), which are concerned with those public issues (defined as problems) and the courses of action (or inaction) that arise to address these problems (Nutley & Webb, 2000). The studies of public policy surround with finding the answers to the questions: “what governments do, why they do it, and what difference it makes?” (Dye, 1976: 1). Within policy studies, what researchers are often interested in are the issues of policymaking which is defined as “the process by which governments translate their political vision into programmes and actions to deliver ‘outcomes’ – desired changes in the real world” (Cabinet Office - Strategic Policy Making Team, 1999, para 2.4). This study is concerned with these programmes and actions that the government implement by focusing on ‘what it works’ and ‘how it works’ before and during the London 2012 Olympic Games in leaving lasting legacy/impacts in Leicestershire.
Evidence-based policy analysis

In the policy studies, policy analysis is referred to “the way in which evidence is generated and integrated into the policy making process” (Nutley & Webb, 2000: 15). This definition stands for analysis for the policy process, which Parsons (1995) distinguishes from analysis of the policy process:

- Analysis for the policy process encompasses the use of analytical techniques and research to inform the various stages of the policy process;
- Analysis of the policy process considers how policy problems are defined, agendas set, policy formulated, decisions made and policy is subsequently implemented and evaluated (p.xvi).

In this study, evidence arising from legacy programmes evaluations was considered to be one aspect of analysis for the policy to form the policy process; it also sought to provide analysis of the policy process to explore whether the legacy-related decisions were made to benefit the region, and how their results were reported, etc.

Evidence-based policy analysis has become an apotheosis in the policy process when the labour government was elected with slogans such as ‘What counts is what works’ in 1997. Ever since then, there have been a number of initiatives launched by government departments and allied bodies to provide the evidence-base’s information for policy-making process. In 2005, when the labour government initiated and won the bid for hosting the 2012 Olympic Games in London, there were a number of initiatives had been planned and delivered in order to “host inspirational, sage and inclusive Olympic and Paralympic Games and leave a sustainable legacy for London and the UK” (DCMS, 2009: 11). Despite there were some changes of strategies and aims were made by the current Coalition government (refer to Table 2.1), such as the dropped target of inspiring one million adults to play more sport, the author argues that it is still important to make sure that evidence-based policies analysis can be provided in the context of Olympic legacy evaluation. In order to achieve this target, this study firstly conducted a systematic review of all the existing research under the Olympic legacy related-subjects, which provides an opportunity to conduct comprehensive syntheses of existing research in order to produce objective overviews of ‘what works’ (Davies, Nutley, & Smith, 2000). Secondly, empirical works that this study did also generate evidence of what goals of policy were, how policy works supposed to be implemented, and evaluating how
successfully it was. Finally, the using of analytic logic models for every programme provides rigorous framework for evaluation and served the function of causal identification.

In addition, the rise of evidence-based policy in the modernising government agenda quest to understand and explain what works for whom in what circumstances – which is the key concept that realist evaluation advocates, and is the evaluation approach this study adopts.

**Definition of evaluation**

In order to conduct an evaluation of London 2012 legacy for a non-hosting sub-region, first of all, it is essential to define what evaluation is. Lincoln and Guba (1986b: 550) define formal evaluation as “a form of ‘disciplined inquiry’ that applies scientific procedures to the collection and analysis of information about the content, structure and outcomes of programmes, projects and planned interventions.”

In addition, the definition of evaluation is outlined by the government in the Green Book, which is “retrospective analysis of a project, programme, or policy to assess how successful or otherwise it has been, and what lessons can be learnt for the future.” (HM Treasury, 2003: 102). Both these definitions however imply that there is a single ‘unitary’ notion of what evaluation is, but as we note below a number of authors (e.g. Pawson and Tilley 1997) suggest that policy evaluation means different things to different people.

Clarke and Dawson (1999) suggest that the primary objective of evaluation is not to discover new knowledge, but to study the effectiveness with which existing knowledge is used to inform and guide practical action. Rather it is concerned with determining the merit, or value of an established policy or planned intervention, and provides practical knowledge to aid the decision-making process. The nature of evaluation is to examine a programme from a number of different perspectives and it will often look for causal linkages between programme activities and outcomes. Clarke and Dawson (1999) point out that, in line with any evaluation research, monitoring the whole process of implementation is essential, which involves questioning the logic or structure of the programme design.

**Basic types of evaluation**

Michael Scriven (1967) identifies two basic approaches to evaluation, namely *formative* and *summative*. According to Scriven, formative evaluation aims to provide feedback to people
who are trying to improve something, and focuses on identifying the strengths and weaknesses of a programme or intervention; whereas, summative evaluation is concerned with determining the effectiveness of a treatment or planned intervention, with an emphasis on finding out whether or not a programme works.

Chen (1996) raises a need for a more comprehensive conceptual framework in order to capture the variety of evaluation types. He classifies the basic types of evaluation into two broad elements: (1) the function performed by an evaluation; and (2) the programme stage focused upon. As to the first element, he recognises that there are mainly two functions that can be provided by an evaluation: *improvement* and *assessment*. In relation to the second element, it can be split into two sub-types: *process* and *outcome*. By cross combination, Chen outlines his four basic types of evaluation: process-improvement evaluation, process-assessment evaluation, outcome-improvement evaluation, and outcome-assessment evaluation. In contrast with Scriven’s dichotomy, his typology provides a broader conceptual framework than those which limit process evaluation to issues of programme improvement, or restrict outcome evaluation to focusing purely on assessing the merit of a programme.

### 3.2.2 Description of four ‘paradigmatic’ choices in evaluation methodology

A rather more sophisticated account of evaluation research, and its history in respect of methodological change is given by Pawson and Tilling (1997) who identify four main perspectives on evaluation. These are *Experimental*, *Pragmatic*, *Constructivist*, and *Realist* evaluation. In the following sections, an outline of each is provided in turn, which provides a basic description of each evaluation model, the theory of each model, their strengths and weaknesses, and their implications for methods.

The description of different evaluation models not only offers an overview of individual theory background and the characteristics of each type, but also demonstrates the process of theory development of evaluation methodology, which eventually was significant in supporting our choice of research approach for this thesis. The strengths and weaknesses of different models should be acknowledged so that the evaluator can identify and formulate an evaluation design and research strategy that is capable of producing meaningful findings for its target audiences.
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a. **Experimental evaluation**

**Background**

The journey of evaluation begins from experimentation. Campbell’s classic OXO notation (Campbell & Stanley, 1963), shown as Figure 3.1, sets out the basic design of experiment. An experimental evaluation is designed for the purpose of obtaining an estimate of the effect of a treatment (or intervention) by comparing the outcome measures from one treatment group with another control group. Therefore, the result from the group which has been treated shows the impact of the intervention.

Figure 3.1 The classic experimental design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-test</th>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Post-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Experimental group</strong></td>
<td>$O_1$</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>$O_2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control group</strong></td>
<td>$O_1$</td>
<td></td>
<td>$O_2$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: adapted from (Pawson & Tilley, 1997)*

The key characteristic of true experiments is the random assignment of cases to control condition, which means each individual or case has an equal probability of being placed in either treatment groups or control groups. The advantage of randomisation procedures is that, at the end of experimental evaluation, when it comes to making causal inferences, helps control internal validity which refers to the accuracy of inferences about whether the imposed treatment caused any change in the outcome measure (Clarke & Dawson, 1999).

The principle of this method is based on the theory of causation. As the experimental and control groups are to begin with under the same condition, the only difference between those two is the application of the intervention. Therefore, it is easy to understand why only the intervention can be identified as responsible for the different outcomes. The basic theory foundation is that, because the causation cannot be observed, therefore, by comparing the outcomes’ differences between those two groups, the causation between treatment and outcomes could then be inferred from the repeated succession of one such event by another. Eventually, by trying to exclude every causal trigger from the experiment, the genuine causal link could be secured.
**Theory of experimental research**

As to experimental evaluation, an evaluation process starts from designing methodological strategy. It normally begins with establishing a philosophical grounding for answering the question ‘what can be known’ and the ways in which knowledge of the social reality can be obtained and also judged as being both adequate and legitimate epistemology - this is the theory of ‘causal explanation’. The way of thinking about causality is then to develop corresponding experimental research designs which are the methods that have been adopted. As has been explained above, the ideal of experiment evaluation is to design pre-test and post-test with both control group and experimental group. The only difference between the two groups should be the application of a treatment within experimental group but not control group. By employing this experimental method, the nature of the phenomena under investigation can then emerge – the validity of causal claims for a specific program.

When it comes to the process of policy implementation, many assumptions have been made. Based on the methodological strategy for experimental evaluation, government or policy makers forward specific initiatives to bring about solutions for some major social problems. Those specific initiatives are what we mean by treatments here. Through a process of repeated experiments, it will be ascertained whether those treatments work or not. In the end, those outcomes could be fed into the policy making process so that let policy maker make a rational choice amongst potential policy reforms.

**Strengths and weaknesses of experimental evaluation**

An experimental evaluation may work very well in the context of laboratory-based science research, such as, in medical science, assessing the effectiveness of drug treatment. By providing the highest levels of causal inference, by implementing random assignment procedures, or by adding experimental groups, a neat comparison between the treatment group and control group may be made. A firm conclusion can thus be drawn in terms of the impact of programme.

However, in the context of a social system, it is not always possible to exercise full experimental control and thus hard to get valid results. There is still no guarantee that an experimental design will inevitably result in a successful summative evaluation. Pawson and Tilley believe that there is a heroic failure inside the experimental paradigm, which also often has been referred to the ‘black box’ problem. A core assumption of experimental evaluation
is that the treatment and control groups are identical, apart from the fact that the treatment groups receive an intervention. Therefore, any change observed in the treatment group is seen as being caused by the intervention. The evaluators make causal inferences on the basis of observations on what happened before the experiment, and after. They can certainly observe what kinds of inputs are inside the ‘box’ beforehand; and after experiment, they can also analyse the outputs produced by imposing a certain intervention. However, the process of experimental evaluation is unable to provide any real insight into the underlying causal mechanisms that produce treatment effects. Pawson and Tilley (1997: 8) state that “the underlying logic of experimental evaluation seems meticulous, clear-headed and militarily precise, and yet findings seem to emerge in a typically non-cumulative, low-impact, and prone-to-equivocation sort of way.” After recognising this serious flaw, they turn to emphasise the importance of understanding how a programme works. They point out that, in order to recognise why not every situation is conducive to that particular process, the focus of evaluation should shift from “what works” to “what works for whom in what circumstances.”

Another problem addressed by Pawson and Tilley (1997) is that experimental evaluation fails to account for the fact that this particular observed outcomes occurs in certain specific conditions. The experimental evaluation seems to ignore the specific characteristic for each method and each context. In practical cases, the social world is complex, open and dynamic. It is hard to make sure that two experimental groups will be identical at the outset; it is also difficult to insert an intervention clearly into the ‘experimental group’ without influencing the ‘control group’. In sum, the mission for providing a neat experimental comparison seems virtually impossible in most practical contexts. Therefore, since we are rarely dealing with a lab-based experiment, it is not easy to draw a conclusion that this particular intervention contributes to the additional outcomes. In a social context, it will be rare to provide positive changes in the entire experimental group and virtually impossible in all trials in all contexts.

Furthermore, Clarke (1999) summarises a couple of significant faults which exist in applications of the experimental approach. Firstly, in the process of randomization as a method of assigning individuals to treatment and non-treatment groups, it is hard for programme planners to be objective as individuals have different ethical concerns. Mark and Cook (1984: 86) also address this issue and state that “programme planners may deviate from random assignment to satisfy their personal conception of how selection should take place.” This is a matter of research attacks, and of the transparency of motives, when a programme
planners’ commitment to random assignment is not honoured which undermines the scientific integrity of the experimental design.

Secondly, it is also difficult to make sure that there is not any change between the groups throughout the course of the evaluation study. Individuals and groups have their own characteristics. Some may refuse to accept the treatment, or may drop out in the middle of the programme implementation, which will result in failure in providing equivalent on all features (except the treatment) for the experimental groups before inserting any intervention. Clarke emphasises (1999) that different levels of involvement in and commitment to particular programmes will contribute to different results. Therefore, this makes it no longer possible for an evaluator to claim the accuracy of internal validity.

Pawson and Tilley’s recommendation is:

*To understand why there is inconsistency of outcomes we need to ask the rather different question of ‘why’ or ‘how’ the measure has its effect. We need a method which seeks to understand what the program actually does to change behaviours and why not every situation is conductive to that particular process.* (1997: 11)

This is a call for the demand of internal validity of causal inference, which requires additional monitoring and statistical controls in order to be sure the intervention is the vital causal agent.

**b. Pragmatic evaluation**

**Background**

Considering the rationales for conducting any evaluation from the politician’s point of view, the reasons are perhaps different to those of scientific experimental evaluation. In political society, when there is a social problem, they need an evaluation, performing as a reformer, to test effectiveness of developed initiatives which tend to help solving the social problem. In other words, the role that an evaluation plays is not initially fundamentally solving any social problem, but reflects political goals and ought to be constructed so that it is better able to be used in the actual processes of policy making (Pawson & Tilley, 1997). This perspective is also addressed by Weiss (1976) as she points out that, in the world of politics, the property of evaluation is changing from a knowledge-driven to a *utilization-focused* approach of research. In this context, ideas on the nature of evaluation underlining points have been changed to become useful, feasible and effective, which redirects the evaluator to the feet-on-the-ground view of methodology. The invention of pragmatic evaluation was based on this demand.
In 1978, based on C.S. Peirce (1931) who initiated theory of pragmatism, Patton (1978) develops pragmatic evaluation. He believes that evaluation research is best learned through exemplars, which relies on its application success. For him, evaluation researches do not have to follow certain epistemological axioms, but rather should be concerned about whether the practical cause of policy making is forwarded.

**Theory of Pragmatic Research**

The knowledge for pragmatic evaluation flows in the opposite direction from that of experimental evaluation. As a utility-focused evaluation, pragmatic evaluation focuses on exploring a theory of how policy is made. The theory constitutes reasons behind the call for evaluation, for instance, in political terms, whether it is feasible to conduct, and what decision maker’s objectives are, etc. Driven by the purposes of evaluation, it implies a model in which policy development is combined with the factors of political feasibility, cost effectiveness, and incrementalism. According to the model, the implemented programme, or intervention, can be developed in order to address the issues which come out from institutional realities, such as ‘services’, ‘careers’, etc.

Within the knowledge of how the policy implementation is going to be in advance, in ontological terms, pragmatic evaluation then rests on a view of the social world. Based on a plurality of techniques, the next step of investigation is to try to penetrate into the influence chains which can drag or promote change, so that researchers can provide ‘enlightenment’ on the basis of information of the program activity from it. Finally, the knowledge is generated from the above process then could be considered as valid – i.e. knowledge is pragmatically acceptable, as it falls into the prevailing framework in which the policy is set.

**Strengths and weaknesses of pragmatic evaluation**

Pragmatic evaluation is often recognised as a more useful evaluation as it helps in narrowing the gap between generating evaluation information and actually applying evaluation information to programme decision making and improvement. Supporters of pragmatic evaluation believe that the possibility of an evaluation’s impact will be substantial, meaningful, and relevant. In this respect, by reviewing the historical emergence of different programme evaluations, it provides an overall framework within which individual evaluator can proceed to develop an evaluation design to the unique circumstances they encounter. This
exercise helps more in carefully targeting evaluation and also increasing the likelihood of its use.

In Pawson and Tilley’s book, they argue about the veracity of pragmatism from two perspectives. On one hand, in contrast with experimental evaluation, utilization-focused method places emphasis on the final results rather than rules, which leads to the difficulty of generalization, and of how to decide why and how to do it. Despite the fact that pragmatic evaluation makes a great effort to emphasise the advantage and necessity of focusing on utilisation, it is a significant weakness that it fails to provide a ‘solid’ methodology. There are two problems that exist in this weakness. First, evaluators can only follow instructions which are provided by policy makers to conduct evaluations – this leads to the results of evaluation suffering from bias. Second, the evaluation itself lacks external validity as it is an utilisation-focused evaluation so that it might be methodologically rootless which causes the difficulty of generalising findings to other settings or to the next group of participants.

Pawson and Tilley emphasise however that research design and data construction need to be rooted in a very clear understanding of social change and social explanation rather than pragmatics if it is to provide useful information on why and how interventions work. One should also bear in mind that the utility and method of an evaluation alone is insufficient because it cannot explain to the others when and why to utilise a particular approach.

c. **Constructivist evaluation**

**Background**

Constructivism was brought into the world of evaluation in 1970s. Its concerns move from political players to social players. Constructivists raise an ontological question – *‘the nature of what it is exactly we are evaluating’*, and bring forward the importance of giving more attention to initiatives and programmes, rather than treating them independently. Having recognised the complex processes of human understanding and interaction, constructivists believe that it is critical to appreciate the whole process of reasoning, change, influence, negotiation, persuasion and finally choices. And only after doing so, will we ensure a certain initiative will work in whatever circumstance. These kinds of insights trigger the development of evaluation moves forward from focusing on outputs to *processes*. 
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The primary distinguishing characteristic of the constructivist approach is that it appreciates the existence of different stakeholders, and emphasises the need for the evaluator to explore how individuals interpret a problem or intervention and to try to bring them together to understand each other. The key principles provided by Lincoln and Guba (1985) for guiding evaluators to do this type of research are that, firstly, it is important that evaluators have open-minds, willing to learn the circumstances surrounding the different perceptions of reality. Secondly, it is also important for evaluators to experience the context within a programme, and to discover how different stakeholders interact with each other. Consequently, the research design and strategy of data collection for constructivist evaluation allow the evaluation approach to emerge or unfold as the research progresses, whereas the traditional experiment evaluation paradigm abides by the rules that existing theory should guide the data collection process.

Theory of constructivist research

Being seen as the ‘opposite’ of the experimentalist’s search for causal laws, constructivism evaluation begins its journey from trying to understand human meaning. Constructivists believe that “knowledge or truth is not discovered by detached scientific observation, but is a construction in the minds of individuals” (Clarke & Dawson, 1999, p.58). Constructivist evaluation starts with identifying key ‘stakeholders’, and knowing the theory of a social world embedded in the everyday reasoning processes present in all social interaction. Constructivists believe that truth is always attached to some standpoint rather than being external to the beliefs of any group, therefore, a process of negotiation is necessary in order to create an evaluation ‘arbitration and conciliation service’. As all stakeholders are involved in this process, they start to establish their ‘constructions’ about a programme after a long period of field observation. In order to produce consensual constructions, key stakeholders start to negotiate between the stakeholders and assemble these claims, concerns, and issues which are not treated as findings or explanations, but are themselves constructions and so open to further negotiations in an on-going process. This unique progress of constructivist evaluation determines that the utility of a constructivist evaluation is regarded as an attempt to reconsider unresolved constructions through a repetitive process of thinking and discussion until enlightenment/consensus is obtained.
**Strengths and weaknesses of constructivist evaluation**

Supporters of the use of constructivist method claim that, as a necessary feature of describing the perception and experience of those individuals involved in a programme, is understanding the internal dynamics of a programme, constructivist evaluation provides an opportunity for bringing different stakeholders together so that they understand more fully their own perspective and opinion as well as those of the other stakeholders.

Pawson and Tilley (1997) point out that the constructivist evaluation fails to recognise the asymmetries of powers that may exist between different stakeholders. It is very difficult to picture that there is a joint construction of claims or concerns of different stakeholders who have totally opposite views toward an intervention. For instance, a very classic evaluation example, which is brought out in Pawson and Tilley’s book, is a neighbourhood watch scheme. In this case, there are mainly three groups of stakeholders, i.e. initiators and polices, neighbours, and potential criminals. Police group tries to understand the nature of the practice of crime, which they can pass on to the neighbourhood watch group in the hope of changing collective ways of acting. As a result of that, hopefully, the third group (potential criminals) would reconsider the odds of being observed and arrested. The fundamental failure of this scheme is that police and criminals can never share the same point of view of claims or concerns as they begin with different assumptions about the legitimacy of a way of making a living. Therefore, in some circumstances with some types of stakeholders, constructivist evaluation will be unfeasible.

**d. Realist evaluation**

**Background**

There is a relatively new evaluation methodology developed by Pawson and Tilley (1997) that is called ‘Realist Evaluation.’ It is based on realist principles which the authors believe provide an abstract language to resolve the problems of explanation in relation to the nature and operation of causal forces. In contrast with experimental evaluation which can be described as ‘method-driven’ approach, realist evaluation belongs to the family of ‘theory-driven’ perspectives on evaluation which stress that an evaluation has the task of testing out the underlying programme theories, i.e. when there is an evaluation for a real facts or policy on-going, it always returns to the core theories about how a programme is supposed to work and then questions it.
In the process of theory development of realist evaluation, firstly, Pawson and Tilley (1997) admit that evaluation is conducted in a social system which is an open system. The nature of an open system is that it can be changed and reshaped by different factors, such as political change, personnel moves, physical and technological shifts, inter-programme and intra-programme interactions and so on. In short, a social system is regarded as self-transformational. That is to say, being realist in an evaluation has to go a step further towards understanding the changing nature of a social system.

Having acknowledged the nature of social systems, Pawson and Tilley (1997) then focus on how an evaluation affects something, rather than simply on whether it works or not. They started to think about the relationship between causality and the experimental method, and then address the fact that, instead of concentrating on whether or not programme actually works, it is more important to look at what are the available reasoning and resources that people have and experience throughout the programme which thus makes it work. They then notice that understanding the principles of generative causation is vital in order to be aware of whether any intervention might or might not work in this specific context. Different to other approaches, the main issue is not so much about whether the programme worked or not but how it did or why it failed to work. Pawson and Tilley (1997) state that realist evaluation seeks an answer to the question “what works, for whom and in what circumstances” (2004: 1). They address (1997) the fact that outcomes are explained by the action of specific mechanisms in specific contexts, and this explanatory structure is established by a combination of theory and experimental observation.

Realist evaluation relies on a key formula and two axioms developed by Pawson and Tilley (1997). Having recognised that there is a causal relationship between ‘outcomes’ and ‘mechanism’ acting in ‘context’ in any evaluation project, Pawson and Tilley (1997) propose a basic realist explanatory formula (see Figure 3.2) which addresses the need to evaluate an intervention within its ‘context,’ and to ask what ‘mechanisms’ are acting to produce which ‘outcomes.’ These three elements play an important role in any programme evaluation in which they highlight “programmes work (have successful outcomes) only in so far as they introduce the appropriate ideas and opportunities (mechanisms) to groups in the appropriate social and cultural conditions (=contexts)” (1997: 57). They term this formula as a CMO configuration which summarises research strategy of realist evaluation.
Essentially, the CMO configuration is a useful method when trying to tease out how a programme might work, and in what circumstances it might not work.

‘Mechanisms’ means what it is about programmes and interventions that bring about any effects. They need to be considered as an account, rather a variable, of the make-up, behaviour and interrelationship of those processes which are responsible for the outcomes. Pawson and Tilley (1997) stress that mechanisms are not programmes that work, but the resources they offer to enable their subjects to make them work; the explanation of the logic of an intervention; and also to trace the origin purpose of a programme theory.

‘Context’ refers to features of the conditions of particular circumstances in which programmes are introduced that are relevant to the operation of the programme mechanisms. Realism suggests that certain contexts will be supportive to the programme theory and some will not. Therefore, understanding the context in which mechanisms operate or not is one of the most important aspects of realist evaluation. One thing Pawson and Tilley (1997) make absolutely clear is that ‘context’ does not simply mean geographical or spatial location which programs are embedded; it not only relates to place but also to systems of interpersonal and social relationship, and even to technology and economic conditions and so on. They believe that the lack of attention to the social conditions which pre-exist and last through programs is perhaps the common mistake which can be found in other evaluation approaches. Therefore, a good understanding of general contextual issues allows appropriate mechanisms to be recommended.

‘Outcome-patterns’ describe the intended and unintended consequences of programmes, as results of the activation of different mechanisms in different contexts. For realism, it is axiomatic that there is a need for multiple measures of outcomes, which means outcome-patterns should be tested against a range of output and outcome measures so that a more sensitive evaluation of complex programmes can be provided.

Two Axioms (see Table 3.1) demonstrate the exact scope and content of theories required for implementing a realist evaluation. Pawson and Tilley (1997) call attention to the production of hypotheses as they are seen as critical to successful empirical work. Those hypotheses
follow the overall logic of realist explanation. In particular, they hypothesize a theory of change in the form of the mechanism question (see axiom 1) and the context question (see axiom 2).

Table 3.1 Axiom for realist evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Axiom 1</th>
<th>Research has to answer the questions: “What are the mechanisms for change triggered by a program and how do they counteract the existing social processes?”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Axiom 2</td>
<td>Research has to answer the questions: “What are the social and cultural conditions necessary for change mechanisms to operate and how are they distributed within and between program contexts?”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Pawson and Tilley (1997)

Theory of implementation

The whole theory of realist evaluation moves from defining its ‘methodological strategy’ firstly to applying this strategy into ‘policy implementation’. The perspective of realist evaluation begins with the assumption that there is a theory of causal explanation based on generative principles. This causal explanation theory then assumes that certain outcomes as results of delivering some social activities are brought about by the underlying ‘mechanism’ in a particular ‘context’, which gives research the task of testing theories of how program outcomes are generated by specific mechanisms and contexts. The process of testing and refining those theories involves making inter-and intra-program comparisons in order to see which CMO configurations are more effective. After building up a methodological strategy for realist evaluation, when it comes to practice, this evaluation approach sees programming as an attempt to embody knowledge which has thus identified ‘what works for whom in what circumstances.’ After accumulating over successive trials of programme and other forms of empirical research, the knowledge could be generated and can be provided to policy makers with all theories specifying typologies of successful CMO combinations. In addition, the researchers are playing important roles in the process of disseminating knowledge by leading and trying to involve all the stakeholders into the process of teaching and learning.

Strengths and weaknesses of realist evaluation

In the past, evaluation research quite often was criticised for being disconnected from reality. The biggest problem emerged from other evaluation approaches is that a carefully designed intervention works only occasionally. Therefore, Pawson and Tilley have proposed an
evaluation approach which is kept grounded in reality so that any research outputs will be presented and accumulated in a format that users can recognise and put into practice.

They consider this type of evaluation is a synthesis to connect up some of the best lessons from the above three approaches, i.e. experimental evaluation, pragmatic evaluation, and constructivist evaluation. Previous evaluation methodologies have tended to focus primarily on designing a ‘worked’ intervention, or an evaluation’s outcomes, or the process of evaluation, rather than paying more attention to the mechanism and contextual aspects. Moreover, realist evaluation recognises the nature of any social evaluation programme is embedded in a particular social system – that is an open system, which is active and changeable by those with reasoning and resources. Therefore, Pawson and Tilley believe that, only after seeing a whole picture of the complex, differentiated, and intertwined programmes, can a more appropriate and realist implication for research and evaluation be provided.

Realist evaluation successfully draws its foundation from the methodology of the natural sciences, and translates this into policy and practice area. It also emphasises the theory and scope for generalisation with an attention to explanatory theory, which is the key in moving progressively from one programme experience to another.

Another strength that realist evaluation has is its effort to connect a specific context to mechanisms in a way that perhaps has not been considered quite so thoroughly before. This attempt has important implications for social evaluation as it is more complex than evaluation in the natural sciences since all agents are interacting within it. In this sense, realist evaluation is more sensitive to diversity, and to change in the process of programme development and delivery, rather than other evaluation approaches which provide one-size-fits-all ways of responding to problems.

Finally, realist evaluation is alert to the importance of stakeholders to programme development and delivery who are treated as fragmentary experts and whose understanding needs to be formalised and tested.

In terms of the weaknesses of realist evaluation framework, Pawson and Tilley having recognised themselves that “realist evaluation requires sustained thinking and imagination to work through programme theory, to define expected outcome patterns, and to figure out exactly what footprints or data signatures to look for and where to find them to text or arbitrate between theories. None of this is easy. It requires advanced theoretical
There are some problems when conducting realist evaluations in practice. Firstly, as Gill and Turbin (1999) point out the requirements of data collection are too specific, it is much harder to collect useful, or valid, data for each of the elements of the CMO configurations particularly where time and resources are limited, when compared with simple proposing plausible CMO configurations. Secondly, in contrast to a randomised-control trial approach, a realist evaluation design is not standardised or reproducible (Pedersen, Nielsen, & Kines, 2011). These shortcomings therefore imply that there is a need to examine the issues of context in much greater depth at the beginning phase of a research.

3.3 Meta-evaluation

Meta-evaluation is increasingly becoming a known approach for evaluating a single or number of evaluation studies. It initially emerged as a result of evaluators being required to evaluate their work (Stufflebeam, 1974), and was applied to assess evaluations in the education area (e.g. the Advanced Technological Education (ATE) Evaluation project, Gullickson, Wingate, Lawrenz, & Coryn, 2006).

The concept of ‘meta-evaluation’ was first developed by Michael Scriven writing in 1969. Later, in his book Evaluation Thesaurus, he explains the concept of meta-evaluation in detail as:

*The evaluation of evaluations – indirectly, the evaluation of evaluators – represents an ethical as well as a scientific obligation when the welfare of others is involved. It can and should be done in the first place by an evaluator on his or her own work; although the credibility of this is poor, the results are considerable gains in validity (1991: 228).*

There are many academics and institutes who have given their definitions on what the meta-evaluation is in the literature. For instance, for Patton (1997: 346), meta-evaluation is the answer to the following questions: “Was the evaluation well-done? Is it worth using? Evaluating the evaluation based on the profession’s standards and principles”. Bustelo (2002) suggests that meta-evaluation is a systematic gathering, analysis and assessment of a pre-determined set of evaluation processes. Furthermore, Stufflebeam (2001: 185) who, based on his experience in leading the development of professional standards for evaluations in the US, defines meta-evaluation as “the process of delineating, obtaining, and applying descriptive information and judgmental information – about the utility, feasibility, propriety,
and accuracy of an evaluation and its systematic nature, competent conduct, integrity / honesty, respectfulness, and social responsibility – to guide the evaluation and/or report its strengths and weaknesses”, which is adopted in this study.

3.3.1 The application of meta-evaluation

The demand for evaluators to ensure they are creating good quality evaluation work is increasing, which results in the call for a method that provides this kind of service and satisfies the need. Meta-evaluation was originally brought in and popularised based on this purpose. Firstly, meta-evaluation should support decision making, which means meta-evaluation should be done proactively to provide timely recommendations in relation to how evaluation studies should be designed; and also meta-evaluation should serve as accountability for evaluation programmes, which means it should produce technically adequate, useful and cost effective results. Secondly, by conducting meta-evaluation, it should also serve accountability for evaluators themselves, control potential evaluators’ bias, and increase evaluation credibility, which requires meta-evaluation to be done retroactively to produce public judgements of the merits of the evaluation work.

Later on, the role of meta-evaluation has been developed and expanded in the following three ways:

1) A meta-evaluation of the methodology of evaluations

As suggested by Scriven (1969), this type of meta-evaluation is the methodological assessment of the role of evaluation (e.g. Scott-Little, Hamann, & Jurs, 2002; Weed, 2006b). It is about assessing the foundations and principles of the included evaluations. Issues include the basic logic and strategy of research, ontological and epistemological foundation, and methods for collecting evidence. Under this meaning, this type of meta-evaluation is fundamental to ensure the extent that findings of individual evaluation are transferrable, and to understand what were the causal logics underlining each evaluation design, but also to the other two main types of meta-evaluation (discussed in detail below).

2) A meta-evaluation of the performances (i.e. quality and standards) of evaluations

In general, this type of meta-evaluation is applied to assure the quality of evaluations with a purpose of finding direction for improving individual studies and developing evaluative
approaches (e.g. Bustelo, 2002; Madzivhandila, Griffith, Fleming, & Nesamvuni, 2010). As Stufflebeam (2001) identifies, the aim of this type of meta-evaluation is to provide judgement about an evaluation’s utility, feasibility, propriety, and accuracy, to obtain information about its systematic nature, competence, integrity, respectfulness, and social responsibility in order to guide the evaluation and publicly report its strengths and weaknesses.

This kind of meta-evaluation can be categorised into three forms based on the conducting phase of its application: formative and summative meta-evaluations (Stufflebeam & Shinkfield, 2007), and concurrent meta-evaluations (Hanssen, Lawrenz, & Dunet, 2008): formative meta-evaluations – assisting evaluators to plan, improve and report their evaluation studies, which are employed in undertaking and conducting evaluations; summative meta-evaluations - providing judgement to the completed evaluations, which focus on retrospective assessment of completed evaluations; and concurrent meta-evaluations – providing advice to the evaluators, together with giving a summative judgement about the quality of the evaluation, in which continuous involvement, attendance at data collection events, and external verification of the evaluation data are required. In order to measure personnel evaluations, there are some checklists or standards for assessing evaluations’ competence and performance, or judging personnel evaluations, which are developed by such as Joint Committee [e.g. the Program Evaluation Standards (1994), the Personnel Evaluation Standards (1988)], and American Evaluation Association [the Guiding Principles for Evaluators (2004)], which are applied widely in the US and Canada, the Evaluation Centre at Western Michigan University, and many others in the EU (e.g. European Evaluation Society, UK Evaluation Society) and further internationally.

3) A meta-evaluation of the findings of evaluations

Evaluation findings are important for evidence-based policy analysis and performance management (e.g. Davies, 1999; Head, 2008). That is why meta-evaluations have been applied for combining results from multiple evaluation studies in the past decade. In this manner, instead of providing evidence of a single intervention, the findings of different research studies analysing similar or the same social science interventions can be gathered and become larger segments of policy making, and therefore it helps to identify common themes and lessons from this collective experience.
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The process of synthesising results of multiple evaluations provides a fuller understanding of the effectiveness of a particular or similar policy initiative(s). This is often done by conducting a systematic review of the literature that critically follows standard methods and stages to integrate and interpret the studies’ findings.

While all the above three forms of meta-evaluation are valuable, the selection of the form of meta-evaluation for its application is flexible, with some examples of meta-evaluations purely focusing on a single function - meta-evaluation of the theories of prior evaluations, or both the quality standards and the synthesis of findings of included evaluations, or for the purpose of all the three types.

Although as identified above meta-evaluations have three tier functions, we suggest that for a comprehensive and rounded meta-evaluation (see Figure 3.3), it should include both the evaluation of evaluations (which combines the first two types of meta-evaluation we summarised above, i.e. methodology and quality insurance meta-evaluation) and together with a synthesis of the results of one or various evaluations (the function of which is similar to the third type of meta-evaluations):

- **Evaluating the included evaluations** - the focus is on those processes and methodological frameworks; it aims not only to assess the quality of individual inclusion evaluations (the extent to which they can be utilised for policy improvement, accountability, or enlightenment), but also to evaluate and synthesise the methodological framework applied in different studies.

- **Synthesis of the results of one or various evaluations** – gathering and summarising the findings of evaluation studies of similar programmes or policies. The procedure for the synthesis could be on both quantitative studies and qualitative studies; it is different to meta-analysis which only allows quantitative studies to be combined (the distinction between these two concepts - meta-analysis and meta-evaluation - is discussed in detail in later section).
Therefore, given the above discussion, the use of a meta-evaluation framework for London 2012 legacy analysis was appropriate in this research project. If we think back to the purpose of this study, which was to undertake a comprehensive and systematic evaluation of the sub-regional impacts and legacy of the Games in Leicestershire by both ‘top-down’ and ‘bottom-up’ analysis. The ‘top-down’ analysis involves evaluating the evaluations of others, e.g. the changes in baseline socio-economic indicators. As one of the seven selected programmes, the CompeteFor project\(^\text{14}\), was a good example of a project for which only secondary research to evaluate the evaluations of others was feasible, because there was a restrictive protection on the relevant data of the project to which we therefore were unable to obtain access. Thus a critical examination of the methodology was carried out to identify what the study tells (and fails to tell) us about the impact in the sub-region of this programme. The ‘bottom-up’ analysis includes conducting primary analysis and aggregating effects identified in project-

\(^{14}\) It was a project that provided free electronic brokerage services that enabled business to compete for contract opportunities in London 2012’s supply chains. For the detailed evaluation of the programme please refer to the Leicestershire CompeteFor evaluation report which is available at http://www.inspireleics.org.uk/uploads/appendix-2-competefor-evaluation-report.pdf
level evaluations. The Workplace Challenge Programme (WCP)\(^{15}\) was a typical case that required primary research at project-level evaluation in order to establish the level of activity generated under the scheme, and to identify the extent to which any outcomes would have occurred regardless of the upcoming Games. From the above examples, we can be sure that applying meta-evaluation research method fitted with the purpose and nature of our study.

### 3.3.2 Meta-evaluation, evaluation synthesis and meta-analysis: concept and differences

It may be helpful to make a distinction between meta-evaluation and other similar concepts, such as meta-synthesis and meta-analysis, as they are often inappropriately used. As stated above, on the one hand, depending on the use of the purpose, meta-evaluations are applied to assess theories of evaluation, the performance of evaluation studies, or to synthesise the findings of evaluations. On the other hand, meta-synthesis refers to gathering and summarising of the results of evaluation studies of similar programmes or policies (Bustelo, 2002). The focus of meta-synthesis is on results rather on the evaluation processes in order to have an empirical base for judging the general findings of the evaluated programmes or policies.

Another similar concept is meta-analysis which is a special type of synthesis achieved by using a statistical procedure for comparing findings of different studies that deal with a common research question (Stufflebeam, 2001). Its methodology is based on quantitative data analysis.

In sum, all of the three approaches (i.e. meta-evaluation, meta-synthesis and meta-analysis) are normally applied to provide evidence-based policy analysis (Bustelo, 2002) which has important impact on assessing the effectiveness of health and social policy interventions, and accumulating knowledge in the field.

### 3.3.3 Strengths and limitations of meta-evaluation

While the strengths of the meta-evaluation approach have been mentioned to some degree from the above discussion, here it is worth summarising as follows:

\(^{15}\) The WCP was an intervention developed by a Regional County Sport Partnership to increase participation in sport and PA to staff in local workplaces. For the detailed analysis of the programme please refer to Chapter 6.
• Meta-evaluation accumulates the knowledge in the field of the same or a set of evaluations, and offers a better understanding of the evaluation function in the policy cycle;

• It can help to improve the methodological framework used to evaluate a particular area (e.g. basic ontology and epistemology of evaluations, the applied research logic and strategy), in order to ensure the soundness of the foundations of evaluations;

• Meta-evaluation provides a quality assurance mechanism that both programme operators and evaluators can use to assure the integrity and credibility of evaluations. As receiving an increasing pressure of providing policy or service performance evidence, the application of meta-evaluations can help stakeholders to scrutinize evaluations of for instance research and development projects, and thus help them to assess the relevance, dependability, and fairness of evaluation information;

• It can be particularly valuable to the evaluation community as it provides an audit trail of activities in the same study or in a set of evaluations. The completed meta-evaluations can be treated as potential data for a further meta-evaluation in the future. Of course, in order to do so, it also requires a detailed description of methodology in order to maintain its consistency.

Although meta-evaluations have been identified as a hallmark of good evaluation for decades (Scriven, 1969; Stufflebeam, 1974, 2001), relatively little has been identified about the potential issues and pitfalls of this evaluation approach. For example, firstly, the process of sampling for meta-evaluations requires a further clarification. In particular, the inclusion criteria need to be defined clearly and legitimately in order to lessen the likelihood of bias.

Secondly, a potential issue in terms of lack of accuracy when synthesising and interpreting results from the sample of included evaluations occurs when different political and cultural contexts are not taken into account. In fact, in respect to this, it has also been identified as a thorny problem for meta-analysis and meta-synthesis studies in the literature. What is more, as meta-evaluations often incorporate both of those studies this makes it even harder to integrate. In addition, in terms of potential methodological challenges, meta-evaluations certainly face issues in the process of bringing together data, given that different studies may integrate different purposes, be based on different methodological positions, and cover different time periods.
Furthermore, despite the fact that meta-evaluations possess significant advantages, not all evaluations will require a meta-evaluation, simply because for example small-scale or locally focused evaluations may not be able to conduct a meta-evaluation due to an insufficient number of individual evaluations (Stufflebeam, 2001); and even if there are enough individual evaluations, making sure of accessing to data from all studies is another issue. Nevertheless, Stufflebeam does point out that the costs and resources for conducting a meta-evaluation of large-scale evaluations are relatively small compared with the costs for individual evaluations.

3.4 Additionality and related concepts in the assessment of impact

A related set of concepts identified in policy evaluation literature (Office of the Deputy Prime Minister, 2004) and increasingly in the UK context used in the evaluation of sporting impact (e.g. Grant Thornton, Ecorys, & Centre for Olympic Studies and Research Loughborough University, 2011a; Grant Thornton, Ecorys, & Centre for Olympic Studies and Research Loughborough University, 2011b, 2012) is that associated with ‘additionality’ (i.e. the extent to which the impacts are additional).

The concept of additionality originally came from the evaluation of innovation and technology policy in which a justification for public support to technology development in companies was needed so that claims such as public funds did not directly substitute for corporate investment in R&D, but were additional to that which would have happened anyway can be made (Buisseret, Cameron, & Georghiou, 1995). The framework of additionality was developed and refined in the UK in the early 1980s, which later on developed in other European countries (Luukkonen, 2000). In practical terms, additionality has become one of the key concepts together with others, for instance, the general impacts, effectiveness, efficiency, and value for money (HM Treasury, 2003), etc.

Here the focus was on distinguishing the net impact of a project or programme, that is, establishing what additional impacts (and outputs/outcomes) were achieved exclusively as a result of the programme/project rather than those impacts/outcomes which would have occurred anyway.
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Reasons for identifying additionality

The core question to the additionality issue is “what additional impacts (or outputs, outcomes) were achieved exclusively as a result of the programme”. Understanding the extent of additionality is vital to a robust evaluation (HM Treasury, 2003) for the following reasons.

First of all, in terms of the issue of the validity of findings, the final quantitative figures or qualitative reports assessing the impacts created by a particular intervention do not stand up to scrutiny if only the gross impacts are captured. Without assessing additionality it is not clear what the intervention is adding over and above what would have happened anyway. As a result, it might present a misleading picture of the value of a programme due to the fact that only the direct impacts of a programme were measured, and the wider impacts or how the project may have impacted on other activities are not taken into account.

Furthermore, the process of teasing out the additionality of an intervention helps programme/initiative developers and policy makers to gain a better understanding of all stages of an intervention’s lifecycle, to make a comparison between actual achievements and the objectives of a programme, to identify unintentional outputs/outcomes. As a result, when it comes to re-designing or delivering a similar intervention, it can be used in a positive way as a tool that supports the attaining of as many as possible of the intended benefits, maximising the existed linkages.

Overall, the process of defining, or calculating additionality is thus crucial to the maximising of the impacts of an intervention, and to ensuring that it delivers real results. At the end of the process, it draws lessons from the evaluated programme to inform the work of stakeholders, and the development and evaluation of future similar projects.

3.4.1 Different types of additionality

In R&D terms, additionality was differentiated by Georghiou (1994) into three types: input additionality (the extent to which the subsidy is reflected in increased expenditure by the firm); behavioural additionality (a series of actions taken as a result of funding); and output additionality (the extent to which the end results are different as a result of the subsidy). In economic terms, additionality may also relate to: scale additionality (e.g. a greater quantity of jobs or funding may be delivered in an area; this is similar to the concept of input additionality); timing additionality (e.g. activities may happen earlier than would otherwise
have been the case), *specific area or group additionality* (the extent to which the target beneficiaries actually benefit from an intervention), and *quality additionality* (the quality of the outputs/outcomes may be different) (English Partnership, 2008).

In policy evaluation terms, additionality is defined as “the amount of output from a policy as compared with what would have occurred without the government intervention” (HM Treasury, 1988: 26). Policy additionality is based on the *policy counterfactual* which refers to an assessment of the key strategies, policies and initiatives would have been delivered in the absence of an intervention (detailed discussion is provided in the later of the section).

Policy evaluation has long been seen as an important means to improve decision-making and resource allocation (Foley, 1992). Some policy evaluation techniques, e.g. cost-benefit-analysis, were popular in the 1970s; however, their utility was questioned. The attention to policy evaluation was shifted to assessing the value for money of a policy intervention where emphasis was often to be placed on the measurement of counterfacture and additionality by the 1980s.

Indeed, assessing additionality has come to be regarded as an essential step in the policy evaluation cycle when trying to answer the question of whether the particular policies under review have been successful in achieving the outcomes desired; or more importantly, to answer whether the present policy still merits priority (i.e. *Use-of-Resources additionality*). Another type of policy additionality is *programme additionality* which refers to the extent to which the designed programmes/initiatives have leverage effects that would otherwise not have occurred. Ultimately, the additional final social and economic benefit of a policy in relation to the cost (i.e. *value-for-Money additionality*) should be assessed.

---

16 This concept of additionality remains consistent with HM Treasury’s Guide to Appraisal and Evaluation in Central Government (referred to as ‘the Green Book’) and Office of the Deputy Prime Minister’s Guidance on Assessing the Impacts of Spatial Interventions (referred to as the 3Rs guidance).
### Table 3.2 Additionality category in different disciplines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of additionality</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public R&amp;D Programme Evaluation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Input Additionality:</em></td>
<td>the extent to which the subsidy is reflected in increased expenditure by the firm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Behaviour Additionality:</em></td>
<td>a series of action taken as a result of funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Output Additionality:</em></td>
<td>the extent to which the end results are different as the result of the subsidy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spatial Intervention Evaluation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Scale Additionality:</em></td>
<td>the extent to which the inputs and delivered outputs are different as a result of the interventions, which is the most significant type when it comes to assessing overall economic impact in terms of Gross Value Added.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Timing Additionality:</em></td>
<td>the start time, the finish time, or the duration of the created impacts may be different, which are only likely to be an issue for a small number of interventions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Specific area or group Additionality:</em></td>
<td>the extent to which the target beneficiaries actually benefit from an intervention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Quality Additionality:</em></td>
<td>the quality of the outputs/outcomes may be different.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy Intervention Evaluation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>The-use-of-resources: Additionality:</em></td>
<td>the extent to which the present policy merits priority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Programme Additionality:</em></td>
<td>the extent to which the designed programmes/initiatives have leverage effects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Value-for-Money Additionality:</em></td>
<td>the additional final social and economic benefit of a policy in relation to the cost.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.4.2 Measuring additionality

English Partnership (2008) provides practical guidance on the basic information of how to take into account the additionality of interventions with the purpose of ensuring that net impact could be assessed. The formula from Figure 3.4 displays how to assess the net impact, and also presents how to calculate the additionality of the intervention. Here, the application of the additionality formula does not focus on calculation of every precise figure, but rather on providing clarity about the likely scale and nature of an intervention’s additional impacts.

Estimation of the net impact involves adjustments to be made for *leakage, displacement, substitution* and *multiplier effects*. The first step of calculating additionality is to set out the counterfactual scenario which means establishing what would be the case if its antecedent were not true, in other words, what would have happened if the intervention had not gone ahead. For example, when calculating the impacts boosted by the UK hosting the London 2012 Games, the counterfactual scenario is defined as what would have happened had the London 2012 Games not taken place. The counterfactual has two dimensions: (a) the policy counterfactual; (b) the outcome counterfactual (Grant Thornton et al., 2011b).

---

17 It typically relates to regeneration, renewal or regional development initiatives.
(a) **The policy counterfactual:** refers to an assessment of the key strategies, policies, and initiatives that would have been delivered in the absence of the Games. This can be done by reviewing the policy and strategic documents and conducting key stakeholders interviews. For example, there would clearly have been a range of interventions which would have been major drivers of changing people’s behaviour in terms of sport participation even if the Games bid had been unsuccessful. However, as a result of London 2012 Games, the government paid more attention to addressing this issue with a significant injection of funding for existing policies or programmes and the implementation of some new interventions. Therefore, by contrasting these two scenarios, the evaluation may be sensitive enough to capture the genuine impact of staging the Games in terms of policy direction and emphasis.

(b) **The outcome counterfactual:** relates to what results would have occurred on the ground in the absence of the Games. For instance, the national and regional outcome in terms of sport participation counterfactual can be informed by using survey and statistical data (e.g. the Active People, and Taking Part Surveys); to this can be added an assessment at the local level, to be assessed by combining evidence emerging from ‘bottom up’ project-level evaluations with data derived from ‘top down’ national studies.

Only after the counterfactual analysis is conducted, can an estimation of the additional impact of legacy-related activities be made.

**Baseline**

The baseline often is known as the existing position for a given project, which has two dimensions: the policy context baseline and the available data baseline (English Partnership, 2008). It was defined by English Partnership (2008: 13) as “*the state of the economic, social or environmental context at the beginning of the intervention period.*”

The policy context refers to the conditions that are outside the control of the decision-makers in the process. Defining the policy context is important because it will have implications for the delivery and performance of the outputs and outcomes. It is important to set up the baseline which helps to identify the benchmark against which policy change can be assessed. As to the evaluation of 2012 legacy impact for UK, Year 2003 was identified as the starting line for setting up of the both policy context and available data baseline. The reason was
because it was the year when the decision to bid for hosting of the 2012 Olympic Games took place. From that date the government commenced with its related marketing campaigns, and later designing and launching various initiatives and programmes in order to meet the commitments made in the bid. This resulted in changes in the social environment, and the policy context across the UK. For the sub-region however (the level at which this study was undertaken) it was necessary to adopt a more restricted time horizon since regional response to the changing national context was effectively fore-shortened. We adopted therefore the policy baseline date as the Year 2010\textsuperscript{18}. This was due to firstly although the core members of the Leicestershire 2012 Steering Group were gathered around in 2009, the official formalisation of the operational team, i.e. Inspire Leicestershire, and the sub-regional London 2012 strategy document were established in early 2010. Subsequently, the sub-regional legacy-relate data and policy documents became available, which thus assisted this evaluation. The review of some national and regional strategies and reports in relation to the three themes (Sport participation, CYP and volunteering) provided us a root for building up the policy context baseline.

Available data on the baseline position was required to establish a benchmark such that subsequent changes can be estimated. Whether these changes would have been attributable to policy action is a matter to be evidenced and argued for. For example, estimating the impact of an intervention with the objective of increasing physical activity participation levels would require, amongst other things, the establishing of the physical activity participation rate for the target population prior to the baseline period.

After defining the counterfactual scenario and establishing the baseline, there are four principal elements need to be taken into account when assessing the net impact:

- **Leakage**: the proportion of outputs that benefit those outside of the intervention’s target area or group. For example, to what extent do benefits generated intended for the sub-region / the country actually benefit entities outside of the sub-region or even the country?

- **Displacement**: the proportion of intervention outputs / outcomes elsewhere in the target area. Are the initiatives simply displacing other activities or services previously provided?

\textsuperscript{18} Different legacy strands may have different baselines depends on the time of a particular legacy strand was introduced and started to operate in the sub-region.
- **Substitution**: this effect arises where a beneficiary substitutes one activity for a similar one to take advantage of better priced (and/or more heavily subsidised) activities. In our case for example do consumers of services simply substitute what is offered by new legacy schemes for what they were already doing elsewhere?

- **Multiplier effects**: these occur when the benefits of an activity go beyond the immediate recipients of a service. For instance, to what extent do direct benefits from legacy policies (such as stimulating the recruitment and use of sporting volunteers) trigger indirect benefits resulting from this intervention (for example generating more volunteers may increase the supply of sporting opportunities and thus enhance participation).

The assessment of net impact thus formally expressed in the formula:

**Figure 3.4 Net impact calculation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Net Impact</th>
<th>Additionality of Intervention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NI*</td>
<td>( [G I \times (1-L) \times (1-D) \times (1-S) \times M] )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*after taking into account of the counterfactuals effects

Source: adapted from (English Partnership, 2008)

### 3.4.3 The importance and issues of assessing the additionality

As demonstrated above, issues such as additionality are important to much research, and yet are often oversimplified or even omitted from consideration. The process of conceptualising these key elements in each intervention not only facilitates making a specific estimation of interventions’ impact, but also reflects what challenges may arise in the period of data collection. Indeed, assessing additionality is not always a straightforward process which requests a good understanding and knowledge of the intervention and judgement, together with sufficient information which can support to identify its four core concepts. Overall, the programme of additionality remains a core issue for evaluation insofar as it addresses whether there is a rationale for intervention (Georghiou, 1998).

There are some issues in relation to assessing additionality which are worth addressing here. For example, firstly, the growth of the application of the methodological framework has been significant over the past two decades, and yet the degree of its application varies in different studies. The complex nature of additionality’s key concepts requires different types of
examination. However, when for example evaluators conduct investigation, often only one or two simple counterfactual-type questions are asked to respondents to indicate whether the programme would have taken place (Mceldowney, 1997) or when reporting the results of additional impacts of a programme, only two degrees of additionality (i.e. high or low) are considered grossly oversimplifying the basis for making any claims about additionality.

Secondly, as with any kind of research, risks of bias exist in assessing additionality. When conducting an investigation, information is often collected through key stakeholder interviews. This can be a problem as organisations in receipt of funding assistance may exaggerate the positive influence of their programme/initiative in order to support their position. Thus a careful consideration of additionality will be required in considering policy documents and strategy statements.

### 3.5 Logic models

For the evaluation of any intervention’s impact, a useful first step is to develop a logic model. Basically, a logic model is “a systematic and visual way to present and share your understanding of the relationship among the resources you have to operate your program, the activities you plan to do, and the changes or results you hope to achieve” (W. K. Kellogg Foundation, 2001: 1). It is a picture of how your programme works and to what end, which thus is refers to as *theory*. According to DCMS’s 2012 Legacy evaluation framework (DCMS, 2009), it is essential to develop logic model for each intervention as it is integral to the development of effective evaluation planes.

However, different to the traditional logic model, this study argues that the logic models produced for each programme evaluation were regarded as being the view of one set of stakeholders only. As this study based on critical realism methodological foundation (see Chapter 5 for detailed discussion), one perspective that critical realists emphasis (and also is recognised by constructionist), is to understanding the way that different stakeholders view the world (and the policy problem, its intervention and so on). Therefore, to have a single logic model would seem to deny the possibility of other views. There might be several logic models that one might face for the same intervention or programme. According to Chelimsky (1985), the scope of evaluation includes three broad categories of questions: (1) ‘how many people are engaged in particular programme activities and what form their participation takes?’; (2) ‘To what extent a programme is operating as originally intended?’; (3) ‘whether
or not a programme has worked?’. Yet, this last point that Chelimsky outlines leaves aside the issue of in whose view the programme has worked or not. This is at the root of the multiple-constituency approach which this study adopts. In the field of organisational effectiveness research, there has been a debate between the organizational goals approach and the systems approaches as to which theory appeals to be a ‘better’ way to be used to study organisational effectiveness. The traditional organizational goals approach, which is based on the identification of different goals, and how well the organisation attains or makes progress toward them (Slack, 2006), emphasises the outputs of the organisation (Chelladurai, 1985); While the systems approach, which argues that organisations may be evaluated by how well they solve the four essential problems: goal attainment, adaptation, integration, and pattern maintenance (Connolly, Conlon, & Deutsch, 1980), emphasises the inputs (Chelladurai, 1985). Connolly et al. (1980) propose an alternative approach – Multiple-Constituency approach - which, in essence, is based on a view of effectiveness that allows multiple evaluations from multiple constituencies. Here, ‘constituencies’ refers to the criterion sets of different individuals and groups. Go back to what we argued against the third point that Chelimsky suggest ‘whether or not a programme has worked’, the answer to this question is inevitably contingent on whom one is asking. As Connolly et al. (1980) emphasis that different stakeholders adopt divergent views of what the organisation’s goals should be, it has an empirical matter to this study that in order to conduct an evaluation to reveal the fact, a certain degree of considerations of different perspectives that different stakeholders may need to be addressed by starting from being aware of the existence of various analytic logic models from diverse stakeholders.

**The structure and key elements of a logic model**

The logic model outlines the objectives, throughputs, inputs, outputs, and outcomes for a particular initiative based on expectations given the activities proposed and experience of similar projects. The common structure of a logic chain is presented in Figure 3.5. Table 3.3 indicates the definition of the key elements of logic model.
Figure 3.5 The structure of a classic logic chain

Table 3.3 Definitions of the key elements of a logic model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key elements of Logic model</th>
<th>What are they?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rationale</strong></td>
<td>The rationale behind the programme intervention, i.e. which areas are targeted to achieve what kinds of outcomes from a policy maker’s point of view</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objectives</strong></td>
<td>The objectives of the programme which have been set out by stakeholders in the period before the programme was launched</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inputs</strong></td>
<td>The inputs refer to materials and human resources which have been used to implement the programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Throughputs</strong></td>
<td>The throughputs mean what kinds of actions have taken place by whom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outputs</strong></td>
<td>The outputs are looking for summarising what directly ‘credits’ have got as results of inputs and activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcomes</strong></td>
<td>The outcomes are the changes in behaviour triggered by delivering the programme, which could be split into short-term and long-term outcomes as it may continue for many years after the projects has completed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: adapted from DCMS’s 2012 legacy evaluation framework (2009)

Analytic logic models

According to the role of logic model, there are two different types, a Descriptive Logic Model, and an Analytic Logic Model. A Descriptive Logic Model focuses on simply presenting and describing the above six key elements. The function of it is to map out a proposed programme that helps stakeholders and evaluators visualize and understand, at the very basic level, how financial and human investments can contribute to achieving intended programme goals. By contrast to the Analytic Logic Model, although also acting as an informative tool, it presents in addition causal links between inputs and outputs and outcomes. As outlined above the logic model provides and outline of the basic theory of the whole programme, with an analytic logic model emphasising how and why a programme works. In other word, it links theoretical ideas together to explain underlying programme assumptions in order to learn lessons from this particular example and to apply to somewhere else. This function provides rich explanation of the reasons for what exactly particular kinds of inputs or resources can contribute to change. It also identifies the problems or issues that are
addressed by the programme, in the meantime, provides reasons for selecting certain solution strategies and potential activities.

In addition, as Weiss (1998) points out clearly for any programme evaluation, it is important to know not only what the program expects to achieve but also how. Understanding the principles on which a programme is based is essential in the sense of understanding whether, how, and why a program works. Through drawing and displaying these key elements of logic model (inputs, throughputs, outputs, and outcomes), the assumed causal linkages can be tested and monitored in evaluations of the programme. This concept is important because in practice an evaluation often easily measures the outputs but misses out outcomes and the causal relationships between inputs and outcomes.

For instance, LRS launched the Workplace Challenge programme in order to promote the benefits of a healthy and supportive working environment to all employees and organisations in Leicestershire. They started with providing financing support and extra staff (i.e. inputs) to create a programme website, to design and deliver different types of physical activity events and so on (i.e. throughputs). The only observable indicator after finishing the programme was how many employees and organisations participated in the scheme (i.e. outputs). However, were these numbers really demonstrating what this programme sought to achieve (i.e. outcomes and impacts), and how did these numbers explain whether or not local staffs health status has improved? Do we even know what exactly this initiative was expected to achieve in the first place, and by what means?

This series of questions illustrates that it is necessary to think through the following factors in advance of conducting a programme evaluation (a) rationales and objectives of programme, (b) what are the assumptions underlying the programme (c) what kinds of resources are needed for delivering this programme, (d) what kinds of direct outputs are hoping to get as a results of implementing what kinds of actives, (d) finally, whether these outputs will lead to our expected outcomes and hopefully to the long-term impacts.

This kind of the discussion of a programme will guide evaluators to collect required credible evidence, and lead them to pay attention to the right paths by which outcomes and impacts are produced. Of course, this takes us back to Pawson and Tilley’s realist evaluation models. In our case, in terms of learning lessons from legacy, developing an analytic logic model for every programme was to make sure that we can explain how this works. In fact, we went
beyond simply describing what had been done in a particular legacy-programme to analyse the causal mechanisms which were anticipated to produce desired outcomes. As a consequence of this, lessons learned could both inform stakeholders, and could be applied to other similar contexts.

3.6 Conclusion

This chapter reviewed a range of policy evaluation approaches, including realist evaluation and other significant evaluation models, including meta-evaluation, and the assessment of additionality. These frameworks represent in most instances the dominant view of how policy evaluation should be approached. In particular, the realist framework appears to offer a persuasive set of insights into how to identify the mechanisms for change triggered by a programme and how to explain whether they counteract, reinforce (or are neutral in respect of) the existing social processes in a particular context. In this case the ‘meso’ context is a non-hosting sub-region; and each programme investigated has its own context targeting different social groups). Following this model, an important aspect for empirical investigation in the study is the identification and exploration of the mechanisms, outcomes and contexts of the proposed legacy programmes. In terms of meta-evaluation, its nature and peculiarities make it suitable for a comprehensive evaluation project, such as this, which seeks to develop evidence-based approaches to outcomes by gathering evidence from a range of projects or policy programmes. It is also considered to have the greatest capacity to account for providing theoretical guidance on data synthesis and analysis, as well as scrutinising the quality of evaluations. The process of teasing out the issues surrounding additionality is acknowledged as a critical and significant step in providing realistic evidence-based policy evaluation in practice. However, it should be noted that operationalizing its related key concepts has proved difficult. Nevertheless, its principles and mechanisms provide conceptual tools for ensuring the quality of the evaluations.
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4.1 Introduction

The aim of conducting a literature review is often to enable the researcher both to map and to assess the existing intellectual territory, and to specify a research question to develop the existing body of knowledge further (Tranfield, Denyer, & Smart, 2003). It is a vital and integral part of the research process and instrumental in guiding the decisions made by the researcher on how to carry the study forward.

There is a well-established stream of literature which covers the legacies, or other similar terms, such as ‘impacts’, ‘effects’, of previous Olympics, or broader, like mega sporting events, with notable examples being those by McCartney et al (2010), Weed et al (2009), Preuss (2004b), Rose and Speigel (2011), Baade and Matheson (2002), Cashman (2002), Chalkley and Essex (1999), Coalter (2004) etc. Despite of the fact that there are already two valuable pieces of systematic review work on the subject of sport participation impact of mega sporting events (including the Olympics) existed in the literature (McCartney et al., 2010; Weed et al., 2009), so far, there is not any literature review that specifically addresses the issues in relation to the Olympic Games legacies per se. Indeed, the Olympic legacy spreads over a wide range of areas, not only in relation to health and sport, but also to economy, tourism, volunteering, urban regeneration, and social, etc. It is thus important to conduct a literature review that provides an overview of the Olympic legacy/impact in a systematic and rigours manner. Therefore, this study aimed to carry out a systematic review to synthesise the findings, approaches and methods in relation to the subject of Olympic legacy/impact from the literature.

4.2 Systematic review methodology

In order to seek the answer of in which way that researchers can put the evidence into evidence-based practice, the systematic review approach was initially developed in medical sciences (e.g. Eysenbach, Powell, Kuss, & Sa, 2002). Later on, this method of synthesising evidence has been widespread to other fields, such as psychology (e.g. Eccleston, Morley,
Williams, Yorke, & Mastroyannopoulou, 2002), policy (Pawson, 2002), and social sciences (Stuck et al., 1999).

4.2.1 **What is a systematic review?**

Defined by Klassen et al (1998: 701), the systematic review is “a review in which there is a comprehensive search for relevant studies on a specific topic, and those identified are then appraised and synthesised according to a pre-determined explicit method”. Key features of the systematic review, e.g. transparency, reproducibility, and systematism, make the review process better serve the purpose of enhancing the knowledge base and informing policymaking and practice (Tranfield et al., 2003). With regard to the transparency aspect, it means that the criteria for the inclusion or exclusion of studies in the review is explicit from the outset, which therefore makes it replicable as if others may not agree with the criteria, they can trace back to the ‘raw data’ and create their own inclusion. In terms of systematism, the whole process, from the very beginning, i.e. creating review panel, carefully defining the scope of the review and criteria for inclusions and exclusion, to the end, appraising and synthesising the results, makes the review more rigorous and structured.

In contrast, traditional used literature review approach is so-called narrative review which is a process of synthesizing primary studies, and offers a ‘tour’ of research in the area selected by the author (Weed, 2006b). However, it does not present a comprehensive coverage of the target area, and is viewed as lack of thoroughness (Tranfield et al., 2003) as these reviews can be biased by the researcher. It often argues that the traditional literature reviews, even those written by experts, can be made to tell any story on wants them to. They fail to apply scientific principles to the process of reviewing the evidence that therefore can lead to biased conclusions (Petticrew & Roberts, 2006). Differed from narrative reviews, systematic reviews provide objective, replicable, systematic, and comprehensive coverage of a defined area (Weed, 2006b). Meta-analysis approach is often mixed up with systematic review method. It is a special type of synthesis by using a statistical procedure for comparing findings of different studies (See Table 4.1 for the comparison with different literature review approaches).
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Table 4.1 Different approaches for a literature review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Narrative review</td>
<td>The process of synthesizing primary studies and exploring heterogeneity descriptively, rather than statistically.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systematic (literature) review</td>
<td>A review that strives to comprehensively identify, appraise, and synthesize all the relevant studies on a given topic. Systematic reviews are often used to test just a single hypothesis, or a series of related hypotheses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meta-analysis</td>
<td>A review that uses a specific statistical technique for synthesizing the results of several studies into a single quantitative estimate (i.e. a summary effect size)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: adapted from (Petticrew & Roberts, 2006: 19)

4.2.2 Reasons and limitations of conducting a systematic review

The review approach of systematic review selected for this study was mainly based on the following two reasons.

The first reason was derived from the idea of providing evidence based policy analysis. Similar to the meta-evaluation approach, systematic reviews are forms of research synthesis which is increasingly sprouting and viewed as a promising practice (Leseure, Bauer, Birdi, Neely, & Denyer, 2004). Over the last 15 years, the idea of evidence-based practice has been advocated and developed by academics and policy-makers. In the context of conducting a literature review, it is concerned with improving the quality of the review process by synthesizing research in a systematic, transparent, and reproducible manner to inform policy and decision making about the organisation and delivery of a respective discipline (Cook, Greengold, Ellrodt, & Weingarten, 1997; Tranfield et al., 2003). With this manner, ‘best evidence’ can then be assimilated.

The second point was in relation to an often controversial view that the bias exists in a traditional literature review. As Tranfield et al (2003) proposed, by applying specific principles of the methodology, systematic review helps with counteracting bias by making explicit the values and assumptions underpinning a review. It enhances the legitimacy and authority of the resultant evidence. As a result, it could provide policy-makers with a reliable basis to formulate decisions and take action. This advantage that systematic reviews possess is particularly sobering when considering such a significant project – for example hosting the Olympics - involves over billions financial investment and enormous human resource requirement, it demands a rigorous literature review in order to provide detailed guidance and best-practice manuals in this disciplines.
Chapter 4 A Systematic Review of the Literature (1996-2011) on the Subject of Olympic Legacy

By conducting a systematic review on the subject of the Olympics legacy/impact, it helped to review the existing research in the Olympics related effects, or organisational and management questions, assessing the best evidence available, collating the findings and presenting them in a way that was accessible and relevant to decision-makers.

However, it does not mean that all literature reviews should be systematic reviews. Firstly, given a relatively complex and strict search strategy defined by systematic reviews, it deems to require more time commitment and accessibility to a wide range of resources. The information explosion noted in the next section creates a difficult scenario for most people who are required to do a systematic review. According to Badger et al. (2010), the amount of time and money required by a systematic review is nearly twice that of a narrative literature review and yet still may not analyse all the data that are collected. In addition, conducting a systematic review where there are well-established findings will probably yield a low return for the resources invested.

Another disadvantage of systematic reviews occurs during the process of identifying research evidence. As it is the review team itself which defines and selects the key variables of its study population (e.g. the selected electronic databases), decisions about which databases should be used may unintentionally introduce bias into the review (refers to ‘the impact of publication bias’ by Centre for Reviews and Dissemination, 2009), resulting in the omission of some potential bodies of literature from other databases. In addition, only using electronic databases means that for many such databases only published journal articles could be included, which may lead to the review being subject to publication bias as this approach is unlikely to identify studies that have not been published in peer reviewed journals (Centre for Reviews and Dissemination, 2009) (although efforts of including ‘valuable’ sources from relevant books was made in the scoping study element, this may not be considered sufficient). With regard to this point, potential issues also exist at the stage of scoping study, such as the possibility of some relevant databases may not have been located due to the knowledge limitation of the review panel (Goldner et al., 2011).

Lastly, it must also be acknowledged that similar biases that often arguably existed in ‘traditional’ literature reviews can apply to systematic reviews. The flaws lie in for example the lack of any systematic critical appraisal of the included studies, or an over restricted search for relevant studies, a lack of exploration of heterogeneity among the studies, etc. (Petticrew & Roberts, 2006).
4.2.3 The systematic review process

This study used the systematic review approach to identify articles relating to the Olympics legacy/impact that come out from refereed journals and grey literatures in the five-year period from the start of 1996 to the June of 2011 (See Table 4.2 for the detailed search strategy). It examined both the Summer Olympic Games and the Winter Olympic Games, and the range of areas (e.g. impacts, values, effects, etc.) covered in those articles, thus establishing a summary of current knowledge and issues in the Olympic legacy/impact sector.

By following the guidance of the stages of a systematic review provided by Clark and Oxman (2001) (see Figure 4.1), the main steps taken in this systematic review are summarised in Table 4.2.

Figure 4.1 Stages of a systematic review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage I: Planning the review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase 0 Identification of the need for a review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1 Preparation of a proposal for a review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2 Development of a review protocol</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage II: Conducting a review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase 3 Identification of research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 4 Selection of studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 5 Study quality assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 6 Data extraction and monitoring progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 7 Data synthesis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage III: Reporting and Dissemination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase 8 The report and recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 9 Getting evidence into practice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: adapted from (Clarke & Oxman, 2001)*
### Stage 1: Planning the review

| Step 1: Forming a review panel | Professor Ian Henry (Sports & Leisure Policy)            |
|                               | Louise Fletcher (librarian specialised in sports)         |
|                               | Shushu Chen (PhD Candidate)                              |

**Stage 2: Conducting a review**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 4. Identification of research</th>
<th>Olympic legacy, Olympic effects, Olympic benefits, Olympic values, Olympic impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 5. Evaluation of studies</th>
<th>Group keywords into search strings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Include studies based on criteria</td>
<td>1. Olympic* AND legac*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Olympic* AND impact*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Olympic* AND value*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Olympic* AND effect*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Olympic* AND benefit*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Define appropriate databases**

- Web of Science
- SPORTDiscus
- Science Direct
- Business Source Complete
- EconLitc
- Emerald
- Leisuretourism.com
- Scopus
- Grey literature: Intute, Index to Theses, Open Grey, Google, Google Scholar

**Stage 3: Reporting and dissemination**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 8: Reporting findings</th>
<th>Step 9: Informing research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Table 4.2 Key stages of the systematic review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 1: Planning the review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1.</strong> Planning the review panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Ian Henry (Sports &amp; Leisure Policy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louise Fletcher (librarian specialised in sports)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shushu Chen (PhD Candidate)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Stage 2: Conducting a review**

**Stage 3: Reporting and dissemination**
Stage1: Planning the review

Step 1 Forming a review panel

The members of a review panel were selected based on their background and the expertise related to the field of the study, and also their involvement within the PhD process.

The panel members were as follows:

- Professor Ian Henry (Sports & Leisure Policy)
- Louise Fletcher (Liberian specialised in sports)
- Shushu Chen (PhD Candidate)

The first panel meeting was held on 8th June 2011. During the meeting, the panel identified the aim of this systematic review, the appropriate databases and the key terms. This will be outlined later.

Step 2 Mapping the field of study

The process of literature mapping was undertaken in March 2011 in order to gain a broad perspective of the field and to clarify and delimit the aims and objective of the review. This process is referred to as the ‘Scoping Study’ which includes a brief overview of the related topics surrounding the field of mega sporting events’ impacts (in particular, the Olympics).

The scoping study was useful to establish a brief overview of the related topics surrounding the field, including theoretical, practical, and methodological history and key discussions (Tranfield et al., 2003). It also helped to identify appropriate keywords, search strings, and databases. The scoping study was a good way to establish a brief overview of the related topics surrounding the field, including theoretical, practical and methodological history and key discussions.

Step 3 Developing a review protocol

The criteria for inclusion and exclusion were established (See Table 4.3). Beside the academic relevance and language in English, the publication date was limited to after 1995 as IOC started to address the considerable public concerns relating to the legacies of the Olympic Games only since 2000, and also in order to capture the current trend in the study field the panel decided to limit the publication data after 1995 in which the Atlanta Games
was just about to start. With the purpose of ensuring the quality of papers, the panel considered that all the papers have to be peer reviewed. Publication length was required to be more than 5 pages as the length less than 5 papers might be litter or no academic merit. In addition, depending on the functionality of each individual database, the detailed refine criteria were defined in order to extract the most relevant articles.

Table 4.3 Inclusion criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Academic relevant and peer reviewed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Language in English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Length (5 pages or more)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stage 2: Conducting a review

Step 4 Identification of research

In order to get the most relevant papers related to the topic in this review, the panel decided to construct keywords into search strings rather than to use a single keyword. The selection of the keywords was identified by the panel based on their prior experience. There were five search strings identified (See Table 4.4)

Table 4.4 Combinations of keywords

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Combinations of keywords</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Olympic* AND legac*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Olympic* AND impact*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Olympic* AND value*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Olympic* AND effect*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Olympic* AND benefit*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of the databases, the panel identified 13 databases (including the databases for grey literature) to search for keywords based on the relevance to the sports, social science, and business and economic management fields (see Table 4.5).

Table 4.5 Databases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journals Databases</th>
<th>Grey Literature Databases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Web of Science</td>
<td>9. Intute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. SPORTDiscus</td>
<td>10. Index to Theses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. EconLitec</td>
<td>13. Google</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Emerald</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Leisuretourism.com</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Scopus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The data extraction was conducted in June 2011. The keyword combinations were entered in each database, and the number of results published in each database returned is presented in the following Table 4.6.

Step 5 Evaluation of studies

The title and abstract of all papers from the results of searches were screened from inclusion by the author. If there was any indecision, it would be brought for discussion with another reviewer Professor Ian Henry. This manual inclusion and exclusion was based on the criteria agreed by the panel.

Step 6 Conducting data extraction

The systematic literature search yielded eight journal databases and five grey literature databases, of which 1683 results returned. Data-extraction forms were created to present details of these returned results (See Table 4.7). 1167 papers (of which, 998 from Journal databases, 169 from Grey literature) was excluded either because they are irrelevant to the context, or their page number are less than 5, or they are duplicated. After the assessment of each result based on their titles and abstracts, 115 papers were identified, together with the articles that analysed during the stage of scoping study\(^\text{19}\), for a further examination (See Figure 4.2 for details. Please contact the author for the list of included and excluded articles).

\(^{19}\) Some of those articles do not directly link with the Olympic context but were included here as they proved to be valuable for reviewing of the methodological context of major events.
Table 4.6 First extraction results from 13 selected databases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Databases / Keywords</th>
<th>Olympic* AND legacy*</th>
<th>Olympic* AND impact*</th>
<th>Olympic* AND value*</th>
<th>Olympic* AND effect*</th>
<th>Olympic* AND benefit*</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Web of Science</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPORTDiscus, Business Source Complete, EconLitect</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Direct</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerald</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisuretourism.com</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scopus</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intute</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index to Theses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Grey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Google Scholar</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Google</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Databases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1464 (Journal) + 219 (Grey) = 1683</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>382</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Total (exclude duplicate)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1301</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.7 Data extraction statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journals Databases</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Included</th>
<th>In Total: included paper (Journals + Grey)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Web of Science</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. SPORTDiscus, 3. Business Source Complete, 4. EconLitect</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Science Direct</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Emerald</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Leisuretourism.com</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Scopus</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1464</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grey Literature Databases</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Included</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. Intute</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Index to Theses</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Open Grey</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Google Scholar</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Google</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Figure 4.2 A flow chart for search and selection of studies

Based on the Refining Criteria (see Appendix B), references identified through database searching and screened

References identified from other sources

1464 titles were screened for duplication

219 titles and abstracts were reviewed for relevance

Articles and books from the scoping studies study

357 duplicate articles were excluded

1107 titles and abstracts were reviewed for relevance

155 articles were excluded:
(a) Less than 5 pages (n=145)
(b) Irrelevant to the topic (n=885)

1030 articles were excluded:
(a) Less than 5 pages (n=145)
(b) Irrelevant to the topic (n=885)

26 duplicate articles were excluded

77 full articles were read +38 Grey literature=115
4.3 Descriptive and thematic analysis

The following sections provide a description of the nature of the studies that identified in the search of the literature, which aim to map out the broad categories researched; together with a thematic analysis of the emerged issues of each category. In this case, seven areas of the Olympic legacy/impact were identified: urban regeneration, volunteering, social impact (more broadly), economy, tourism, sport participation, and legacy. The analysis was used to assess in some significant detail if and how the issues relating to the research questions had been discussed in previous literature.

4.3.1 Urban regeneration

The arguments surrounding urban regeneration arise from the nature and characterises of the Olympic Games. The scale and status of the Olympic Games, the ability to attract international media attention and to bring in investments, make it an unique mega-event, which have been increasingly used as a trigger for a wider range of urban improvements (Chalkley & Essex, 1999; Davis & Thornley, 2010; Essex & Chalkley, 1998; Newman, 1999). Nevertheless, the typicality of the Olympic Games has impacts not only on bringing short-term international participation and attention, but also on having long-term consequences for the host city (Hall, 1992; Ritchie & Smith, 1991; Roche, 1994). The benefits of hosting the Olympic Games have been studied in a certain depth in the literature – from as a tool of developing economic and promoting physical regeneration, to recently highly appreciative as an opportunity for infrastructural investment, environmental improvement, and enhancing a city’s global recognition, image and reputation, etc. (Chalkley & Essex, 1999; Essex & Chalkley, 1998; Kitchen, 1996). In particularly, the Olympic Games have been recognised as a significant catalyst of urban change and can act as a key instrument of urban policy for their host cities.

The outcomes of urban regeneration are varied from different cases. On a broader scale, it involves the improvement of transport networks, air terminals, sport, tourist and cultural facilities, enhancing the city’s landscape and physical appearance, etc. (Chalkley & Essex, 1999; Essex & Chalkley, 1998). The 1960 Rome Olympics provided the first example of using the Olympics as a trigger for both new sports facilities and substantial improvement to the urban infrastructure. It is widely accepted that the 1992 Barcelona Olympics is perhaps the best indication of the Olympic potential role as a catalyst of large-scale urban
improvement and consequently they have had a wider impact on the host city’s built environment. Particularly in the case of the three Asian hosts (i.e. 1964 Tokyo, 1988 Seoul, and 2008 Beijing), the Olympic Games gave the host cities impetus to their huge urban regeneration plan, including reducing pollution problems, improving standards of water quality, hygiene and sewage disposal. The concept of ‘sustainable urban development’ has been added to the mission of modern Olympic Games development – Sydney 2000 is a good example as they emphasised environmental protection, and incorporated ‘green’ design principles, such as energy conservation and recycling (IOC, 1993).

In reviewing the literature, some issues with regards to using Olympic Games as a trigger for urban change are identified. Firstly, having recognised that preparations for mega-event like the Olympics are certain to have significant impacts on host cities’ urban regeneration, the question contested is whether the average urban citizen may receive same or more direct benefits than the costs they have paid, whether the decision to bid is based on a clear expression of public opinion (Roche, 1994). It is not surprised to see that these concerns in relation to social inequality have surfaced as a decision to bid for the Olympics is made by the city’s political authorities, backed by the national government and by business corporations (Cochrane, Peck, & Tickell, 1996), in many cases the bid preparation is ‘fast-tracked’ with only limited public consultation and an incomplete evaluation of the social and economic implications (Hall, 1992).

Secondly, the issue of gentrification has also been recognised in the literature. A successful urban regeneration may lead to upgrade an area and increase land and property values (Davis & Thornley, 2010). The bidding for the Games likely exacerbate urban problems, e.g. extra costs can emerge through increased taxes raised to finance the sporting infrastructure, and destruction of existing communities through building projects.

Thirdly, the failure of Atlanta 1996 Olympic Games to use the opportunity to revitalise its central city neighbourhoods explores that it is difficult to provide the parity between the costs and benefits of the Games on neighbourhood residents (only those areas closest to Olympic venues received substantial support for revitalisation) (Newman, 1999).
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Fourthly, the ‘White Elephant’ stadium and sporting facilities have been long time under debate. Chalkley and Essex (1999) point that the types of facilities that the Olympic Games require are quite specialised and are unlikely to be used by a return visit – only three cities have hosted the Games more than once. Therefore, under these circumstances, in order to create more lasting benefits host cities have needed to give particular attention to funding issues and to ensure that investments prove worthwhile in the longer term.

Finally, it is difficult to quantify the legacy of urban regeneration as a result of hosting the Games. Davis and Thornely (2010) argue that the characteristics of the Games legacy, i.e. short-term or long-term, tangible or intangible, direct or indirect, foreseen or unforeseen, positive or negative, make it very difficult to evaluate the legacy of urban regeneration in any terms, for instance, the lost alternatives that have been usurped by using the land or resources for the Olympics, or it is difficult to define the counterfactual scenario and pin directly on the Games themselves because they are part of a broader ongoing process (Essex & Chalkley, 1998).

In the case of London 2012 Olympic Games, a great emphasis on legacy and regeneration was been placed by the government. In particular, having recognised that the ‘East End’ has contained the poorest neighbourhoods and had a long association with the low paid and casual dockland employment, the Mayor of London readdressed this issue and listed the regeneration and sustainable development in East London, especially in the five Host boroughs of Greenwich, Hackney, Newham, Tower Hamlets and Waltham Forest, as a priority with the strategic objectives (The Mayor of London, 2008). A major challenge to London is the post-games use of the facilities in order to ensure long-term benefits. In order to avoid ‘White elephant’ effect, long-term planning for the exploitation of the Olympic assets beforehand is vital – which is the lesson learned from Athens Games that two years after the Athens Games finished, Athens government plan for the assets’ utilisation was put into practice (Kissoudi, 2008).

It is promising to see the first step towards to the exploitation of the Olympic legacy was made in Aug 2011, when Olympic Delivery Authority secured £275m as a return for UK taxpayers from selling London’s Olympic Village to Qatari (Kollewe, 2011). In addition,

---

20 A white elephant generally refers to newly established expensive sporting facilities being poorly used after the Games.
according to the plan, there will be 2,818 affordable housing left for Londoner after the village converted into a neighbourhood.

### 4.3.2 Volunteering

Perhaps it is because that debatable concerns on whether the use of public funds to host sports events and/or build stadia and facilities can yield potential benefits to a community, thus the literature has focused more on the direct and indirect economic benefits and costs associated with these investments, in order to seek any obvious answers in monetary term, whereas, less is written about the intangible economic impact, or on the ‘human legacy’ (Downward & Ralston, 2006). Olympic volunteering can be counted as one of the intangible Olympic legacies. The importance of volunteers in sporting events has been recognised during the past decade (Giannoulakis et al., 2008). Nevertheless, there has been a dearth of materials which specifically address the role of volunteering in organising mega-sporting events. There are a relatively large number of articles in the literature deals with the issues on sport volunteers, but not Olympic volunteer which is why the total number of included articles in this systematic review is small. The number of included articles in relation to the volunteering theme is few (n = 9, five from the scoping study). Within this literature, the specific characteristics and motivations of being a volunteer at a major sporting event are treated more directly with more critical approaches and empirical results by a number of authors (Bang, Alexandris, & Ross, 2008; Downward & Ralston, 2006; Farrell, Johnston, & Twynam, 1998; Giannoulakis et al., 2008; Kemp, 2002), while others have demonstrated concerns on the evolution and development of Olympic volunteering (Bladen, 2009; Chalip, 1999; MacAlloon, 1999; Moragas, Moreno, & Paniagua, 1999).

The concept of the Olympic volunteer was first defined explicitly in the Official Report of the Barcelona Olympic Games 1992: “the volunteer is a person who makes an individual, altruistic commitment to collaborate, to the best of his/her abilities in the organisation of the Olympic Games, carrying out the tasks assigned to him/her without receiving payment or rewards of any other nature” (COOB'92, 1992: 381). Continuous growth of the scale of the Olympic Games requires the organising committee to recruit more volunteers to work on different position in various areas, e.g. transportation, security, medical aids, game operation support, venue operation support, news operation support, cultural activity organisation support, protocol reception (Giannoulakis et al., 2008), and different activities, e.g. torch relay, pre-Olympic training, and Olympic Games time (Chalip, 1999).
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The recognition of the importance of volunteers in Olympic Games is a relatively recent phenomenon for researchers and the Olympic movement. Since the Olympic volunteering programme was first implemented in the 1980 Lake Placid Olympics, volunteerism has become a growing trend not only for the operation of the Olympic Games, but also for the successful implementation of the event (Giannoulakis et al., 2008). A major side effect of the rapid growth in the size of the Olympic Games (referring to gigantism) has been the growing pressure of recruiting a large number of volunteers for supporting delivery of the Games. The number of Olympic volunteers has increased substantially during the past two decades (see Figure 4.3). Previous Games are definitive confirmations of the growing importance of the volunteer phenomenon as an integral element of the success of the Games. That is why the voluntary element is now seen as important to the sustainability of the Games (Moragas et al., 1999). As summarised by Moragas et al (1999: 151), there are three main aspects that demonstrate the importance of the Olympic volunteering:

- From the political point of view, it represents the uniting of individual energies into a common project, a new form of participation and the expression of a great public momentum;
- From the economic point of view, the Olympic volunteers lead to a major reduction in salary costs and, if adequate training is provided, the result could be a more highly-qualified population. As estimated by MacAloon (1999), in the case of Athens 2004 Olympic Games, the involvement of around 51,000 volunteers who contributed approximately 542,000 hours of labour provided a new aggregate value of US $57.7 million to the ACOG budget – this figure is equivalent to two or three TOP sponsorships. The same estimation was made by Chalip (1999) as well - in the case of Sydney 2000 Olympic Games around AUD$ 109.7 million value of labour would be generated. While a strong emphasis on the importance of sponsorship in the Olympic Games, Olympic volunteering also contribute to public communications, hospitality, good will, peace, and to internal OCOG morale.
- From the cultural point of view, volunteerism involves basic education in multiculturalism and solidarity. This point is also supported by MacAloon (1999) who points out that the moral values and social aspirations associated with the Olympic Movement and Olympic spirit can be carried, disseminated by volunteers, and protected for the future.
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The important role of volunteers has also been recognised by Chalip (1999) who suggests that although the essential role of volunteers is ensuring service delivery, the economic and social significance of volunteers in the production of an Olympic Games are required thoroughly consideration.

**Figure 4.3 Summary of the number of volunteers participated in previous Olympic Games**

![Graph showing the number of volunteers in previous Olympic Games]

*Source: adapted from (ACOG, 2007; BOCOG, 2011; Kemp, 2002; Moragas et al., 1999)*

**Themes**

Themes emerging from the literature on volunteering section are identified as follows. First of all, calls for more research related to Olympic volunteerism, or mega-events volunteerism, are evident in the literature. Reasons for this emphasis are not only because it has been demonstrated that the evolution of Olympic volunteerism is associated with the development of the Olympic Games and the Olympic Movement (MacAlloon, 1999), but also because, on the one hand, it is arguable that funding and investment in such a mega sporting event may appear more worthwhile from a *local*, host region perspective, but are not necessarily seen from a *national* perspective as the best use of public funds (Downward & Ralston, 2006). For instance, it is clear that Londoners will have access to the sporting stadiums much more readily than Manchester citizens (not with-standing the difficulty of getting tickets). Therefore, the question of what benefits will accrue for people who are not from London after sixteen days of the London 2012 Olympic Games seems to be restricted to intangible legacies, such as volunteerism. On the other hand, a lack of ex-post and long-term economic effect
analysis, in such environments, makes current studies shift away from the conventional economic assessment of the impact of sporting investment and instead to focus upon the ‘psychic income’ generated, such as volunteerism (Crompton, 2004).

Secondly, as Farrell et al (1998) argue that understanding of the motivations, perceptions, and behaviour of volunteers in special events has potential to improve planning, management, and recruitment strategies for maintaining a strong volunteer base, one important implication of this is that the use of volunteering in mega event – like Olympic Games – as a mean to reward, train, and provide added experience for sport volunteers so that an enhancement of the country’s pool of volunteers in sport can be achieved (Chalip, 1999). In addition, as noted by some academics (Chalip, 1999; MacAlloon, 1999; Moragas et al., 1999) that such a large and unique sporting event, as the Olympic Games, generates a broader volunteer profile which can be used in the further development of a body of volunteers so that its sustainability can be ensured (Farrell et al., 1998). Moreover, it has also been evident that individuals with prior volunteering experience are more likely to be willing to volunteer for another major sporting event, or another major event (Downward & Ralston, 2006). This point is especially significant in the context of the UK which relies on the volunteers contribution to sport for delivery of its sport services, but also faces a problem of ‘supply’ shortage (Nichols, 2004). Therefore, understanding and analysis of motives and expectations of volunteers are extremely important to policy makers who seeks to use sports events as sports development policy instruments, and are also important to the UK government who have claimed to get more people, and specifically more young people giving time to their local communities as a result of the 2012 Games (LOCOG, 2009), leaves a volunteering legacy for the future major sporting events, for the upcoming Glasgow 2014 Commonwealth Games.

Thirdly, it is also identified in the literature that in order to implement successfully a functional strategy for recruiting and engaging volunteers, it requires a clear understanding of why individuals are involved in Olympic volunteerism, and then therefore with sending out the right communicative message on how the recommended course of action would satisfy individuals’ motives and goals, potential volunteers could be attracted. Literature highlights the following factors which would work on attracting volunteering participation, e.g. sense of national pride, uniqueness of experience, the chance to contribute to the success of the Games, as well as promotion of the Olympic spirit and value of cooperation (Kikou, 2001). Other motivation factors from the literature are summarised in the Table 4.8.
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Seeking the answers to the questions of why did the individuals involved decide to become Olympic volunteers, how were they recruited and trained and what planning took place is becoming increasingly central to the development of host country, especially to the Olympic Games hosting country which is anticipating more upcoming mega sporting events. Since most upcoming events in a particular country will rely on volunteer labour in much the same way, if not to the same extent, as the Olympic Games, it is important to conduct some research to apply the lessons learned from the Olympic Games for its benefit of the host country’s sport development.
### Table 4.8 Summary of the results and characteristics emerged from the four included articles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Predominant Motivation Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| (Giannoulakis et al., 2008)   | Athens 2004              | **Method**: questionnaires (n=146)  
**Scale**: modified version of the Special Events Volunteer Motivation Scale (Farrell et al., 1998) | **Olympic-related motivation**:  
- The desire of volunteers to associate with the Olympic movement,  
- Be involved in the Olympics,  
- Meet with Olympic athletes  
**Egoistic** (i.e. motivation related to the individual’s needs for social interaction, interpersonal relationships, and networking)  
- The desire of volunteers to associate with the Olympic movement,  
- Be involved in the Olympics,  
- Meet with Olympic athletes  
**Purposive** (i.e. relate to doing something useful and contributing to society)  
- The desire of volunteers to associate with the Olympic movement,  
- Be involved in the Olympics,  
- Meet with Olympic athletes |
| (Kemp, 2002)                  | Lillehammer 1994 & Sydney 2000 | **Method**: questionnaires  
(Lillehammer: n=200; Sydney: n=200)  
Comparison of two Olympic Games | **Satisfaction**:  
- Pride in their country and culture  
- Social contact and friendship  
- A desire to feel valued and needed by society at large by being ‘employed’ even if it is unpaid  
- Younger volunteers were more motivated by social factors and the acquiring of future employment skills rather than national pride and self-worth issues  
**Job skills**:  
- Social contact and friendship  
- A desire to feel valued and needed by society at large by being ‘employed’ even if it is unpaid  
- Younger volunteers were more motivated by social factors and the acquiring of future employment skills rather than national pride and self-worth issues  
**Job characteristics**:  
- Social contact and friendship  
- A desire to feel valued and needed by society at large by being ‘employed’ even if it is unpaid  
- Younger volunteers were more motivated by social factors and the acquiring of future employment skills rather than national pride and self-worth issues |
### Significant Factors of the experience of volunteering at the Games:

- It improved my chance of employment.
- It looks good on my CV and Application forms.
- I have learned new skills and capabilities
- I enhanced and developed my skills.
- I have enhanced my personal development
- I have increased my self-confidence.
- It provided new challenges.
- It changed my life.

### Purposive: highest ranking reasons, which relate to doing something useful and contributing to society

### Solidary: are based on social interaction, group identification, and networking.

### External traditions: expresses motivations related to family traditions and the use of free time that can be seen as external influences on an individual’s volunteer career.

### Commitments: contains incentives that link external expectations and personal skills with commitment to volunteering.

| (Downward & Ralston, 2006)\(^{21}\) | Manchester Commonwealth Games 2002 | **Method:** questionnaires (n = 407)  
**Factor analysis:** to summarise volunteer experience  
**Regression analysis:** controls for differences in the sports and socio-economic characteristics | **Significant Factors of the experience of volunteering at the Games:**  
- It improved my chance of employment.  
- It looks good on my CV and Application forms.  
- I have learned new skills and capabilities  
- I enhanced and developed my skills.  
- I have enhanced my personal development  
- I have increased my self-confidence.  
- It provided new challenges.  
- It changed my life. |
|---|---|---|---|
| (Farrell et al., 1998)\(^{22}\) | The Canadian Women’s Curling Championship 1996 | **Method:** questionnaire (n = 300)  
**Scale:** 28-item Special Event Volunteer Motivation Scale | **Purposive:** highest ranking reasons, which relate to doing something useful and contributing to society  
**Solidary:** are based on social interaction, group identification, and networking.  
**External traditions:** expresses motivations related to family traditions and the use of free time that can be seen as external influences on an individual’s volunteer career.  
**Commitments:** contains incentives that link external expectations and personal skills with commitment to volunteering. |

---

\(^{21}\) This study was included during the process of scoping study as part of the method review.

\(^{22}\) *ibid*
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**Issues**

On the one hand, without the contribution from the thousands of volunteers, the Olympic Games would simply not be possible (Chalip, 1999; MacAloon, 1999; Moragas et al., 1999). On the other hand, sporting mega events, such as the Olympic, provide channels for public participation (MacAloon, 1999; Moragas et al., 1999). Based on the above analysis, some underlying issues can be discussed.

One, the measurement of such ‘soft’ legacy is difficult. As Bladen (2009) argues, planning for a volunteering legacy is an oxymoron, in the sense that, in contrast with the other legacies of which most are intangible, volunteering legacy is difficult or impossible to review in quantifiable terms. In addition, it often argues that it is too expensive and troublesome to accurately assess this legacy, so tends to be forgotten after the Games have ended.

Two, the uniqueness of the Olympic Games makes the dissemination of the results of motivation and satisfaction analysis in other sporting events context difficult. As Farrell et al (1998: 298) argue that “motivation for special event volunteers is different from that for other volunteers. Special event volunteers might find these distinct dimensions (purposive, solidary, external conditions, and commitments) important because of their volunteer commitment and their attachment to the activity”, it implies that the emergent list of motivation factors would work in the next round of volunteer recruitment for a major sporting event, or for the second time of hosting the Olympic (if there is one), yet it cannot be assured in the context of other sporting events, such as National Championships, or local competition etc. With regard to this point, it questions to what extent the strong volunteer base gained after hosting the Olympic could be sustained and applied to other circumstances, which therefore leads to a further step in the research, that of developing a concise tool to further measure and understand volunteer motivation.

Two, issues related to limited availability of labour specifications and accommodation which may be problematic, and in particular exacerbated (Chalip, 1999), by the size of host cities with for relatively small populations. Specifically, the fact that host cities with relatively small populations require volunteers not only from a local base but also from non-hosting regions, will create challenges and pressures on the host city’s transportation and accommodation system. Despite the enthusiasm of those from non-hosting regions for being an Olympic volunteer, it is understandable that is difficult for him/her to find accommodation.
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during the Games within commutable distance, not to mention the increased accommodation costs that one may have to deal with pre and during the Games. This point implies that if accommodation and transportation systems are not adequate may undermine the promise of getting broad public participation in the Games, and may also create a certain degree of ‘exclusion’ in terms of the accommodation and transportation barriers faced by potential volunteers from non-hosting regions.

4.3.3 The social impacts of the Olympic Games

In the light of three benefits of hosting mega sporting event (namely, I. a decade of global exposure – from the bidding period, through the preparations phase to the final staging of the events; II. economic dividends; and III. urban transformation) summarised by Vigor et al (2004), it is short-sighted to claim that mega sporting events, such as the Olympic, have only ‘hard’, tangible impacts on the host country, but not ‘soft’, intangible legacies. This view is supported by Chalkely and Essex (1999) who suggest that given the increased size of the event and the economic motivation surrounding the host, the implications extend well beyond the provision of facilities and management of the event. Indeed, hosting the Olympic Games is a unique opportunity for the host country and city to bring not only economic outcomes, but also social and cultural outcomes. However, the irony is that, with the purpose of serving the public interest, government focuses more on entrepreneurial and corporate interests, but broader social goals (Hall, 2001). It perhaps explains the lack of adequate consideration in the literature of broader issues, such as social, environmental, and tourism strategies.

Within the literature, it has been suggested that a balanced appraisal of event’s impacts – integrating the social dimension with economic and environmental evaluation – is vital (Ritchie, Shipway, & Cleeve, 2009). Indeed, as advocated by Fredline (2005), understanding the social dimension of hosting any mega-events is crucial in order to develop local support. The most prominent social effect of the Olympics in the literature review is the assessment of residents’ perceptions of the Olympic Games (Deccio & Baloglu, 2002; Guala & Turco, 2009; Guala, 2009; Kapareliotis, Panopoulos, & Panigyrakis, 2010; Kim & Petrick, 2005; Mihalik & Simoneita, 1998; Ritchie et al., 2009; Zhou & Ap, 2009); or impacts on the image, status and sense of place. The terms to describe these impacts are various, e.g. sharing Olympic spirit, pride of place, ‘feel good’ factor, showcase, image and status, nationalism, civic boosterism, political legacies, non-infrastructural outcomes for socially excluded groups et al (Auruskeviciene et al., 2010; Bridges, 2008; Gibson, Qi, & Zhang, 2008; Hall, 2001;
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Given that the impacts of the Olympic Games can be both tangible and intangible, or both ‘hard’ and ‘soft’ impacts (Gratton & Preuss, 2008), or can be on an economic, social, or environmental level, or a combination of these areas (Minnaert, 2011), it is hard to offer a clear-cut classification of those social impacts. For example, in terms of ‘resident perceptions’ of the events, it emerges from tourism impact of the Games which is one area of the economic and tangible impacts. But as to ‘resident perceptions’ themselves, they can be categorised to social and intangible impact. Another example is that, although the regeneration of urban areas often serves the economic goals of attracting new investment and stimulating the local economy, there are also social benefits attached to them, e.g. new sporting infrastructure may improve access to sport, the redevelopment of run-down areas may increase feelings of safety and local pride (Minnaert, 2011), which therefore cannot be classified as purely economic impact or purely social impact. The terms used in the dimension of social legacies often are the non-infrastructural outcomes, intangible, ‘soft’ impacts of mega sporting events, and may include for example increased sports participation, changing tourist image etc. so that social impacts inevitably overlap to some degree with other types (e.g. sporting or economic legacies).

Kim and Petrick (2005) argue that relatively little evidence of social impacts is provided in the literature for three reasons: first of all, social and cultural impacts of mega-events are seen to be ‘external’ to most forms of economic evaluations which are used to promote the idea of substantial outcomes for the event to citizens of the host city; second, these impacts tend to be intangible and thus are difficult to quantify; third, some of these impacts may be considered as negative factors and thus their measurement is not encouraged. Therefore, many evaluations of sporting mega events’ impacts tend to disregard social impacts. However, as discussed before, measuring and understanding social impacts of a sporting mega-event should be regarded as being as important as economic impact because, for example, if residents’ perceptions of hosting a mega-event are not examined, important positive or negative impacts such as residents’ perceptions will remain unacknowledged. A consequence of failure to acknowledge such legacy/impact could be that community residents to the event may remain unidentified and therefore unaddressed (Waitt, 2003).
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In the literature, on the one hand, many researchers have identified a series of benefits of hosting mega sporting events, in terms of social impacts, for example, increased community pride, quality of life, strengthening of cultural values and traditions, building national identity, helping preserve the physical environment and local heritage, reducing social exclusion, et al (Deccio & Baloglu, 2002; Kim & Petrick, 2005; Minnaert, 2011; Waitt, 2003). On the other hand, it is also accepted that negative social impacts occur, for instance, the hosting of mega sporting events can lead to increases in the cost of living and taxes, concerns over traffic congestion, parking problems, or the loss of the recreational amenity to local community (Deccio & Baloglu, 2002; Mihalik & Simoneita, 1998; Ritchie et al., 2009; Waitt, 2003).

a) Emerging themes

Residents’ perceptions of the Olympic Games

The theme of residents’ perceptions is derived from the question of what do residents feel about heavily investing their tax dollars in hosting mega sporting events. As identified in the literature, residents perceived social issues, such as national and community pride and community attachment, just as or more important than economic benefits (Mihalik & Simoneita, 1998; Ritchie & Aitken, 1985). In this light, Jeong and Faulkner (1996) suggest that the study of residents’ perceptions should be considered an integral part of the mega-event cost-benefit analysis. Furthermore, it has been argued that residents’ perceptions of a mega-event’s impact must be studied and addressed because the positive perceptions that residents have will enhance the spectators’ and tourists’ experiences and contribute to a destination’s overall attractiveness (Deccio & Baloglu, 2002; Gibson et al., 2008; Guala & Turco, 2009; Hall, 2001; Kapareliotis et al., 2010; Zhou & Ap, 2009). For example, a post Games research conducted by Kapareliotis et al (2010) aims to investigate the opinions of Beijing’s residents about the effects of the Olympics on their town. Their findings advocate that tourism is strongly related with the Olympic perceptions and opinions of the Olympic city residents. It is thus important to analyse these perceptions so that the tourist industry in the Olympic city and also country can be developed and improved.

In addition, Guala and Turco (2009) recognise that the perception of residents toward hosting the Olympics can affect tourism throughout the Games life cycle. Evidence from Torino 2006 Winter Games suggests that positive perceptions may stimulate support for increased tourism development, while negative sentiments might create a backlash against future tourism.
growth and subsequent event bids. In particular, direct encounters with tourists and negative or positive ‘word of mouth’ will influence tourists’ perceptions of the host community (Guala & Turco, 2009). Deccio and Baloglu (2002) also support this view and further emphasise also the importance of the resident’s perception to non-host community. They argue that given the unique qualities of mega events, in terms of the size and scope of the phenomena, they provide special opportunities not only to the host community and but also to peripheral communities.

Extensive research has been conducted on host-resident perceptions of particular tourism development and mega events (Guala & Turco, 2009; Guala, 2009; Kapareliotis et al., 2010; Kim & Petrick, 2005; Mihalik & Simoneita, 1998; Waitt, 2003; Zhou & Ap, 2009) and little research exists that examined perceptions of non-host community residents (Deccio & Baloglu, 2002; Ritchie et al., 2009). Literature reviewed in the field of residents’ perception of the mega sporting events starts from 1996 Atlanta Olympic Games to 2012 London Olympic Games, which are summarised in Table 4.9.
Table 4.9 A review of social impact studies related to mega sporting events – resident’s perception

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Mihalik &amp; Simoneita, 1998)</td>
<td>Atlanta 1996</td>
<td><strong>Method:</strong> longitudinal study repeated cross sectional study; telephone survey in 1992 and 1993</td>
<td><strong>Before the Games:</strong> respondents expressed many concerns over traffic, inflation, and excessive costs. <strong>After the Games:</strong> concerns decreased significantly. However, due to the attempted attack in the Olympic Park, security concern remained steady.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Deccio &amp; Baloglu, 2002)</td>
<td>Salt Lake 2002</td>
<td><strong>Method:</strong> a random sample – 189 surveys received <strong>Location:</strong> 250 miles south of Salt Lake City</td>
<td>In general, the findings suggest that non-host residents who expected benefits, economic gains and more opportunity of resource use through the Olympics tend to support the Games, whereas those who were sensitive to environmental concerns do not support the Games. Although some residents perceive that the Olympics will bring opportunities, most do not anticipate any local impact form the event. The sense of apathy felt by residents is a particular concern. However, they do encourage promotion of the area during the Olympics and would be willing to support their rural community activities during the event. <strong>Suggestions:</strong> - A marketing awareness campaign would be beneficial to the community; - By working closely with state tourism leaders, local officials can tie into tourism campaigns and special promotions designed for the Olympics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Waitt, 2003)</td>
<td>Sydney 2000</td>
<td><strong>Method:</strong> longitudinal study (before and during the Games) Prospective panel design: telephone surveys to 658 host residents in 1998; 178 residents in Sep 2000.</td>
<td>In general, respondents felt positive, enthusiasm for the event. <strong>Expressed feelings:</strong> patriotism, community spirit, and the desire to participate as a volunteer, a significant psychological reward (i.e. the imagined bond that underpins national identify)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Kim &amp; Petrick, 2005)</td>
<td>Seoul the FIFA 2002</td>
<td><strong>Method:</strong> longitudinal study Repeated cross sectional study: 710 host residents in last week of event and 200 host residents 3 months after event</td>
<td>In general, Seoul residents perceived a fairly high level of positive impact from the event, also were most likely to consider image enhancement and consolidation to be the most positive impact as a result of the event. One of the findings is consistent with Waitt’s (2003) that attitudes towards an event are likely to change across time because the formation of an</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

23 This study was included during the process of scoping study as part of the method review.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Kavetsos &amp; Szymanski, 2010)</th>
<th>The Olympic Games; the FIFA World Cup, and the UEFA European Cup over the period of 1974 – 2004</th>
<th><strong>Method:</strong> self-reported life satisfaction (happiness) for twelve European countries – surveys were conducted twice each year, in the spring and autumn, where each time approximately 1,000 individuals are randomly interviewed in each country.</th>
<th>Significant support for the short term feelgood effect of ‘hosting major sporting events raises reported happiness’ only in the context of major football championships.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Guala &amp; Turco, 2009)</td>
<td>Torino 2006</td>
<td><strong>Method:</strong> longitudinal study – telephone interviews with Torino residents from 2002-2007 (n = 900 interviews per year; N = 5,400)</td>
<td>Torino residents experience euphoria when the revealing of the host city of 2006 Winter Olympic Games – <strong>pride and optimism.</strong> During the preparation stage, hey wait and see – largely because of the Italian central government’s issues in financing the Games – <strong>uncertainty and concerns.</strong> When the Games finished, public confidence and support generally increased – <strong>happiness and successful feeling.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Zhou &amp; Ap, 2009)</td>
<td>Beijing 2008</td>
<td><strong>Method:</strong> factor analysis - telephone interviews and questionnaires in 2006 n = 1,165 host residents</td>
<td>In general, 96% of respondents indicate their supporting for the Games. Residents perceived the Games’ impacts more positively in terms of the social-psychological, urban development, and economic development benefits. Especially, Chinese residents are likely to show respect and concur with the social utility and development benefits that will accrue from hosting the Games, even if their personal interests may be disadvantaged. Residents who had positive attitude towards government performance or tourism development were more favourable towards event impacts and more supportive of the event.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### (Kapareliotis et al., 2010) Beijing 2008

**Method:** 1000 urban Beijing residents interview

**Results:**
- According to Beijing residents, the Olympic Games improve tourist infrastructure.
- Tourism is strongly related with the Olympic perceptions and opinions of the Olympic city residents.
- Three clusters of residents, namely the eco tourism supporters, the linked tourism supporters, and the mainstream tourism supporters, have been identified.
- The analysis of different clusters of residents provides valuable insights related to tourism stemming from the Olympic infrastructure.

### (Ritchie et al., 2009) London 2012

**Method:** longitudinal study – factor analysis – questionnaires in Weymouth and Portland, 2007. Study is planned to be repeated in 2009, 2011 and 2013.

**Five identified factors:** ‘positive social impacts’, ‘negative impacts’, ‘transport issues’, ‘positive economic impact’, and ‘price rises’

**Concerns:** traffic congestion, parking issues, and potential increases in the cost of living.
**Host country image**

In the literature, there has been a growing understanding of one particular social impact that hosting mega events, such as the Olympics, can have on the host country – that is through the ‘media hype’ to build host country and city’s image (Essex & Chalkley, 1998; Ritchie, 1984). As Hall (1989; 2001) advocates, mega events can play a role of image builder for modern tourism. They can help establish a positive image and build commercial and public awareness of a destination. Image is a central factor in understanding tourists’ destination choice processes. Destination image that is closely linked to intention to travel has been evident (Woodside & Lysonski, 1989), which is affected by a tourist’s characteristics, such as past travel experience and tourist role preference (Gibson et al., 2008), age, gender, education level, and nationality (Baloglu & McCleary, 1999). Indeed, by examining the images and intent to travel among a large population, it would benefit the host country’s tourism agencies and the National Olympic Organizing Committee to see how life stage, social class and nationality influence these constructs. Empirical study does suggest that, overall, hosting mega sporting events can raise awareness of the host city, which in turn can be generalised to an improved image of a country (Kim & Petrick, 2005). Examples of using mega events to create positive image impacts in order to increase the influx of tourists exist for previous Olympic Games. Barcelona Olympic Games, alongside other national promotional programme events, improved Spain’s image (Gilmore, 2002). Sydney used the Games to improve the tourist image of Australia and also wanted to raise its international profile (Morse, 2001). China anticipated that by hosting the Beijing Olympic Games it would raise awareness among potential tourists and stimulate their interest in visiting the country so that China’s tourism industry would receive a boost (Gibson et al., 2008). The details of the literature reviewed, in terms of assessing host country image, are summarised in the Table 4.10.

Mega sporting events can be perceived not only as a public investment in the regional image, but can also be used as a signalling tool for the host (Fourie & Santana-Gallego, 2011; Preuss & Alfs, 2011; Rose & Spiegel, 2010). Preuss and Alfs (2011) argue that, the motivation of hosting mega events has been to demonstrate major changes in the host city and country to the world. An example of ‘signalling’ is provided by the Munich Olympics 1972 to show that (West) Germany had rid itself of its Nazi past (Daniels, 1996), South Korea also wanted to use the Olympic Games to demonstrate its modern, high-technology national industries and
replace its image as a developing country (Denis, Dischereit, Song, & Werning, 1988), more recently, in the case of Beijing 2008 Olympic Games, China used the Games to signal to, amongst others, potential business partners and investors, to change the perception and image of China (Preuss & Alfs, 2011).

Table 4.10 A review of social impact studies related to mega sporting events – host country’s image

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Auruskeviciene et al., 2010)</td>
<td>Torino 2006</td>
<td><strong>Method:</strong> Longitudinal study – 297 surveys before the Games &amp; 346 surveys after the Games (not repeated)</td>
<td><strong>Country Image:</strong> by testing the following three image dimensions: image of the people in the country; image of the societal system and the level of animosity towards the country, only the last dimension was proven – respondents got less favourable impression of Italy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Gibson et al., 2008)</td>
<td>Beijing 2008</td>
<td><strong>Method:</strong> 350 questionnaire were collected in 2004</td>
<td><strong>Destination Image:</strong> Findings confirmed again that there is significant relationship between destination image and intent. Destination image partially mediated the relationship between past international travel experience and intention to travel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Preuss &amp; Alfs, 2011)</td>
<td>Beijing 2008</td>
<td><strong>Method:</strong> quantitative content analysis – 740 news reports between 1 July and 30 September of 2008</td>
<td><strong>Signalling theory:</strong> China used the worldwide media coverage to mainly convey information on business-related location factors to potential external investors. Negative news reports may dampen the effect of the positive ones, However, overall, positive news outweighed the negative news.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Political legacies**

Girginov and Parry (2005) suggest that the Olympic Games have been used as a ‘political project’ that can be assessed on two levels: national and international. On the national level, it implies enhancing the economy through additional employment and urban regeneration, increasing the people’s participation in healthy activities, promoting nation-building, and forging social integration. On the international level, it implies using sport to perform political functions, such as boosting prestige, developing diplomatic links, and outmanoeuvring rivals. Based on these arguments, by examining the Seoul 1988 Olympics, Bridges (2008) indicates that the Seoul Games provided definite and broadly positive legacies for South Korea at both levels. Development of the economic, socio-cultural and political-diplomatic through hosting the Olympics did result in the establishment of the foundation of an advanced nation and an upgraded international status for South Korea. Another example of this is the Berlin Olympics 1936 which demonstrated the ‘superiority’ of a political system (Preuss & Alfs, 2011).
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Socially excluded groups

Concerns on socially excluded groups emerge from the failure of ‘trickle down’ economic effect. As Ryan-Collins and Jackson (2008) argue that although the principles of ‘trickle down’ economics assumes that the public and private financial investment flowing into deprived areas will naturally distribute, in practice, it leaks out through consultants, developers and large companies which are best able to exploit new commercial opportunities. For socially excluded groups, the impacts may be negative. In reviewing data from seven Olympic cities (Atlanta, Nagano, Sydney, Salt Lake City, Athens, Turin and Beijing), Minnaert (2011) summaries the following three main potential legacies for socially excluded group:

- **skills (volunteering)** – Although volunteering can generate positive feelings and skills in, e.g. expanding of social networks, heightened self-esteem, increased competence in team work (Kemp, 2002), there are limitations for socially excluded groups: they are generally hard to engage and include in the volunteer experience;

- **employment** – new employment opportunities are not always evenly distributed as many Olympic contractors would like to employ people who were already skilled, whereas a lot of long-term unemployment were not getting Olympic jobs (Lenskyj, 2002).

- **sports participation** – it has been shown that persons who are socially excluded are less likely to participate in sports (Minnaert, 2011).

The findings from this study also confirm that the Olympic Games do not automatically bring non-infrastructural benefits for all – socially excluded groups in the host community, who are very rarely specifically targeted to be beneficiaries of the event. Therefore, attention and designed strategies for greater inclusion is needed (see section 4.3.2 for more detailed recommendation).

b) **Issues and implications**

As identified above, hosting mega sporting events has various impacts in the social dimension, such as, developing the host country’s image, increasing global awareness, and civic boosterism et al. However, empirical studies also suggest that none of these would happen without implementing well-designed strategies and increasing local community
engagement (Deccio & Baloglu, 2002; Gibson et al., 2008; Hall, 2001; Kim & Petrick, 2005; Minnaert, 2011; Ritchie et al., 2009; Waitt, 2003). Therefore, implications of these studies can be summarised as the following two points:

The concept of social impact assessment addresses the importance of a long-term approach. Social impacts tend to be fragmented and the cause-effect relationships underlying those tend to be complex (Silvestre, 2009). Since the potential legacies of hosting Olympic Games are relevant for the lives of most of the citizens, it demands a careful planning and relation to a long-term strategy (Hall, 2001; Ritchie et al., 2009; Silvestre, 2009). With specific designed strategy to leverage images and to send out signals to the world, in conjunction with the event (pre, during and after), the level of awareness of a city (or country) can be raised, the national pride can be boosted, which in return may provide the impetus to visit at some point in the future, and may refashion collective feeling, identity, consciousness and bring more positive social outcomes.

In terms of specific strategies designed for socially excluded groups, Minnaert (2011), reviewing data from seven Olympic Games (Atlanta 1996 – Beijing 2008), summarises four planning and management principles for greater inclusion:

- **Building links with existing policies and networks** – the literature suggests that local governments and community organisations should co-operate and represent the needs of socially excluded residents;

- **Focused vs. universal programmes** – it is recommended that more focused programmes which consider the characteristics of socially excluded groups may be more suitable and successful in engaging these groups;

- **Participation and involvement** – try to get the local community to continue to be involved in the overall event hosting process;

- **Delivering the legacy during the ‘pregnancy’ period** – because funding for legacy, and interest in Olympic programmes, often wanes after the Games (Smith, 2009), the period of preparation of the Games is also crucial for delivering the legacy, especially in socially excluded groups.

  a. **Local community and residents’ engagement**

A mega sporting event is not able to solve ‘all of society’s problems’ by itself (Lenskyj, 2002), however, it offers an opportunity to involve several segments of the society and to
bring them together to better address the city’s/country’s most pressing problems (Silvestre, 2009). As Hall (2001: 8) suggests, “the more an event is seen by the impacted public as emerging from the local community, rather than being imposed on them, the greater will be that community’s acceptance of the event”. Moreover, the planners of the Olympics in the local area should consider engaging the community more in decision making, which could increase residents’ overall support for the event (Ritchie et al., 2009). They also recommend the use of media to communicate issues to residents so that the flow of information can be improved, as well as the overall support for the event.

Findings emerged from the literature have important implications for organizers of future events. Firstly, it has been confirmed that global sporting events, such as Olympic Games, can be employed as a mechanism to generate patriotism and a sense of community or belonging – are also called civic boosterism, especially among the young and ethnic minorities (Waitt, 2001, 2003). Secondly, Olympic Games provide the opportunity for government and city authorities to re-establish or increase the attachment and identification of people to place (Waitt, 2003). However, one thing needs to be borne in mind is that such effect tends to diminish after the Games have finished.

4.3.4 Economic impact

In the literature review, there has been a relatively significant number of studies that assess the economic impact of the Olympic Games (n=39). One reason for this may be that, ever since Los Angeles generated millions of dollars profit from hosting the 1984 Olympic Games, the prevailing perception of organising mega sporting events like the Olympics seems to be a way of fostering economic growth and tourism development in the host nation. Another major reason is, as discussed in the volunteering section, the concerns about whether the use of public funds to host sports events can create potential benefits to the wider community, lead the research to focus on the direct and indirect economic benefits and costs associated with these investments. However, do the Olympic Games actually make profit for the host nations in general? Do the Olympics generate the same amount or more of economic value as/than expected? From the taxpayer’s point of view, was it worth the public funds used? To date, there is no consensus with respect to this. Therefore, by virtue of the systematic review of the literature, the answers to those questions revealed in the literature can be evaluated.
There are mainly two types of economic impact analysis were taken for the previous Olympic Games, one is *ex ante* studies (undertaken before the event) with empirical data (Andersen, 1999; Anonymous, 2000; Balfousia-Savva, Athanassiou, Zaragas, & Milonas, 2001; Blake, 2005; Chen, 2008; Economic Research Associates, 1984; Hashmi, Fida, & Alhayky, 2008; Humphreys, Plummer, Games, Selig Jr, & Georgia, 1995; InterVISTAS Consulting Inc, 2002; KPMG, 1993; Madden, 2002; Madden & Crowe, 1998; Papanikos, 1999; Zhang & Zhao, 2007). These studies were mainly commissioned by government bodies, which therefore one may argue they may incorporate potential bias; the second is *ex post* studies (undertaken after the event) that examine the economic situation of the host country or region before and after the event (Baade & Matheson, 2002; Baade, Baumann, & Matheson, 2008; Brunet, 2005; Giesecke & Madden, 2007; Kasimati & Dawson, 2009; Kim, Rhee, & Ju, 1989; Porter & Fletcher, 2008; PricewaterhouseCoopers, 2002). These studies are mainly conducted by economists and academics in order to tease out the ‘true’ effects of hosting the Olympic Games. The implication here is that governments are interested generally in the prospective impacts but not in identifying the ‘actual’ outcomes. There are also some studies in the literature that summarise previous Olympic Games’ economic studies which are undertaken by other academics and economists (Bruckner & Pappa, 2011; Chen, 2008; Locate in Kent, 2009; Sterkena, 2006; Tien, Lo, & Lin, 2011). Moreover, papers in relation to the basic economic assumptions, frameworks and models have also been included in this review in order to gain a thorough overview of the economic approaches (Kasimati, 2003; Kasimati, 2006; Li & Blake, 2008; Li & Blake, 2009; Matheson, 2009; Preuss, 2004a, 2004b).

Tourism impacts have been identified by a number of academics as one of the key legacies of the Olympic Games (Athanasopoulos & Hyndman, 2008; Chernushenko, 1996; Dansero & Puttili, 2010; Duran, 2005; Fourie & Santana-Gallego, 2011; Fredline, 2005; Groote, 2005; Kapareliotis et al., 2010; Kirkup & Major, 2006; O’Brien, 2006; Roche, 1996; Smith & Stevenson, 2009; Song, 2010; Spilling, 1996; Teigland, 1999; Weed, 2006a). Other impacts like employment (Green, 2003; Hotchkiss, Moore, & Zobay, 2003; Tucker, 2006), stock market reaction (Berman, Brooks, & Davidson, 2000; Bruckner & Pappa, 2011; Clark, Cornwell, & Pruitt, 2002; Floros, 2010; Miyazaki & Morgan, 2001; Samitas, Kenourgios, & Zounis, 2008; Veraros, Kasimati, & Dawson, 2004), overall trade and national exports (Rose & Spiegel, 2010; Song, 2010) have also been addressed in the literature.
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This section can be broken into three parts. The first part is an overall review of the existing literature in relation to the Olympic Games’ economic impact. The second part examines the strengths and shortcomings of the three main economic impact assessment techniques, i.e. the Input-Output (I-O) Model, the Cost-Benefit analysis, and the Computable General Equilibrium (CGE) Model. The last part of this section summarises induced economic impact of the Games, such as tourism impact, employment impact, trade and export effects, and the more recently emerging topic of the stock market impact.

a) Costs and benefits of the previous Olympic Games

In the literature, economic analyses shows mixed evidence as to whether organizing large sporting events contributes to economic growth. There is ongoing controversy about whether the monetary impact is always/sometimes/never positive for a host city (Bruckner & Pappa, 2011; Crompton, 1995; Hashmi et al., 2008; Kasimati & Dawson, 2009; Matheson, 2009; Matheson & Baade, 2004; Rose & Spiegel, 2010; Tien et al., 2011). It seems safe to say that there is a large positive gross economic impact associated with the Olympics (as to certain parameters, such as national export, investment, consumption, overall trade, gross domestic product performance and unemployment etc.), however in gross terms the net cost of hosting the Games is also significant. Many of these positive effects are temporary, and the estimates of their value over time, and the estimates of costs over time, are problematic. Thus for example, a major criticism levelled by Crompton is that estimated multipliers of a different order are used by supporters and by opponents of a project, with little empirical justification.

According to Bruckner and Pappa’s (2011) recent research, by examining economic outcomes of the Olympics in 184 countries, they confirm that hosting the Games has a permanent level effect. Their findings indicate that, for the actual Games’ host, the Olympic Games can generate positive investment, consumption, and output responses before, during, and after hosting. As there is a considerable period of time, i.e. seven to ten years, before the actual hosting of the Games, Bruckner and Pappa also argue that, even for the bid countries, the Games can also generate positive investment, consumption, and output responses at the time of the bidding, although such effects are transitory.

Moreover, another longitudinal study of the economic effect of the Olympics from 1951 to 2008, conducted by Tien et al (2011), suggests that the economic impact of the Games on the host countries is only significant in terms of certain parameters, i.e. gross domestic product
performance and unemployment in the short term (the significant impact only occurs before the Games, not during or after the Games). Such short-lived impact on the host countries is consistent with the findings of Baade and Metheson (2002).

In the literature review (see Table 4.11 for details), the *ex ante* research deals with evidence for the following Games: e.g. studies such as Economic Research Associates (1984) for the Los Angeles Games, Humphreys and Plummer (1995) for the Atlanta Games, Andersen (1999), KPMG (1992) and New South Wales Treasury (1997) for the Sydney Games, Pappanikos (1999) and Balfousia-Savva et al (2001) for the Athens Games, Zhang and Zhao (2007) for the Beijing Games, InterVISTAS Consulting Inc (2002) for the Vancouver Games, Blake (2005) for the London Games; and the Games which are the subject of *ex-post* research include the following: Kim et al (1989) for the Seoul Games, Brunet (1995) for the Barcelona Games, Giesecke and Madden (2007), and PriceWaterHouseCoopers (2002) for the Sydney Games, Baade et al (2008) for the Salt Lake Winter Olympic Games, Kasimati and Dawson (2009) for the Athens Games.

In order to assess the likely growth in economic effect, *ex ante* analyses are more generally used to forecast the economic impact of the sporting events and provide the rationale for funding. *Ex post* studies often are more descriptive, dealing with the actual economic impact that took place during the Games on the basis of various economic indicators. It tends to come from ‘independent’ academic sources, and often does not correspond with the predictions of *ex ante* analysis. The *ex ante* approach has tended to be predominant type. The results of *ex post* studies on average are more modest in their claims of net impact than those projected by the *ex ante* studies funded by supporters of the event in, for example, host cities (Sterkena, 2006). *Ex post* studies are more likely to be seen by local organizers as arguably of little value as, once the Games are completed, efforts to reveal whether the Games achieved the hoped-for outcomes seem to be potentially politically embarrassing and an unnecessary expenses since the investment has already been committed. However, in the literature, a number of economist have emphasised the importance of providing *ex post* economic evidence (e.g. Baade & Matheson, 2002; Giesecke & Madden, 2007; Kasimati & Dawson, 2009; Porter & Fletcher, 2008). Findings emerging from the *ex post* economic analysis can be used to identify excessively optimistic appraisals about the extent to which the Games are likely to boost the economy of a potential host community. Therefore, good *ex
post studies can feed into future ex ante predictions of net impact, and thus contribute to estimates by cities bidding for the future Games.

By comparing the existing economic impact studies’ results for a given edition of the Games (see Table 4.11), it is claimed that ex ante estimates of direct and indirect expenditures that are induced by the Olympic Games were exaggerated (see e.g. the Atlanta Games: Humphrey and Plummer’s study versus Porter and Fletcher’s study; the Sydney Games: KPMG’s study versus Giesecke and Madden’s study; the Athens Games: Balfousia-Savva et al and Papanikos’ studies versus Kasimati and Dawson’s study). Explanations of the different findings between ex ante and ex post studies are given by some economists (e.g., Crompton, 1995; Giesecke & Madden, 2007; Owen, 2005; Porter, 2001; Sterkena, 2006). First of all, ex ante economic analyses seems to perform a function feature rather than serving solely economic purposes, as ex ante analysis is normally led (or funded) by government and conducted by consultancies or research centres. The predicted Olympic budgets are more likely to be acceptable if a surplus is shown. Thus, a tendency to bias seems to exist in such studies (e.g., Crompton, 2006; Downward, Dawson, & Dejonghe, 2009; Kasimati, 2003). Secondly, in ex ante studies, the crowding out issue tends to be underestimated or ignored and the gross result is thus often confused with the net impact. Thirdly, wrongly estimated income multipliers in the ex ante studies can lead to exaggerated benefits.
### Table 4.11 The economic impact studies of previous Olympic Games

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Economic Research Associates, 1984)</td>
<td>Los Angeles 1984</td>
<td>Ex ante Economic Analysis Model: I-O Commissioned by: government body</td>
<td>This study aims to forecast the effects the Games might have on various segments of the local and regional economies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Results:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- The <strong>total impact</strong> of $3.29 billion represents roughly 1.6 percent of the current year’s total gross product in Los Angeles County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 73,375 <strong>jobs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Kim et al., 1989)</td>
<td>Seoul 1988</td>
<td>Ex post Method: a cost/benefit analysis Commissioned by: government body</td>
<td>The impact of the Seoul Olympics on the Korean economy is evaluated as a chapter in Kim et al’ report for the Seoul Olympic Organizing Committee. The other parts of the report include, for example, analysis of the impact on Korea’s international relations, social and cultural development, and the development of politics and public administration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Results:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- An <strong>economic</strong> impact of around $1.6 billion, with an increase in <strong>employment</strong> of 336,000 jobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Results:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- A direct economic impact of $30 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 296,640 new jobs in Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Increased capital and improved attractiveness, the urban development process has continued long after 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Humphreys et al., 1995)</td>
<td>Atlanta 1996</td>
<td>Ex-ante Economic Model: I-O models Commissioned by: government body</td>
<td>This study was commission by the Atlanta Organizing Committee’s Games Financing Committee with the purpose of assessing the statewide economic impact of hosting the Atlanta 1996 Games.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Results:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- The <strong>economic impact</strong> of the Games on Georgia was US$5.1 billion in 1994 dollars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Generated an additional 77,026 <strong>jobs</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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| (Porter & Fletcher, 2008) | Atlanta 1996 & Salt Lake 2002 | **Ex-ante Economic Model**: I-O models  
**Ex-post Comparison Data**:  
- Real data: hotel occupancy rates and airport traffic measures  
- Nominal data: hotel room prices  
- Other data: total retail trade and taxable sales | This study uses data from the two previous Olympic Games to test the predictions of regional I-O model.  
**Results**: As the I-O model will incorrectly attribute economic impact to the products of both perfectly inelastic and perfectly elastic supplies, therefore overestimating the true economic impact, real changes associated with both events are insignificant. By looking at the collected *ex post* real data, it appears that the predicted results generated from the I-O models overestimate demand increases and factor price increases.  
**Suggestion**: predictions should be drawn from studying the *ex post* impact on areas hosting past event and not from application of a long-run, steady state model of the regional economy, such as the I-O model. |
|---|---|---|
| (KPMG, 1993) | Sydney 2000 | **Ex-ante Economic Model**: I-O model  
**Results**:  
- The *economic impact* of the Games on Australia was estimated to be US$5.1 billion in 1992 values  
- 156,198 new *jobs* to Australia as a whole |
| (Andersen, 1999) | Sydney 2000 | **Ex-ante Economic Model**: CGE model  
**Commissioned by**: government body  
**Results**:  
- The *economic impact* of the Games on Australia was estimated to be US$4.5 billion in 1996 values  
- 90,000 new *jobs* to Australia as a whole |
| (Chen, 2008) | Sydney 2000 | **Ex-ante Economic Model**: CGE  
**Commissioned by**: government  
This study\(^{24}\) examines the effects on the New South Wales and Australian economics of the 2000 Olympics. The Olympics are modelled over a 12-year period from 1994 to 2005, i.e. (i) the pre-event phase, 1994 to 1999; (ii) the event year, 2000; and (iii) the post-event phase, 2001-2005.  
**Results**: the central scenario is  
- The present value of the impact on real GDP and real *household consumption* for *Australia* over the three phases of the Olympics is $6.1 billion and $2.7 billion respectively – which amount to 0.11% and 0.08% of the present value of estimated GDP and real consumption respectively over the 12 years of the Olympics phases. The corresponding percentages for *NSW* are 0.36 and 0.22.  
- Almost 100,000 full-time equivalent annual *jobs* are expected over the 12 year period. |

\(^{24}\) This study’s data also has been used by Madden and Crowe in a conference paper in 1998. The conference article has been included in this systematic review from grey literature searching.
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| (Madden, 2002) | Sydney 2000 | **Ex-ante Economic Model:** CGE | Commissioned by: government | This study draws on economic modelling which author undertook for the Centre for Regional Economic Analysis (CREA) and Arthur Andersen in 1999\(^{25}\) (also see Madden and Crowe, 1998), and assesses the economic impact of the 2000 Olympics. **Results:**  
- It was estimated that **NSW** Gross State Product (GSP) increased by almost $490 million (1996 prices) in an average year;  
- It was estimated that there was an increase in **Australian economic activity** of 0.12% on average over the 12-year period from 1994 to 1995;  
- **NSW** activity is 0.3% higher over the 12-year period (1994/95 to 2005/06) due to the Games, but there is little effect on the other states. However, the final outcome is sensitive to the degree the Olympics promote tourism from overseas and the labour market reaction.  
- There was a projected increase in **NSW jobs** in an average year of the 12-year Olympics period of almost 5300, and the whole of Australian employment by 7500.  
- The overall estimated impact on **Australian GDP** is that it will be 0.12% higher over the 12 years than if Sydney had not staged the Games.  
- There was an increase in **real household consumption** – the estimated present value of this increase for **NSW** was $2.0 billion. |
| (Giesecke & Madden, 2007) | Sydney 2000 | **Ex-post Economic Model:** CGE | Commissioned by: academics | This study undertakes an *ex-post* analysis of the Olympics by using the CGE models. **Results:**  
- The Sydney Olympics had a **negative** effect on **NSW** and Australia as a whole, in terms of purely measurable economic variables. **NSW** GDP is positively affected, but not their real private and public consumption as it is that state which covers the construction costs of the Games – the Sydney Olympics generated a net consumption **loss** of approximately $2.1 billion;  
- The labour market was much tighter in the Olympics year than was formerly thought. There was **no** effect on overall Australian **employment**, although aggregate employment at the state level was assumed endogenous. |
| (PricewaterhouseCoopers, 2002) | Sydney 2000 | **Method:** secondary data analysis – quantifiable data has been used, such as expenditures, contracts, |  | This report collects evidence of business and economic activity one year after the close of the Games. The evidence collated in this report supports the view that the Games delivered **substantial benefits** to Sydney, NSW and Australia. |

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Commissioned by</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Kirkup &amp; Major, 2006)</td>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>Pre-Games economic impact reports of the Sydney 2000 Games and</td>
<td>academics</td>
<td>Results:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>contrast them with post-Games analysis.</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Although NSW experienced increases in GDP, Blake (2005) notes that estimates indicated that the rest of Australia would actually incur a loss in GDP for the Games year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-Games three studies:</td>
<td></td>
<td>- From the three studies carried out pre-Games, there are discrepancies that exist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Andersen, 1999</td>
<td></td>
<td>Issues:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- NSW Treasury, 1997</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Terms such as ‘economic activity’ or ‘economic injections’ are difficult to interpret their particular meanings if without a precise definition of.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- KPMG, 1993</td>
<td></td>
<td>- It is rare for further research to challenge these impact analyses once the Games have passed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Post-Games data source:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Suggests: the needs for more rigorous and standardised industry methods to reduce discrepancies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- PWC, 2002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| (Baade et al., 2008)                      | Salt Lake| Method: ex post analysis of taxable sales from 1982 and 2006 for Utah,| academics                | Results:                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
|                                           | 2002     | and other five surrounding counties.                                  |                          | - Findings reveal that some sectors such as hotels and restaurants prospered (statistically significant gains of $70.6 million) while other retailers such as general merchandisers and department stores suffered. |
|                                           |          |                                                                         |                          | - However, overall the gains in the hospitality industry are lower than the losses experienced by other sectors in the economy (it has been reported that there are losses in the general merchandise industry of $167.4 million). |

- Some $3 billion in business outcomes, including:
  - $600 million in new business investment
  - $288 million in new business under the Australian Technology Showcase
  - Almost $2 billion in post-Games sports infrastructure and service contracts
- Injection of over $6 billion in infrastructure developments in NSW
- Injection of over $1.2 billion worth of convention business for NSW between 1993 and 2007
- Greatly enhanced business profile for Sydney, NSW and Australia through the equivalent of up to $6.1 billion worth of international exposure
- Over $6 billion in spending by an additional 1.6 million visitors during 2011; the attraction of more than 110,000 Games-time specific international visitors
- Greater expertise and confidence in tendering, both domestically and overseas, on large-scale projects.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Model Type</th>
<th>Commissioned by</th>
<th>Result Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Anonymous, 2000)</td>
<td>Salt Lake, 2002</td>
<td><strong>Ex ante Model</strong>: Utah State and Local Government Fiscal Impact Model (FIM)(^{26})</td>
<td><strong>Commissioned by</strong>: government body</td>
<td>This study assesses the additional output, income, employment, population, and government revenue and expenditure that is generated because of the injection of new money into the Utah economy. In general, it is predicted that the 2002 Olympic Winter Games will generate a <strong>significant</strong> amount of employment, earnings, and output in the Utah economy prior to and during 2002. <strong>Results:</strong> - Output: $4.5 billion in economic output or sales - Employment: 35,000 job years of employment - Earnings: $1.5 billion in earnings to Utah workers - Net Revenue to State and Local Government: $75.9 million - Visitors: Net increase of 50,000 visitors per day during the Games</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Papanikos, 1999)</td>
<td>Athens, 2004</td>
<td><strong>Ex ante Model</strong>: small aggregate macroeconometric model</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Results:</strong> - The economic impact of the Games was estimated to be US $15.9 billion in 1999 values, between 1998-2011 - 445,000 new jobs generated in Greece as a whole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Balfousia-Savva et al., 2001)</td>
<td>Athens, 2004</td>
<td><strong>Ex ante Model</strong>: small aggregate macroeconometric model</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Results:</strong> - The economic impact of the Games was estimated to be US $10.2 billion in 2000 values, between 2000-2010 - 300,400 new jobs generated in Greece as a whole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Kasimati &amp; Dawson, 2009)</td>
<td>Athens, 2004</td>
<td><strong>Ex post Model</strong>: small aggregate macroeconometric model - Ex post assessment of the impact of the Olympics during the preparation and implementation period (1997-2004) - Ex ante analysis to forecast the impact of the Games on output and employment post-games (up to 2012)</td>
<td><strong>Commissioned by</strong>: academics</td>
<td>The findings of this study support the view that the Olympics is an event that could <strong>successfully</strong> boost the economy of the host city by generating benefits that outweigh the preparation costs. <strong>Results:</strong> - For the period 1997-2005 the Games boosted economic activity by around 1.3% of GDP per year, while unemployment fell by 1.9% per year. - For the period 2006-2012, the Games effect is more modest – GDP increases on average between 0.46 and 0.52% per year and unemployment falling on average by 0.17% per annum.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{26}\) The FIM captures the interaction between the economy, the population, and government revenue and expenditure. It is the same methodology and model that is used by state government to evaluate other projects and policies.
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#### (Zhang & Zhao, 2007)
- **Location**: Beijing 2008
- **Study Type**: *Ex ante economic analysis*:
  - The interregional I-O model
- **Commissioned by**: Academics
- **Results**: During 2002 to 2007, Olympic-related investments will add 2.02, 0.23 and 0.09 per cent to annual Gross Regional Products (GRP) in Beijing, surrounding area and the rest of China.

#### (InterVISTA S Consulting Inc, 2002)
- **Location**: Vancouver 2010
- **Study Type**: *Ex ante economic analysis*
  - **Method**:
    - Economic Impact Model: A spreadsheet-based economic impact model was designed to capture the capital and operating costs of the Games, as well as projected tourist expenditures over the 20-year period spanning the Games.
    - Multiplier Analysis: The British Columbia I-O model
- **Commissioned by**: Government body
- **Results**: This report is a updated version of a preliminary study that was completed in 2002 with the purpose of assessing the economic impact of hosting the 2010 Winter Olympic Games.
  - **Results**: Impacts for the medium-high scenario are
    - $2.1 billion in *direct GDP*
    - $3.3 billion in *total GDP*, including potential multiplier impacts
    - $8.4 billion in *total GDP*, if the impacts of expanding the Vancouver Convention and Exhibition Centre (VCEC) are also included
    - **Employment**: 55,000 *direct* person years of employment and 77,000 *total* person years. A total of 187,000 person years of employment may be created over a 30-year time period if the impact of the VCEC expansion project estimated in a separate study is included.

#### (Blake, 2005)
- **Location**: London 2012
- **Study Type**: *Ex ante Economic Analysis*
  - **Model**: CGE
- **Commissioned by**: Academic
- **Results**: This study examines the economic benefits and costs of hosting the Olympics. The net benefits are found to be *positive* on both the UK and London, and large relative to the investment in the bidding process, although *smaller* than previous studies that have tended to examine gross effects.
  - **Results**: An increase in GDP over the 2005-2016 period of £1,936 million
  - An additional 8,164 full-time equivalent jobs created for the UK.
b) Economic analysis models

Economic impact analyses exist primarily to provide evidence of the efficacy of projects to assist decision makers in evaluating (Baade & Matheson, 2002). There are three main types of economic modelling approach can be used in economic analysis of a mega event. They are the Input-Output model, the Cost-Benefit analysis, and the Computable General Equilibrium model. Due to that in the examined literature two of the three models (i.e. the I-O and CGE) have comparatively been applied in a large number of the economic studies, our focus here is to summary these studies and briefly outline the strengths and weaknesses of the two models.

The main advantage of the I-O model is that a host of predictions about the impact of demand changes on the regional economy can be relatively simply estimated by using the I-O model. This method has been used in studying previous Olympics such as the Los Angeles (Economic Research Associates, 1984), Atlanta (Humphreys & Plummer, 1995), Sydney Games (KPMG, 1993) and Beijing Games (Zhang & Zhao, 2007) etc. However, in the literature, the application of this model has been challenged by a number of economists (Baade & Matheson, 2002; Blake, 2005; Madden & Crowe, 1998; Porter & Fletcher, 2008). For example, by applying the I-O model, the Atlanta Olympic Games were predicted that it would have around $5.1 billion economic impact and create over 77,000 jobs by Humphreys and Plummer (1995). However, Porter and Fletcher (2008), who did an ex post study after the Atlanta Games, reject these predictions. They argue that, by looking at the real data of the hotel occupancy rates, the total retail trade and taxable sales, it was impossible for the Atlanta Games to bring such predicted levels of benefit.

Critics of the I-O model point to two major difficulties with the approach. The first is miscalculations of the economic effect of hosting the Olympics. Gross and net spending has to be separated when calculating the direct expenditures. The I-O model thus needs to accurately assess the extent to which spending would have occurred in the absence of the Games (Baade & Matheson, 2002; Madden & Crowe, 1998). Although their focus is predominantly on American professional sport, the principles apply also to Games hosting. They argue that sport fans’ spending on the Games may come from reallocating leisure spending from somewhere else while leaving spending overall fundamentally intact. Therefore, distinguishing the gross and net spending will be essential and may not contribute as much as to metropolitan economies as boosters claim (Baade, 1996). Moreover, it fails to
distinguish the spending by local residents and non-local and leakages from the circular flow of spending are underestimated (Baade & Matheson, 2002; Baade et al., 2008).

Secondly, it in general ignores opportunity costs. In other words, even if the Olympics do generate positive net benefits, it is arguable that public funds could be invested in somewhere else if the net benefits exceed those from an alternative use of the funds (Baade & Matheson, 2002; Baade et al., 2008; Kesenne, 1999).

Another important method is the CGE model. One advantage of the CGE analysis is that it can automatically calculate the displacement effects that have been referred to the main reason of overly-optimistic estimates from the Games (Madden, 2002). Resource scarcities are taken into account by the CGE model so that some of the resources spent on the event and event-related activities, such as tourism, are drawn from uses in other activities. Although the I-O model is less costly and simpler to use, there is a growing recognition in the literature that the assumptions imposed on the I-O framework are overly restrictive therefore the application of the CGE model is recommended. The CGE model was first adopted in the ex post-economic analysis of the Sydney Games by Giesecke and Madden (2007). It has been also applied in the ex ante London Games analysis by Blake (2005). As discussed above the I-O model tends to provide positive prediction, in contrast, the results that the CGE model estimates are more likely to be modest. For example, KPMG’s ex ante study (1993) estimates, by applying the I-O model, that the 2000 Olympics would add over $7 billion to Australian GDP in total over the period 1991 to 2004 and more than 11,000 jobs nationally. These predictions have been challenged by Andersen (1999) and NSW Treasury (2008). They demonstrate that, by using the CGE model the value of the Olympics is estimated as $6.5 billion in GDP, and as $6.1 billion respectively. However, the CGE analysis still faces some problems (Giesecke & Madden, 2007). As this model still must make assumptions regarding certain factors which are likely to be the key drivers of the results, Madden (2006) points out that without careful defining of the direct effects, indirect effects and induced effects, the estimated results could be totally underestimated.

Emergent themes

By reviewing the literature, a relatively clearer picture of the economic impact of the previous Olympics is provided, which can be summarised in the following three points. In relation to the first point, on the one hand, although it has been evident that overly-optimistic
benefits from hosting the Olympics tend to be generated, *ex ante* analysis of the macroeconomic impact of hosting events is still necessary, especially at the bidding process and pre-Games period, in order to present a balanced view of host nation’s expected costs and benefits. On the other hand, even though the CGE model seems to overcome some fundamental deficiencies of the I-O model, it is still not a panacea for the economic analysis of the Olympics as compared to the I-O model the costs of producing a CGE analysis of the Games are relatively high, and also it is a complicated economic framework which requires careful application. Therefore, bearing in mind the strengths and weaknesses of the two economic models, a relatively suitable technique should be selected to correspond with particular circumstances; and also the assumptions on which the models are based should be carefully defined and scrutinised.

Secondly, another major issue is whether significant additional economic growth effects can be derived from organizing the Games. Hosting the Olympics Games seems to be associated with a ‘White Elephants’ effect. Mixed findings in terms of the Olympics’ contributions to the host areas’ economy exist in the literature. The dispute of the extent to which the benefits of hosting the Olympics justify the large public expenditures is still on-going. However, a simple answer of ‘yes’ or ‘no’ to the question cannot be given. Instead, it should be considered in line with the objectives that each host county expects to achieve (Tien et al., 2011). As the value of and objectives for hosting the Olympics are wide-ranging, e.g. economic, tourism, political, social etc., it is arguably that the impact of hosting the Olympics should not only be assessed in terms of financial benefits, but should also consider other impacts and be compared to respective strategic objectives. Moreover, as pointed out by Preuss and Solberg (2006) achieving economic benefits was never the initial reason for staging mega sporting events. Events such as the Olympics have social values to local residents and the national population as well, such as non-pecuniary ‘feel good’ benefit, or when Crompton (2001) refers to as ‘psychic income’ and civic pride effects etc. The transitory nature of the economic impact of the Olympics (Preuss & Alfs, 2011) could be assessed to some degree, however, due to the difficulty of quantifying social impacts, it seems arbitrary to conclude the Olympics did or did not bring benefits to the host nation based on the financial values calculated to represent these non-financial costs and benefits.

Finally, it has been recognised in the literature that the economic effect goes beyond the host city to other regions of the same country, yet there is little evidence to support this claim.
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(Kurtzman, 2005). The only study conducted an economic-related analysis in a non-host region is a contingent valuation study of the London 2012 Games for Bath residents (Walton, Longo, & Dawson, 2008). Positive intangible effects associated with the Games have been found – non-host residents are willing to pay toward the cost of hosting the London 2012 Olympic Games. Yet, little studies on non-host cities have been undertaken.

c) Other economic impact

Stock market

There is a limited amount of literature that examines the reaction of the stock market to the Olympic announcement, or the impact on sponsoring firms’ stock returns, some with positive findings (Bruckner & Pappa, 2011; Clark et al., 2002; Miyazaki & Morgan, 2001; Samitas et al., 2008; Veraros et al., 2004); and some indicating no overall impact on the stock market (Berman et al., 2000; Floros, 2010).

A significant positive effect on the host nation’s stock market has been found in the Athens Games (Veraros et al., 2004), and in the Atlanta Games (Miyazaki & Morgan, 2001). Recently, another stock market analysis study conducted by Samitas et al. (2008) found a marginal positive impact that sponsorship announcements cause in international and national sponsors’ stock returns. Specifically, the Athens Games’ sponsorship announcements were more influential for small size firms’ stock returns which were more positive compared to larger ones.

An analysis of stock market reaction between 1970 and 2006 to both the hosting and bidding countries is carried out by Bruckner and Pappa (2011). The empirical results indicate that the before effects of the Olympics on stock prices are positive and significant nine and eight years before the hosting of the events for the bidding countries.

However, the Olympics do not always react positively to the stock market. Studies by both Berman et al (2000) and Floros’ (2010) suggest that there is no overall impact on the stock market either in the Sydney Games or the Athens Games. In the case of the Sydney Games, only a limited number of industry portfolios show a significant positive impact of the Olympic Games announcement. As to the Athens Games, Floro’s findings are consistent with the empirical results of Samitas et al.(2008), Miyazaki and Morgan (2001), and Clark et al
who conclude that sponsorship by Greek organisations was successful and enhanced the corporate image and the value of the Greek firms (OTE).

In sum, mixed evidence in the literature indicates that either the Olympic Games positively influence, or that there is no overall influence on the movement in stock prices of particular official Olympic Sponsors, or of the whole. However, there is a growing literature addressing this particular aspect, which appears to be correlated with expected future sponsorship success. Moreover, becoming exclusive sponsors of the Olympic Games still seems to be a way of reaching an international audience and linking products to the Olympics Games in order to gain an edge over competitors (Kapsi, 2004).

**Trade & Exports**

Another economic impact evident in the literature is in relation to the Games’ impact on national exports and overall trade. By using a variety of trade models, Rose and Spiegel (2010) demonstrate that hosting the Olympics has positive impacts on national exports by analysing annual data between 1950 and 2006 from some 196 territories and localities. They find that countries which have hosted the Games seem to have exports over 20% higher. And such positive effects of export and trade are statistically robust, permanent and large, the same as to unsuccessful bidding countries.

**Employment**

In the literature, the Olympic Games’ impact on the employment aspect is often analysed together with the general economic effects (findings of employment effects are summarised in the Table 4.11). The reason for creating this particular section for employment effect review is there are three specific studies which are purely focused on such themes, with empirical data (Hotchkiss et al., 2003), without empirical data (Green, 2003), and with secondary analysis of previous findings (Tucker, 2006).

Empirical data from the Atlanta Games identifies that there is a positive employment impact of the 1996 Games on an extended area of countries that hosted Olympic events, with an increase of 17% of employment that translates into approximately 293,000 more jobs (Hotchkiss et al., 2003). Green (2003) critically evaluates the claim that IntervistasConsulting (2002) made for the Vancouver Games. He argues that the predicted number ignores additionality and that the 244,000 ‘new jobs’ refers to the total number employed not to net
new job creation. In addition, the majority of these employment figures come from the archive of the Convention Centre rather than the Olympics. Furthermore, a secondary analysis (Tucker, 2006) of the previous findings suggests that, with reviewing the Summer Olympic Games from 1984 to 2004, there is a positive impact on employment associated with the Games. In addition, the Olympics may induce more employment in wealthier countries than in less wealthy countries. Employment levels may increase long before the Games, which perhaps are in response to construction and increased international visibility. Another interesting finding is that higher levels of infrastructure expenditures have a strong negative effect as, for instance, it is arguable that employment gains may be diminished when politicians use the Games as a cover to engage in expensive projects that would not otherwise be feasible. ‘Olympic’ expenditure in such cases simply represents displacement of expenditures in the ‘normal’ infrastructure budget.

4.3.5 Tourism

As suggested by the IOC that potential visitors will be drawn to Olympic venues after being exposed to them through the Games, it has been identified in the literature that there is a strong relationship between the Olympics and tourism (Fourie & Santana-Gallego, 2011; Kapareliotis et al., 2010; Song, 2010). Specifically, sporting mega-events, such as the Olympics, play a significant role in connecting tourism with the event itself, in terms of their attractiveness to participants, the fans, spectators, and the officials and so on (see for example, Dansero & Puttilli, 2010). Moreover, it has significant positive impacts on the tourism industry in terms of boosting the number of external and internal tourists, generating economic benefits. Such effects begin with the preparation phase and continue during the event, and can sometimes continue even after the Games although it has been considered as short-lived (e.g., Dansero & Puttilli, 2010).

A particular sub-set of the literature on the Olympic Games legacies/impacts is about tourism effects. A number of authors have addressed this issue based on empirical data (Athanasopoulos & Hyndman, 2008; Blake, 2005; Duran, 2005; Leeds, 2008; Spilling, 1996; Teigland, 1999), while some of them have focused on developing critical historical evaluative overviews of the tourism effects of the Games (Fourie & Santana-Gallego, 2011; Groote, 2005; Kirkup & Major, 2006; Preuss, 2004b; Song, 2010), others have demonstrated their managerialist set of concerns on the development and strategy of the tourism and the key
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cornets of tourism legacies and tourism development (Chernushenko, 1996; Dansero & Puttilli, 2010; O'Brien, 2006; Roche, 1996; Smith & Stevenson, 2009; Weed, 2006a).

What the Olympics can offer for tourism?

As the world’s premier sporting event, with an audience of billions and a worldwide range of media coverage, the Olympics provide an opportunity to better communicate with travellers and audiences. The economic impact that international tourism brings to the host nation during the Olympic Games’ year has been recognised as one of the most significant components of the effects of the Olympic Games on national economies (Li & Blake, 2008). For instance, the Barcelona 1992 Games enabled the city to expand its tourist capacity and update its tourist infrastructure. In addition, the influence of the media coverage placed Barcelona on the map and led it to become one of the Europe’s main tourist destinations since the Games. This Barcelona tourism phenomena has impacted not only on the city, but also on the state of Spain as a whole (Duran, 2005). Another successful example is the Sydney 2000 Games. As a consequence of hosting the Games, the city and country were subject to increased awareness and interest which generated additional tourism impacts (Chalip, Green, & Hill, 2003). Although, the tourism visits to Sydney reduced after the Games but this is related to the problem of SARS, and the terrorist incidents in New York on September 11th (ETOA, 2007), so it could be argued that without the Olympics tourism would have decreased by a greater amount.

Olympic tourism can be divided into three parts in terms of time periods: one, the visits of spectators, athletes, officials and dignitaries during the Games; and pre- and post-games tourism which may result from sports training tourism, sports event tourism, sports participation tourism and tourism with sports content (Weed & Bull, 2009). Tourism impacts of the Olympics come from additional international tourists and tourism spending.

By examining the data set between 1982 and 2008, Song’s study (2010) summarises the impact of the Summer Olympics on tourism as positive and significant. However, such effects are quick and short-lived, concentrated around 4 years before and after the actual hosting of the Games. In addition, it also implies that, due to the short term Olympic impacts on tourism, impact studies may be prone to overestimate these benefits of the Games. Other tourism related studies in the previous Olympics have been summarised in the Table 4.12.
Table 4.12 The tourism impact studies of previous Olympic Games

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Predominant Motivation Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Duran, 2005)</td>
<td>Barcelona 1992</td>
<td>Ex post</td>
<td>Results:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Room occupation rates had risen from 71% in 1991 to 84% in 1992, immediately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dropped to 54% in 1993 and 1994. This figure has increased to 80% between 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and 2001 thanks to the other major events coming to the city.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 1.7 million visitors in 1990 – by 2001 this had increased to 3.4 million.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- The image of Barcelona changes from ‘business and industrial city’ before 1990 to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>now the ‘holiday and sport destination’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- The Games created a development in which tourism represents 14% of the city’s GDP,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>equally to a direct injection of some 1,438 million Euro into the local economy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Spilling, 1996)</td>
<td>Lillehammer 1994</td>
<td>Ex post Method: secondary analysis of the national Statistics Norway, which include data on:</td>
<td>Results:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>bed capacity and number of guest nights obtained every month for all hotels and other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>accommodation businesses in the region; data of the number of visitors in the major tourist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>attractions of the region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Statistics suggest that there has been a significant growth in the number of visitors in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lillehammer (59%). In particular, there was a peak demand during the Olympics, and the number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>of guest nights has dropped significantly since then.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- In the region, there was a total growth of guest nights for the years 1989-1995 (60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- The Olympic arenas development has turned out to be major tourist attractions, and existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tourist attractions have also experienced significant growth in attendance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fourie &amp; Santana-Gallego (2011)</td>
<td>1996-2011</td>
<td>Ex post Model</td>
<td>the gravity models</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Mega-events, such as the Summer Olympic Games, can increase the number of tourists in the year of the event, on average by roughly 8%;
- The Winter Olympics seem not to have a significant positive impact on tourism. This may be due to tourism displacement.
- There are significant increases in pre-event tourism; whereas, lack of performance of post-event.
- Tourism from participating countries increases more than tourists from countries not participating in the mega-event.
- Mega-events do promote tourism but the gain is dependent on the type of mega-event, the participating countries, the host country’s level of development, and whether the event is held during the peak- or off-season. |
| Madden (2002) | Sydney 2000 | Ex post Model | the Multiregional Forecasting model | the increased international tourism spending was predicted to be around AU$400 million. |
| Athanasopoulos & Hyndman (2008) | Sydney 2000 | Ex post Model | Innovation state space models | the findings suggest that the impact of the 2000 Games on Australian domestic tourism such as the increase in business travel immediately after the Games. |
| Li & Blake (2008) | Beijing 2008 | Ex ante Economic Model | CGE | 
- The central scenario assumes that a foreign visitor would spend $225 per day during the Beijing Olympics.
- The increased foreign tourist number attributable to the staging the Olympics was forecasted to be 294,000, with total spending $899.39 million. |
- The summer Olympics have positively and significantly affected tourists and export.
- Such tourism effects are quick and short-lived, concentrated around 4 years before and after the actual hosting of the Olympics. |
| Blake (2005) | London 2012 | Ex ante Economic Model | CGE | international tourism expenditures was estimated to be £364 million |
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a) Emergent themes

Displacement effects

*Displacement* effects have been emphasised by a number of academics in terms of assessing the tourism effects of the Games (Blake, 2005; Crompton, 1995; Dansero & Putilli, 2010; Preuss, 2004b). The *displacement* or *crowding-out* effect, refers to non-sporting tourists who may choose to travel elsewhere during the Games in order to avoid the crowds, or local residents who seek to travel abroad to escape the disruption normally associated with the Games, such as security, transport and escalating prices concerns (Fourie & Santana-Gallego, 2011). Preuss suggests that the Olympic tourism effects are often exaggerated as a result of lack of consideration of the displacement effects. With regards to this point, it is not surprise that such conclusions surface from the literature as similar results have been also identified in the general economic impact section. On the one hand, bearing in mind the possibility of miscalculating displacement effect in the tourism legacy evaluation, it is important to maintain a neutral attitude towards the results as the Olympics in general still can generate significant positive impacts in the tourism sector. For instance, a historical overview of the Olympic Games from 1996-2006 suggests that, in general, hosting the Olympic Games is beneficial even taking into account of the tourism crowding-out effect (Fourie & Santana-Gallego, 2011). On the other hand, even with these tourism positive effects, we cannot be over optimistic since the overall benefits still might not exceed the overall costs of hosting the Games. A comprehensive consideration of the overall picture thus needs to be taken.

Another interesting point in relation to *displacement* effect emerges from the literature, especially in the context of the Winter Olympics. A study carried out by Leeds (2008) examines the spillover effects of the 2002 Olympic Games on the ski industry in the nearby cities. He argues that, tourists who cannot, or do not, want to visit the city because it is hosting the Games will look for a reasonable alternative, and a neighbouring city could gain from spillover. Empirical data confirms this hypothesis that an alternative destination experienced a significant economic boost with regards to ski resorts as a result of the 2002 Winter Olympics. Therefore, it suggests that nearby states and cities might want to encourage their neighbours to host the Games because of such gains. This particular case has two-fold meanings. One, the existing *displacement* effect explores the possibility of non-host regions enjoying the tourism benefits of the Games. It suggests that, from the non-host region point of view, a specific strategy of tourism development during the Games may bring extra profits.
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since it has been evident that some non-host cities have made gains. The successful creation of an appropriate experience in non-host cities would probably increase the potential possibility of re-visiting even after the Games. Second, from academic’s point of view, while providing an analysis of the host city’s tourism impacts of the Games, a broader overview of other non-host regions’ situation may be worth being given. However, the author argues that the benefits which accrue to non-host regions may be more evident in the context of the Winter Olympics – since the requirement of the Games to use the host city’s winter sporting facilities is inevitable, and thus the majority of the traditional sporting tourists would have to go to another city in order to avoid not only the crowded zones, but also overloaded sporting facilities.

**Temporary effects**

As identified in the literature, especially in the context of tourism, the Olympics tend to create a significant positive boost which subsequently stabilise activity at a ‘permanently’ higher or a lower level than where it had been before the Games (Dansero & Puttilli, 2010; Spilling, 1996). Such effect is also referred as ‘industrial intermezzo’ which means a sudden economic success after the event that usually lasts only for a short time such as the Lillehammer example (Spilling, 1996). Specifically, Spilling compares the data of the number of visitors not only in Lillehammer, but also in two nearby cities, which indicated that there had been a significant growth (59%) in Lillehammer but this had dropped immediately after the Games; whereas, the other two cities also experienced significant growth (225% for Oyer and 76% for Gausdal) in the number of visitors – and such growth continued even after the Games but generally moved toward stabilisation at a higher level than where it was before the Olympics.

Dansero and Puttilli’s (2010) study also suggests that the positive effect the Torino 2006 Games had on tourism was only temporary and that the city’s attractiveness to tourists diminished even more than was expected before the Games. The data on foreign visitors and arrivals in 2007 in the city were lower than they had been fours year before the Olympics in 2002.

Indeed, the Olympics do contribute to stimulate the development and expansion of the tourism industry in the host country and city; however, these temporary effects are likely to be insufficient for justifying the huge costs of hosting the Olympics. This therefore casts
doubt on claims about the optimistic tourism benefits through hosting the Olympics, made by supporters of the bid. Such temporary effects also raise a concern about what types of policies need to be implemented in order to support the development of tourism in a host country.

However, such temporary impact is not always the case - the Barcelona Games appear to have been an exception. Barcelona demonstrates the positive use of a series of different major events and conferences after the Olympics (Duran, 2005). In order to harness the power of the Games in post-Games period, a specific programme – ‘Barcelona Sports’ was developed that aimed to attract the 15 major internationally-consolidated sporting events which recur year after year. These events attract hundreds of thousands of visitors from around the world. As a result, Barcelona enjoyed the most spectacular tourist growth in Europe over a 10-12 year period (1990-1992-2002). Now Barcelona has become a major urban tourist destination, and in particular a sporting and cultural tourism centre. The principle lessons learnt from the Barcelona Games can be summarised as: first, that careful strategic planning and management can generate success; and second, managing to host repeated major events at the same location generates repeated returns on investment.

The function which the London 2012 Games may serve is to create an interaction between sport as tourism, and London as a world leading tourist destination27. This could provide the potential for a wide range of highly significant benefits (Weed, 2006a). With limited tourism related initiatives having been developed, the answer to the question of whether the 2012 Games will provide an opportunity to generate the projected £2.3 billion (at 2006 price) in additional tourism benefits for the UK over a 7-10 year period is still open (DCMS, 2007).

b) **Recommendations**

**Integration of the policy and resource, leveraging Olympic tourism**

Dansero and Puttilli (2010) argue that in order to avoid the ‘intermezzo’ effect, the integration of the event’s legacy must be incorporated into medium- and long-term tourism policies, and specific initiatives will also need to be delivered. One thing which should be borne in mind is that such proposed recommendation requires a complex system of governance. It is easier to summarise this issue from the literature than it is to ensure it will

---

27 The brand image of London consistently ranked impressively on welcoming people, cultural richness, education and business climate. In specific, London ranked as the second place among 50 cities measured in 2011 (GfK, 2012), while the UK ranked as the third (GfK, 2011).
be delivered. The issue is thus whether the host city is able to equip itself with policies to manage and promote the legacy beyond the event with a more far-sighted view of promoting tourism for the region.

As identified by Dansero and Puttilli (2010) in the case of the Torino 2006 Games, there are three key factors which are critical to the creation and retention of the Games’ tourism legacies. The first is the ability to make the Olympic image and legacies work together as a system with the resources that the host city can mobilise, or already has. Indeed, the first step of developing tourism legacy of the Games is to foster a positive destination image, and also recognise which resources the Games has procured for the host city and country, and how these resources can continue to be valuable, even after the Games, to attract tourists. The idea of event leverage, which suggests that using events to achieve pre-existing and long-term objectives, rather than developing provisional plans has been proposed in the literature (Chalip, Ritchie, & Adair, 2004; O’Brien, 2006; Smith & Fox, 2007; Weed, 2006a). The term ‘leverage’ refers to “those activities which need to be undertaken around the event itself …which seek to maximize the long-term benefits from events” (Chalip et al., 2004: 228). This idea of leveraging legacy is important if temporary effects are to be transformed into lasting benefits for example in the tourism industry. The event leveraging starts from tightening of linkages among different agencies responsible for sport, tourism, and economic policy development (Chalip, 2001). By establishing a medium through which hosts can relate to the international business decision-makers, local stakeholders can be facilitated to get access to multiple business networks in the context of the Olympic excitement (O’Brien, 2006). In order to ensure a positive legacy can be leveraged, it also requires effective co-ordination between Games organisers, local agencies, different levels of government, local business and communities(Dansero & Puttilli, 2010).

The second factor is in relation to the ability of reusing the Games’ facilities to attract new international and national events. This point is also supported by commentators, such as Li and Blake (2008) who suggest that, in order to promote the city as a tourism destination, efforts need to be made to enhance the Games’ legacy by attracting more subsequent major events. Repeated events at the same location might create several waves of development and increase awareness of the location (Teigland, 1999). Hosting of the Olympics requires the development of new tourist services, structures (such as hotels, restaurants), the infrastructure networks (for instance, roads, railways, airports). Such tangible impacts are valuable
resources which can be reused for future events. Therefore, the ability to attract more national and international events to the host city is crucial in order to make efficient use of the resources generated by the Games. Therefore, the World Athletics Championships attracted to London can be also seen as UK Sports successful campaign to host events in the UK.

The last identified factor is the ability to make effective use of the legacy of the event not only towards external tourism (on an international scale), but also towards internal tourism (regional). While it is important to use the Games to attract international tourists, we have to face the fact that such positive effects are likely to wane seriously after the Games. In addition, one cannot be sure that the host country/city will be able to bid successfully for future major events, and even if they are successful, how long such major events will be in coming. Thus, as part of the tourism legacy, domestic tourists have significant potential in terms of better maintaining the Games’ legacy. Rather than of requiring more significant tourism resources as international tourists would need, the focus of development has been shifted to incorporate ‘soft’ tourism demand, based on recreational and cultural activities for domestic tourists.

4.3.6 Sport participation

Together with other social impacts of major sporting events, it has often been quoted that the association between the events and health improvements exists via increased sport participation, promoting healthy living, improved physical health and interest in Olympic sport (Atkinson, Mourato, Szymanski, & Ozdemiroglu, 2008; Haynes, 2001; PriceWaterhouseCoopers & DCMS, 2005b). However, the notion that the Olympics might inspire grassroots participation has been challenged in the literature. The direct evidence of sport, health, and physical activity legacies for previous Olympic Games is poor (McCartney et al., 2010; Weed, 2006a).

The value of encouraging sports participation has long been established in the literature. For example, sport promotes a healthy lifestyle and raising wellbeing. Being active increases chance to resist a wide range of diseases, such as obesity (Kavetsos & Szymanski, 2009), and forms of cancer (Kreis & Bodeker, 2004). In addition, there is a high financial cost linked to obesity, and physical inactivity. For instance, it is estimated that the figures of health care costs resulting from physical inactivity could be as high as $24.3 billion for the US (Colditz, 1999), and £8.2 billion for England (Chief Medical Officer, 2004). Moreover, it is also
suggested that an active lifestyle can create other positive psychological effects, for example enhancing confidence, discipline, responsibility and self-esteem (London East Research Institute, 2007; Pfeifer & Cornelißen, 2010; PriceWaterhouseCoopers & DCMS, 2005b). Furthermore, a direct connection between sport and physical activity participation and workplace performance suggests that employees practicing sports take sick leave significantly less often (or for shorter periods) than their colleagues not practicing sports, especially when their work is sedentary (van den Heuvel et al., 2005).

In reviewing the literature, mixed evidence can be identified:

- **Positive evidence**: In the literature, it is suggested that the Olympics increased participation in physical activity in the Barcelona Games (London East Research Institute, 2007), although this conclusion was drawn from comparing two different reports carried in 1989 and 1995 respectively (Truno, 1995). In 1989, the sport participation rate of Barcelona was 47%. After hosting the Olympic Games, the number of people participating in sport had risen to 51%. In particular, the number of women participating in sport had significantly increased by about 10%, from 35% in 1989 increasing to 45% in 1995. However, Truno’s study, on which these claims are based, tended not to take account additionality effects, and thus although the positive claim that sport participation rates increased can be made, it is difficult to determine the extent to which these changes were triggered by hosting of the Barcelona Games. Another example of generating positive results came from the Sydney Games. By reviewing the data from Australian Bureau of Statistics, Veal and Toohey’s (2005) study identified an increase in sports participation following the Sydney Games. In specific, among Olympic and non-Olympic sport, some showed increases in participation after 2000, some were decline and some were stable. Their analysis of these positive results indicated that such results were likely due to either (or both) the Olympic effect and the changes in survey design.

A study of post Games legacy uses, in terms of civic amenity and sporting venue, was conducted by Cashman (2006). The overall figures of sport participation moved upwards. However, this research is arguable to be seemed as problematic, in terms of the positive conclusion of sport participation it generated, that failed to specify what constitutes ‘sport participation’.
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• **No Change evidence:** by reviewing evidence from past Olympics, Edcoms (2007) suggested that there was no clear evidence that hosting events encourages participation in physical activity, although there may be short term gains. Another study carried out by Murphy and Bauman (2007) examined the effects of the Sydney Games on physical activity by comparing the national annual physical activity surveys before and after the Games. The results suggested that there was no change in the proportion of the population meeting health-enhancing physical activity levels. The participation rates were even lower in 2000 than in 1999 and 1998. Other studies of the sport participation legacy in the Sydney Games resulted in the similar findings – there was insignificant change to sport participation level in general, but with a short-term spike after the Games (Heuvel, 2001; Veal & Toohey, 2005). Moreover, with the passing of five years of the Sydney Games, according to research conducted by Bowles et al (2006), there was still no evidence to demonstrate that the Games had a positive effect on physical activity frequency.

• **Negative evidence:** previous research in the context of the 2002 Manchester Commonwealth Games (MORI, 2004) surprisingly showed that there was even a decline in the amount of sport participation by 2% in Manchester area. Coalter (2007) shares his concern on negative sport participation effects that mega sporting events may generate. He argues that despite of major sporting events increased the number of available venues and facilities, big events may be counterproductive for grass roots participation as they divert funds from grass roots investment.

Two studies are worth mentioning here as both of them are based on systematic literature reviews in the area of the health and physical activity impacts of major multi-sport events, i.e. McCartney et al (2010) and Weed et al (2009). In general, both studies conclude that there is not no strong evidence that hosting major sporting events has clear positive health impacts on host populations. In terms of the sport and physical activity impacts of the Olympics, Weed et al conclude that “the use of an Olympic Games to raise physical activity and sport participation has not been attempted in any real sense”(2009: 8). The assessment of such impacts is often assumed rather than support with robust evidence (this point will be returned to later).
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London 2012 legacy research commissioned by the DCMS and the COI was conducted by EdComs in 2007, in order to assess the potential of mega-events, and in particular the Olympic and Paralympic Games, to influence people’s wider attitudes and behaviour across the five legacy commitment areas: sport, regeneration of the east London, children and young people, sustainable living, and business. In general, the report suggests that there is no robust evidence to show a link between the positive effects on a community of hosting a major sporting event such as the Olympics, but also no evidence of negative effect either. One reason for this is perhaps that there are a variety of different methodologies used to measure such impacts; as a consequence, the findings can lack clarity.

a) Emergent issues

In general, the low quality of evidence in support or against arguments for physical activity legacy is recognised within the field (McCartney et al., 2010; Weed et al., 2009). The following three issues are evident in the literature and are worth addressing.

‘Trickle down’ effect

The notion of the ‘trickle down’ effect refers to the claim that successful performances by elite athletes can inspire greater participation at the sport-for-all level (Toohey, 2010). This is a virtuous circle in which sport-for-all supports elite sport, which in turn, it is anticipated, will inspire more people to participate. It is assumed that the affective use of the Games, the role models of the athletes, the infrastructure and expertise mobilised in putting the Games under the spotlight of global broadcasting will motivate those at grassroots level to engage in sports participation (London East Research Institute, 2007).

In the literature, there is mixed evidence of the ‘trickle down’ effect on participation (Weed et al., 2009). Evidence from the Vancouver Games showed that there seemed to be effects to demonstrate the ‘trickle down’ effect in Canada (VANOC, 2007). However, it is worth noting that there were some non-Olympic related initiatives which were delivered in the period of the Games time were likely to have contributed to this effect. Strong in New Zealand study (Hindson, Gidlow, & Peebles, 1994) examined the impact of the Albertville and the Barcelona 1992 Games based on a postal survey of 35 New Zealand sports clubs and six National Sporting Organisations after the Albertville Games and the Barcelona Games. The survey suggested that the Olympics may have limited ‘trickle down’ effect on general community participation, with six of the clubs having an increase in membership inquiries,
three experiencing an increase in competitive membership, and two increasing recreational membership.

Coalter (2004) rejects the assumption underlying the ‘trickle down’ effect. He argues that unless the Games are embedded in a longer-term development strategy they are very unlikely to have any general impacts. Those ‘trickle down’ effects from the Olympics are not automatic. And they appear dependent on broader factors and surrounding initiatives. In addition, EdComs’ report (2007) also indicates that much of the increased participation that seems to be obtained from elite events is in fact likely come to disproportionately from people who are already active.

Hindson et al. (1994) also concluded that, in order to generate trickle down benefits from the Olympics, there is a need to establish a longer-term developmental strategy embedded in the Games. The authors addressed the need for national sporting organisations to actively use the Olympic Games for marketing, which would help to create links with other organisations and gain benefits from the event as a whole.

In sum, the literature suggests that the assumption of the ‘trickle-down’ effect is likely to be simplistic in terms of using the major sporting events to engage non-participations in physical activity and sport. However, major events may have a potential impact on raising the frequency of participation among those already engaged with sport (Weed et al., 2009).

The role of elite

The role of elite refers to the claim that elite sporting role models will inspire and encourage widespread participation (Coalter, 2007). The general consensus in relation to the role of elite success, as summarised by Weed et al.’s systematic review (2009), is that there is very little academic evidence to confirm the proposed causal link between elite sporting success and general population level participation. Indeed, the effects of elite sporting events on community participation are complex to assess, there is simply a lack of a trustworthy method for evaluating such claims (London East Research Institute, 2007; VANOC, 2007).

The literature suggests that the role of elite is not a direct causal motivator in the promotion of participation (London East Research Institute, 2007). Although EdComs (2007) found some positive evidence of this trend, they reported that it is difficult to separate this from other influences, such as watching the activity on TV, the influence of friends, wider
initiatives to encourage participation, desire to take more exercise etc. Therefore, in general, there is no strong evidence base to support the claim that elite sport can effectively encourage mass participation (Weed et al., 2009), as the underlying assumptions about the relationship between sporting role models and wider sports participation fail to explain the complexity of the processes of learning and behavioural change (Payne, Reynolds, Brown, & Fleming, 2003).

Coalter (2004) supports this perspective. He further argues that elite success may even deter others who fear not being good enough to participate in sport. Hindson et al (1994) also make this point. They argue that, on the one hand, elite sports people can be inspirational as role models; on the other hand, they may deter participation because of the perceived competence gap.

By recognising the potential failure of the sport elite to act as motivational role models, DCMS’s systematic review of sport participation study (2005) suggests that, when models of perfection are used to promote physical activity, people find it difficult to identify; whereas, the ‘real life’ role models appear to be more effective for example in a group of older people, among those from diverse ethnic backgrounds or with teenagers. Thus, instead of using a sporty super hero to attract people’s interest in sport participation and physical activity, real life role models, such as the story of a local successful football player may prove to be more effective.

Facility legacy

The potential of facilities legacies has particular potential impact for on participation among children and young people, Weed et al (2009) claimed in their systematic review. It has been widely claimed that a modern sports infrastructure can have positive impacts for the quality of life of local populations. The Vancouver Games demonstrated that there was an increase in fitness activity and use of facilities especially by children (VANOC, 2007). Similar evidence also found in the Manchester Commonwealth Games and the Sydney Games of which the hosting of the major events and targeted specific programmes for schools or young people can have an impact of increasing their participation in sports, rather than spontaneous involvement (EdComs, 2007). Past experience from the Manchester Commonwealth Games demonstrates that the facilities need to be located in a convenient place for local community
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and targeted to an appropriate audience (EdComs, 2007; London East Research Institute, 2007).

b) The case of London 2012

As was the case for the Sydney Games, the UK government had the same expectations that recreational sport would be a beneficiary of the legacy that the Games would provide. One prospect is that the national sport participation would increase. In the bid for the 2012 Olympics, the government outlined that a successful bid would not only bring legacies of for example economic, tourism, urban regeneration and so, but also would act like “the catalyst that inspires people of all ages and all talents to lead more active lives” (Jowell, 2003).

The potential to achieve this ambition has been challenged in the period since the bid was won in 2005. As the systematic reviews referred to earlier suggest, there is no host country which has yet been able to demonstrate a direct clear sport participation benefit from hosting the Olympic Games (see also Woodhouse, 2011). Indeed, ever the Labour Government’s own sport strategy Game Plan, produced by the DCMS in 2002 acknowledged that “it would seem that hosting events is not an effective, value for money method of achieving either a sustained increase in mass participation or sustainable international success” (2002: 75). Nevertheless, the London’s bid team for the 2012 Olympic insisted on increased participation as a rational for bidding.

With regard to the possible explanations for the failure of the use of major sporting event to generate growth in the host nation’s sport participation, it may be that, the use of an Olympic Games to raise physical activity and sport participation has not been actively pursued in any real sense by governments or host cities (Weed et al., 2009). The London 2012 Games is a different case as the bid team specifically outlined raised participation rates as a target for the Olympic legacy. However, setting a target would not, of itself, produce change. According to the figures from the Active People Survey, the rate of adults participating in at least 30 minutes of sport at moderate intensity at least once a week had risen from 13.9 million in 2005/6 to 14.8 million in 2010/11 (Sport England, 2012), the earlier promise of ‘getting two million people more active by 2012’ would have clearly not been accomplished28. In 2011, the Coalition Government had now officially abandoned this goal (Gibson, 2011). Arguably,

28 However, it is worth noting that, after the Games, the 2012 Active People Survey showed a boost of sport participation with 15.5 million people playing sport at least once a week; and the figure slightly decreased to 15.3 million in spring 2013.
it is good to have such ambition, but which is too high for the relatively limited amounts of funding and the programmes to successfully deliver. It is thus perhaps to be viewed as political rhetoric that never would be fully realised.

A further factor which may explain the failure of delivering raised participation rates by past Games, is that many Olympic sports are minority sports with limited popular appeal, and some require considerable investment in equipment and training as a precondition of participation (The Centre for Social Justice, 2011). For example, in the case of the UK, two Olympic sports at which Britain has excelled, rowing and equestrianism, are equipment and training intensive. Therefore, as to the grass roots, although people may be inspired by their national athletes’ successful performance, they will find it difficult to translate this into participation.

A third factor relates to what we have discussed above – naïve assumptions concerning elite sports people as role models. By comparing the weekly participation rate of the Active People Survey 2 and Active People Survey 4 (Sport England, 2008a, 2010a), only one of the 11 sports, Athletics, in which British athletes won medals during the 2008 Beijing Games had a statistical significantly increase in grassroots participation, which thus clearly demonstrates that it is not possible to demonstrate a link between success in Olympic sports and mass participation.

In terms of the outlined participation ambition, what were the reasons for setting up this (unachievable) target given the fact that it had been recognised that hosting a major sporting event had not generated a sustained increase in mass participation in previous cases. The plans were derived from the expectation that hosting the Games would inspire popular enthusiasm for sport. However, it is arguable that such interest and excitement in sport would not be converted automatically to attitude and behaviour change without well planned programmes, facilities and funding support. For instance, according to a survey conducted by the Centre for Social Justice (2011), the likelihood that an individual would perceive the Games as an irrelevance to levels of participation in their area increased with distance from London – 54% of Londoners felt this way, compared with 72% of Scots. The fact that, in general 61% of people believe that “the London 2012 will make no difference to the number of people participating in sport”, reveals they low or no expectation in relation to increased sport participation being brought about as a result of hosting the Games. Similar findings can be found from MRUK’s study (2009) which was commissioned by the London Councils in
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2008. On the basis of 1,020 telephone interviews across the London, it is claimed that 45% of Londoners felt less confident that the Games would make the UK a great sporting nation. This may explain that while there has not been much obvious change in the level of sport participation, public enthusiasm about hosting the Games was high as to 64.5% (DCMS, 2011).

The issues in relation to strategic planning, the delivery of tailored initiatives, and funding support are even more worrying. First, the change of government in 2010 resulted in a change in the London 2012 legacy strategy (see Table 4.13 for details). The organisational focus of Sport England has shifted in favour of a concentration on sports for sports sake and sporting excellence. The promotion of general physical activity and the wider social, community and economic well-being agenda has been marginalised (Brookes & Wiggan, 2009). Brookes and Wiggan argue that, it is clear that expectations exist that the Olympics should deliver not only for Team GB’s good performance at the medals table, but also leave behind a community legacy of increased participation in sports and wider regeneration activity; however, the shifting policy context and focus of Sport England may result in ‘ignoring’ the public value of sport and focusing ‘persuading’ the public to accept that they have a responsibility to acknowledge that ‘sport for sport’s sake’ is important in realizing the legacy vision for 2012.

Table 4.13 The government strategies of the London 2012 legacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Government Bodies</th>
<th>Strategy / Report</th>
<th>Detailed objective of the Sport theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOCOG</td>
<td>Towards a One-Planet 2012 (2009)</td>
<td>The Games will be used to inspire people across the country to take up sports and develop active, healthy and sustainable lifestyles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HM Government</td>
<td>PSA Delivery Agreement 22 (2007)</td>
<td>Sports participation for all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House of Commons</td>
<td>London 2012 Olympic Games and Paralympic Games: Funding and Legacy (2007)</td>
<td>Maximum increase in UK participation at community and grass-roots level in all sports and across all groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCMS</td>
<td>Before, during and after: making the most of the London 2012 Games (2008a)</td>
<td>Making the UK a world-leading sporting nation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCMS</td>
<td>Olympic Games Impact Study (2005a)</td>
<td>Sporting facilities; increased participation and ‘feel good’ factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor of London</td>
<td>Five Legacy Commitments (2008)</td>
<td>Increasing opportunities for Londoners to become involved in sport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change of the Government in 2010</td>
<td>Plans for the Legacy from the 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games (2010 Dec)</td>
<td>Harnessing the UK’s passion for sport to increase grassroots participation, particular by young people</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Second, in relation to implementing designed initiatives and programmes, lessons may be learned from the Free Swimming Programme. The Free Swimming Programme was announced, as part of its plans for a sporting legacy by the Labour Government in 2008 with £140 million fund support. It aimed to contribute to the target of two million additional participation in sport by offering free swimming sessions for the over 60s and under 16s, delivered by local authorities and funded by a collection of Whitehall departments (DCMS, 2008b). However, according to an evaluation report conducted by PricewaterhouseCoopers (2010), the programme resulted in a substantial number of free swims (7 million), but had not resulted in a significant number of additional swimmers rather existing swimmers appeared to participate more often. The report recommended that providing lessons to those who do not swim has greater potential impact of getting inactive people to participate. The limitations of the Free Swim Programme illustrates that programmes and initiatives must be integrated with existing needs and through appropriate means to satisfy the real demand for sport and physical activity, rather than simply providing generous supply.

In relation to funding support, Gold and Gold (2009) suggest that sports development programmes require long-term commitment of funds if they are to be successful in increasing participation rates. This implies ensuring that sustained funding will be available even after the Games have ended.

A future which tends to be ignored is that of regional resource. From the regional stakeholders’ point of view, opportunities need to be actively identified, and regional legacy events planned as a complement to national initiatives. From the national government’s point of view, ensuring regional resources, e.g. human and finance, is also vital in terms of spreading the Olympic benefits. For example, a survey of managers (n=763) of sports facilities across England in 2007 conducted by Kavetsos and Szymanski (2009), found that while 90% of facility managers believed that the Olympics would have a slightly or very positive effect on sports participation at the national level, the figure dropped to 80% when asked to consider the effect at the regional level, and to 53% at the level of the manager’s own facility. Managers might be generally optimistic about national increases for which they have no responsibility but cautions about providing positive changes for which they will have some direct responsibility. In addition, a majority of those managers who were considering applying for Lottery funding declared themselves discouraged because of the changes to Lottery funding rules, i.e. the diversion of Lottery funds initially intended for investment in
non-Olympic sports and exercise facilities to support the Olympic investment. Such findings imply that many practitioners based outside London see the funding formula as unjust and as not serving the wellbeing of society as a whole.

c) **Recommendations**

In sum, as seen from the literature, hosting the Olympic Games is no guarantee of increasing mass participation. Merely hosting the Games seems to be insufficient to develop a *sustained* legacy. Sport benefits from the events cannot be expected to occur automatically - there is a need for active and integrated legacy strategy in order to leverage participation. This includes community and educational programmes, opportunities for coaching, and well-planned, accessible facilities which serve an existing need (Shipway, 2007; Weed et al., 2009). Indeed, as pointed out by Shipway, the main challenge of increasing participation and enhancing the profile of sport is to develop suitable and accessible sports development programmes and initiatives that will lead to increased participation in physical activity and sport. The literature indicates that there is no clearly direct inherent link between elite events and community participation in physical activity, and that this link would not develop without suitable planning and additional funding (Toohey, 2008; Veal & Toohey, 2005). The underlying difficulty is to achieve a change not simply in people’s attitudes and but also in behavioural factors related to sport and physical activity (Shipway, 2007; The Centre for Social Justice, 2011).

In a valuable piece of research helps us to get better understanding of the reasons why people do and do not participate in sport, Sport England commissioned a systematic review of the drivers and barriers to participation in sport (Foster et al., 2005). The most common reasons, or motivational factors for sports and physical activity participation, were identified as weight management; social interaction; and enjoyment of exercise. Difficulty in accessing facilities/opportunities; the poor state of, facilities; cost; time constraints; lack of competence in core skills; and family responsibilities were identified as key barriers.

Another point which has long been reported in the literature in relation to physical activity and sport is that prior participation in, or experience of, physical activity and sport impacts positively on current and future participation. In fact, empirical evidence has proved that prior sport involvement is a key factor in increased participation (Weed et al., 2009). In order to leverage sport participation legacy, advance planning of supplemental activities and
initiatives could work effectively. The authors also mention the importance of the notion of festival in boosting people’s participation in sports events. The central message is that the nature of ‘festival’ can create in people a desire to be part of something that is significant. Moreover, the desire to be involved in the festival would be satisfied by related initiatives involving physical activity, particularly in the community.

4.3.7 Legacy

Since the Los Angeles 1984 Olympic Games’ financial success, it had been an increasing number of cities bidding for hosting the Olympics and the funds invested in organising the Olympics has also grown dramatically in the past decades. Hosting the Olympics has been seen as a catalyst that would bring about positive changes in the host city and country. As a result, there is a burgeon group of research that addresses the issues and legacies generated by the Olympics. In recent years, following the IOC who urges to prove that hosting the Olympics would generate a positive impact to the host city and nation, maximizing and evaluating the Olympic legacies is now a hot topic.

In this chapter, firstly, it commences with an examination of some key concepts in relation to mega events, the Olympics legacies, and the evaluation of legacies. Then, a brief summary of the literature on the legacies of the Olympics across different areas, e.g. economic, tourism, urban regeneration, social impacts, volunteering, and sport participation, are provided, finally, conclusion and future implication of the Olympics are made at the end.

a) The concept of mega-event

The importance of the Olympics derives from the recognition of its nature and characteristics which is one of the most significant international sporting mega event (Roche, 2001). The concept of mega-event was introduced by Ritchie and Yangzhou in 1987, which is defined as:

Major one-time or recurring events of limited duration, which serve to enhance the awareness, appeal and profitability of a tourism destination in the short and/or long terms. Such events rely for their success on uniqueness, status, or timely significance to create interest and attract attention. (p.20)

Sometimes the Olympics are referred to other types of events, such as hallmark events, major events, or special events in the literature. Among those terms, the definition of hallmark

29 Until the 2016 Games, a gradually decrease of the number of cities interested in bidding for hosting the Olympics was evident.
events is similar with the concept of mega events (Ritchie, 1984); whereas, major events and special events include a wider range of events than mega events have.

The concept of mega events reflects two features of the Olympics, i.e. a large scale (e.g. number of participants and spectators, number of individual sessions, and levels of organisational complexity), and the media and tourism attractiveness (Malfas, Theodoraki, & Houlihan, 2004). With regard to its scale, it is the fact that events with over billions investment and around 11 years preparation, such as the Olympics, are deemed to have significant consequences for the host city, region, or nation (Horne, 2007). With regard to its media interest, the degree of media coverage decides the degree to which the significance of the events; therefore, the more is an international mega event significant, the more it can generate significant positive effects.

b) The Olympic Games legacies

The concept

The concept of ‘legacy’ is often conflated with ‘impact’, ‘effect’ and ‘benefits’, when, in fact it is inherent much longer-term and wider sense (Gold, J.R. & Gold, M.M., 2009), mixed layers’ of influence (e.g. macro and micro level). However, since the term of ‘legacy’ was firstly mentioned in the Melbourne 1956 candidacy for the XVI Olympiad (Leopkey, 2008), there was not any clear definition of it available until recently. Gratton and Preuss provide a definition of ‘legacy’ as – “legacy is planned and unplanned, positive and negative, intangible and tangible structures created through a sport event that remain after the event” (2008: 1924). As defined, the term ‘legacy’ should not be confused with the economic costs and benefits analysis of the Olympics. It combines, both planned and unplanned, positive (e.g. economic boosts, urban and environmental transformation) and negative (e.g. ineffective use of the facilities, high opportunity costs, increases of property rental, loss of house where Olympic facilities are planned to be built), covers both tangible (e.g. new sport structures and traffic infrastructure) and intangible effects (e.g. knowledge of organizing mega events, building business and political networks, ‘feel good’ factor, cultural ideas, enhancing destination image), before, during and after the Games.

Indeed, as suggests by MacRury and Poynter (2009), Olympic ‘legacy’ links and compares two potentially divergent narratives, i.e. the practical accountancy (and financial and political accountability) of city planning, and against the ‘creative’ accounting that underpins Olympic
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dreams and promises. In this respect, the term ‘legacy’ tends to emphasise and compare the before- and after- life of the city and host nation.

The time period

When defining the meaning of ‘legacy’, it should be recognised its long time period for legacies to occur (Gold, J.R. & Gold, M.M., 2009), not only in the sense that a long time after the Games completed, but also in the sense that it might happen right at the very beginning of the preparation of the bid. The considerably long time span reflects the complexity of this process. As suggested by Cashman (2002), the Olympics legacy can be divided into four separate periods:

1. **The bid period**: the strategy of building up the Olympics legacy should begin with the decision to bid (Gratton & Preuss, 2008). In order to win a bid to host an Olympic Games, a Bid Team needs to be formed. They must develop a plan that is attractive both to the IOC and also to host community and key interest groups in the host city. In the bid document, it outlines a list of promises, or impacts of hosting the Olympics will bring to the city and the country. In this period of time, bidding countries need to estimate the financial and social costs of the Games, and all sorts of benefits the host can get in order to ensure that money spent on the Olympics is not wasted. Efforts need to make in a number of areas, including negotiating with the host city, gaining political support from the Government and business support from major organisations, and so on.

2. **The period of preparation for the Games**: the preparation for the Games normally lasts about seven to eight years. It is a difficult and yet important period time for ensuring legacies can be delivered. On the one hand, there are various problems need to be overcome in a short time frame, such as making sure facilities are built and
appropriate city infrastructure are constructed, handling unexpected crises, balancing hidden costs and agendas, et al. On the other hand, in order to maximise the benefits of hosting the Games, detailed strategic plans and complemented initiatives and programmes, across different sectors, need to be set up and delivered. The key point is effective coordination between Games organisers, local agencies, different levels of government, local business and communities, in order to disseminate the Olympic festival atmosphere not only to the host city but also to the whole country.

3. **The staging of the Olympics**: in this short period of time (16-17 days), the main task is to ensure the whole Games can run smoothly and successfully. Citizens can enjoy the fun and glory of the event; can participate in the Games either watch live or TV. However, if there are problems, such as security issues, this positive mood can quickly dissipate.

4. **Post-Games period**: Enthusiasm and passion, sometimes even funds and resources, seem to be vanished as soon as the Games finish. In the literature, it often argues that inadequate attention has been paid to the post-Games period which ironically is the key stage of generating legacies. As pointed out above in the section of Tourism, ‘industrial intermezzo’ effect happens when efforts have not been made to attract other major events to the host city in the future. There is a need, first of all, to plan for the immediate post-Games period in relation to what should be done with the Games infrastructure. Then, detailed plans on how to attract other major events coming to the city, and maintaining the reaped tourism, how to manage and make a better use of the volunteering base, the international and national business network and relationship, how to use the unique experience and skills gained from hosting the Olympics et al. Indeed, planning its legacy is the most important if the temporary effects are to be transformed into lasting benefits.

**Types of legacies**

Generally, the legacy of a mega sporting event such as the Olympics can be interpreted and categorised into different sectors by different academics. For example, Ritchie and Yangzhou (1987) have distinguished the impacts of mega events into five different sectors: *economic, physical, psychological* and *socio-cultural*, and *political* impacts. Cashman (2006) also classifies legacies into six general categories:

- **Sport**: increased sports participation and sport development
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- **Economics**: increased tourism and business development
- **Infrastructure**: transportation systems and sport venues
- **Information and education**: developing skills among planners and those that volunteer
- **Public life, politics and culture**: strengthening of regional values, cultural exchange and understanding
- **Symbols, memory, and history**: increased pride, community spirit and a festival atmosphere

Similar classified legacies have also been provided by other studies (Essex & Chalkley, 1998; Toohey, 2008) as: **sporting, economic, infrastructure, urban, and social**. Preuss (2004b: 26) provides the legacy matrix for gaining better understanding of the legacy (see Table 4.14). The classification that this study adopted is not followed a particular set of taxonomy as outlined above, but the Olympics’ legacies have been categorised into eight groups (each group has been analysed in a certain detail in each section) based on the themes emerged from the systematic review, i.e. economic impact, tourism, sport participation, social impacts, volunteering, and urban regeneration.

**Table 4.14 The legacy matrix**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short Term: Visible</th>
<th>Long Term Visible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Event:</strong></td>
<td><strong>The Legacy:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports success</td>
<td>Sports legacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community debt</td>
<td>Community regeneration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympic employment</td>
<td>Non-Olympic employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Events</td>
<td>Additional housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OLOG Revenue:</strong></td>
<td>Leisure and sports facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media rights</td>
<td>Convention / Exhibition / Office spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchandising</td>
<td>Telecommunications infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>Transportation infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsorship</td>
<td>Environment (parks, space, water, air, ecology)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ticket sales</td>
<td>Tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lottery</td>
<td>Public services – education health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donations</td>
<td>Labour market – skills, knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest earnings</td>
<td>Volunteer organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public subsidy/Tax</td>
<td>Cost of living increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rents &amp; Fees Village</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OLOG Costs:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New temporary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction &amp; removal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event ceremony</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin &amp; PR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Care</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test events</th>
<th>Housing</th>
<th>Media &amp; IT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Short Term Invisible</strong></td>
<td><strong>Long Term Invisible</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City / regional brand / image</td>
<td>Olympic-related jobs disappear</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Can do’ or ‘Can’t do’ approach</td>
<td>Knowledge / skills retained</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political ‘message’</td>
<td>Volunteer Ethos retained</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displacement of resources from other uses</td>
<td>Regional Pride / Image / Brand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displacement of other sources of demand – ‘expenditure switching’</td>
<td>National Pride / Image / Brand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural ‘displacement effects’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c) The evaluation of the Olympics legacies

Generally, it seems that the legacies of the Olympics are difficult to evaluate and quantify, both in the short-term and the long-term. This may be reinforced by the fact that the issue of evaluation methodology flaws result in the exaggerated findings (we will come back to this point later). The evaluation of the Olympic legacies should start with the changes events create (Gratton & Preuss, 2008), and finish until 15-20 years later after the Games finished.

Mega sporting events, such as the Olympics, may have a tremendous impact which in general can be found in economic [1], including tourism effects [2], employment [3], stock market [4], trade and export [5]. However, many other aspects have also been the focuses of the interest, such as social issues [6], urban regeneration [7], sport participation [8], volunteering [9]. Some studies particular looked at the legacies of the Olympics in general (Bondonio & Mela, 2008; Gold, J.R. & Gold, M.M., 2009; Gratton & Preuss, 2008; Horne, 2007; Jinxia & Mangan, 2008; Kaplanidou & Karadakis, 2010; Malfas et al., 2004; Mangan, 2008; Moreira, 2009; Poynter, 2006; Shipway, 2007), or giving a historical overview of previous Olympic Games (London East Research Institute, 2007; Macrury & Poynter, 2009; Sadd & Jones, 2009; Whitson & Horne, 2006).

Non-hosting regions’ Olympic legacies

In the literature, there has been a dearth of materials that specifically address the Olympics’ legacies for non-hosting regions. There are some exceptions, such as Bondonio and Mela’s (2008) account of the importance of interregional governance in strengthening synergies and increasing the competitiveness of the entire north-western macroeconomic region of Italy within European and international markets as a result of hosting the Torino Games. Another study conducted by Deccio and Baloglu (2002) examined non-hosting community residents’ reaction to the Salt Lake 2002 Winter Olympic Games. It reveals that, in general, non-hosting
residents who expected benefits, economic gains and more opportunity of resource use through the Olympics tend to support the Games, whereas those who were sensitive to environmental concerns do not support the Games. Furthermore, another non-hosting communities residents’ reaction to the Olympics study was carried out by Ritchie et al (2009), which indicates that generally residents from Weymouth and Portland in England (where the 2012 Olympic and Paralympic sailing events will be host) were supportive of hosting the London 2012 Olympic Games, but were concerned over perceived traffic congestion, parking issues and potential increases in the cost of living. Additionally, Walton et al (Walton et al., 2008) attempt to provide a contingent valuation study of the London 2012 Games for Bath residents. They found that in general non-hosting residents are willing to pay toward the cost of hosting the Games.

What often discussed in the literature is that ‘to what extent the hosting the Games is the best use of public funds’. Particularly, this issue is more controversial and complicate when considering from non-hosting regions’ taxpayer point of view. They often argue that, with considerably smaller impacts that the Olympics can have on their local area, investing the Olympics may not be the right and fair way of spending public money. And yet, limited researches have been undertaken with respect to this. It is important and necessary to address the problem from a different angle, by taking into account a broader territory of the host nation.

The Olympic Games Impact Study (OGI)

The IOC’s commitment to legacy has extended over recent years to include a wider range of social, economic, cultural and environmental indicators. As part of an attempt, more recently, the IOC introduced OGI project that aims to fulfil two of its principal objectives as written in the Olympic Charter: “to encourage and support a responsible concern for environmental issues, to promote sustainable development in sport, and require that the Olympic Games are held accordingly”, and “to promote a positive legacy from the Olympic Games for the Host Cities and Host Countries” (IOC, 2011: p.15). OGI, aiming to develop an objective and scientific analysis of the impact of each edition of the Olympic Games, forms part of the Official Report is produced after each Olympics. This project was launched in 2000 and first introduced into the Games planning requirements since the Vancouver 2010 Games. London

---

30 The Olympic Games Impact Study was originally called Olympic Games Global Impact (OGGI). The title was modified in 2007 following feedback from each of the organising committees.
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is the first Summer Games Host city which needs to carry out the study. OGI covers the main three areas of sustainable development: economic, socio-cultural, and environmental, based on a set of 120 defined indicators from a maximum period of 12 years (i.e. commencing two years prior to the Host City election, and continuing through to three years after the Games).

It has been argued by some academics that, due to the fact that it will take 15-20 years to measure the true legacy of the Olympics, the launched OGI project which finishes 2 years after the event has been held still cannot provide a truly scientific assessment of the Games’ true legacy, although it will substantially improve the evidence base (Gratton & Preuss, 2008).

d) Issues of the Olympic legacy evaluation

Evaluating the legacies of the Olympics is difficult in three senses: one, the calculation of the economic costs and benefits for the host is complicate, which requires a large number of data set (when estimating the costs: lack of acceptable way of assessing expenditure; when estimating the benefits: often vague definition of what counts as the Olympic benefits) and carefully defining of multiplier effects. In addition, many of these reports are commissioned by the supporter of the Games or local organizers, which therefore are subject to bias and the possible exaggeration of the benefits. Furthermore, the intangible impacts, e.g. social, psychological effects, of the Olympic are difficult to quantify. In this respect, the main difficulty exists under the research design and methodology that isolating other ‘effects’ in order to estimate the net impacts, and assessing counterfactual scenario are challenging.

Hosting the Olympics requires a complex system of governance, from the top, national governing body, the Games organisers, to the meso-level, regional governing body, local agencies and business, to the bottom level – public and communities. A Lesson learnt from the Torino Games (Bondonio & Mela, 2008) is that attention needs to be paid to the intergovernmental relationships between the national and local governments so that they can function properly and create positive effects on the quality and intensity of the promotion of the Games. Therefore, a second challenge of the Olympic legacy evaluation is that, such complex governance system, involving different level of stakeholders’ interest, makes it even harder to draw a fair conclusion of whether their respectively expectation of hosting the Games are met, or to what extent they have gained positive legacies. Indeed, different stakeholders have different objectives and expectation. From politician point of view, hosting the Games is not only about generating financial profits, more importantly, perhaps is to send a signal to potential business partners, or change the perception and image of the host country,
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e.g. the Beijing and Seoul Games. Such potential benefits may not surface themselves immediately after the Games, but they do have important positive influence on the future national economy development. Whereas, from the taxpayer point of view, they may argue such substantial investment would make more contribution, in terms of satisfying public interest, if they were spent on education, or health care industry. Therefore, judgement should not be made cursorily without tracing up to the roots in terms of serving whose interests in the first place. At the same time, evaluation of the Olympics legacies should not only assess the national impacts and the host city’s impact, but also take non-host regions into account.

Third, as pointed out by Preuss (2007), measuring legacy of the Olympics is difficult as the Games are unique, complex, and occur in a fast changing environment, which therefore makes it difficult for benchmark studies to identify and measure legacies for future events. Admittedly, the final point touches off the difficulty of generalisation and the fact that there is a lack of longitudinal studies anyway. It has been recognised in the literature that the legacy of the Olympics started at the very beginning of the bid for hosting the Games, continuing for approximately 15 to 20 years, that the true post-Games legacy can then surface. Despite such recognition, there still are relatively few studies that have been undertaken over a sufficient time frame. It perhaps because that firstly such an over a decade of period time of research project requires a significant research resource commitment. Furthermore, due to it tends to provide modest, or negative results, it lacks support from the host government.

4.4 Conclusion

This chapter has provided a description and thematic analysis of some of the key readings that were retrieved during the systematic review process. The process of reviewing the literature is important to this study as it helped to gain a clear understanding of the key concepts (e.g. Olympic legacy), its relevant theories, the results of past research in the Olympics, the types of methodologies and research designs employed in evaluating the Olympics’ impact (e.g. understanding the strength and weakness of the identified two major models, i.e. the Input-Output and the Computable General Equilibrium, for analysing the economic impacts of the Games), and areas where the literatures is deficient (notably, only a very small amount of the studies investigate some elements of Games’ impact in a non-hosting region).
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There were seven primary topics in relation to Olympic legacies/impacts that emerged from this review, i.e. urban regeneration, volunteering, social impact (more broadly), economy, tourism, sport participation, and legacy. The descriptions are principally based upon the evidence returned from the review, whereas the thematic analysis of the implications and limitations of the results informed the methodological design of the study, and directly formed the basis of the analysis of the legacy gains in the forthcoming case studies sections.

Indeed, conducting a literature review can help to demonstrate the links between what has been found in the review and the way we approached the case studies. For example, in terms of volunteering legacy in the context of the London Games, LOCOG aimed to maintain a strong volunteer base as a result of the Games for future major sporting events (in particular the upcoming Glasgow 2014 Commonwealth Games). As identified in the literature, understanding and analysing the motives and expectations of volunteers is extremely important to policy makers who seek to enhance the country’s pool of volunteers in sport (Farrell et al., 1998). Based on the above findings, it was decided to base the empirical investigation of the volunteering experience in the Games Maker programme on participants in the Leicestershire Games Makers’ London 2012, in relation to their motivation, satisfaction, and future volunteering action.

This review took a comprehensive approach to the literature search but was limited by some factors. Firstly, having been restricted by the search strategy, some directly-relevant materials (e.g. sourced from books) were not identified in the review. Secondly, although all decisions to filter and exclude sources were taken by the researcher with support of other team members (see section 4.2.3), the judgements about inclusion of articles were based on the perceived likelihood of gaining further insights from such a process. Whilst every care has been taken to ensure accuracy, and decisions taken are made transparent, this still does not rule out all elements of subjectivity.

31 Although some books identified at the scoping study stage were included in the review, other valuable evidence that the researcher came across after the completion of the systematic review was unfortunately not included (e.g. Pappous’s work on sport participation after the Athens Games).
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5.1 Introduction

This chapter will discuss the methodology of this study starting from a review of the ontological and epistemological assumptions underlying the nature of the paradigm adopted for the research. Consideration is subsequently given to the key concepts of research methodology and theoretical approaches. In addition, it will address the rationales for selected particular research methods/techniques for the study. Finally, this chapter will conclude with a summary of the study’s overall research protocol, and the issues of research validity and reliability.

5.2 Philosophical approaches and paradigmatic debates

5.2.1 Ontological assumptions

Ontology can be considered as a branch of philosophy which is concerned with the nature of what exists (Blaikie, 2007). In the context of social sciences, it seeks to answer the questions: ‘What is the nature of social reality (or social entities)?’ and ‘Where do we look for it?’ (Blaikie, 2007; Bryman, 2008). Here, social reality refers to “the material and socially constructed world within which everyday life occurs, which can have an impact on people’s lives, in terms of both providing opportunities and imposing restrictions” (Ramazanoglu & Holland, 2002, p. 9: 9). Ontological assumptions are the assumptions made about the nature of the social reality that is investigated. Together with epistemological assumptions, they form the cores of various research paradigms which are the frameworks of philosophical perspectives where research strategies are located within.

There are mainly two domains in ontology assumptions, namely idealism (or constructionism) and realism (or objectivism) (Bhaskar, 1978). Together, they represent two mutually exclusive positions, i.e. whether the external world can be considered as objective reality that exists independently apart from our thoughts; or whether it is just appearances and is not independent of the activities of the human observer.
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Realism & Idealism

Generally speaking, realism, as an ontological position, is “we perceive objects whose existence and nature are independent of our perceptions” (Oxford Companion to Philosophy 1995: 746). Two key points need to be emphasised here. First, realism confirms the existence of social reality which can (or some believe it cannot) be observed or experienced. Second, social reality is independent or separate from actors.

Idealism asserts that social reality and their meanings are continually being accomplished by social actors (Bryman, 2008). It implies firstly social reality is not external to us, but is built up and constituted in and through social interaction—socially constructed; and our knowledge of the social world is viewed as indeterminate as different researchers have their different version of social reality. These views of reality are very different from the realists’ external world, and the associations between social reality and social actors. They claims that there are fundamental differences between natural and social phenomena as humans have culture and live in a world of their shared interpretations (Blaikie, 2007). The process of interpretations and meaning-giving created and maintained by social actors constitutes social reality for them.

Depth realist ontology

In Blaikie’s book (2007), he classifies realism and idealism into a set of subcategories, i.e. shallow realist, conceptual realist, cautious realist, depth realist, idealist, and subtle realist, that are developed based on the work of Bhaskar (1978, 1979, 1986) and his exponents, such as Collier (1994), in order to help understand the range of commonly used research paradigms in the social sciences. Given the title of the categories are not universal, this study adopts Blaikie’s categorisation schemes of both ontology and epistemology assumptions as the majority of the ontology and epistemology arguments are drawn based on the work of Bhaskar, his exponents, and Blaikie.

Here, more emphasis on a branch of realist ontological assumptions, namely depth realism, will be provided in the following discussion, because it is the ontological foundation of critical realism which is the epistemological position adopted in this research. The rationales for choosing critical realism as this research’s theoretical foundation will be given in the

---

32 These two mainly ontological domains are often referred by some other academics as objectivism and constructionism (e.g., Bryman, 2008). As this study applies the same ontology and epistemology categories developed by Blaikie (1993, 2007) who produces the set of categories based on the work of Bhaskar (1978, 1979, 1986) and his exponents (Collier, 1994), it is worth stating here to avoid any confusions may have caused.
Section 5.3.1, whereas here descriptions on the basic concept of depth realism are outlined in order to help build up an understanding of critical realism.

In the depth realist ontology, Bhaskar (1978) puts forward a notion that reality includes three domains (See Table 5.1): the empirical, the actual, and the real. The domain of the empirical is what we experience through the use of our senses, which you may argue is superficial as there might be some underlying phenomenon which cannot be observable. Certainly, if we can observe certain things make us more confident on the existence of these things, however, we cannot deny that something exists although we cannot directly observe it. The actual domain entails both events (or objects which can be physical, or social) and experiences whether or not anyone is there to observe them. Sayer (2000) explains these events, or experiences, as the exercise of a certain structures and causal powers. And the domain of the real includes the whole process which generates events. This domain of reality implies two points. First, both in the natural and social context, the real refer to whatever exists (which can be referred to events and experiences) regardless of whether we have experienced it. Secondly, the real is a branch of objects, their structures and causal powers (which are also referred to as mechanisms), which can be physical, or social. However, in the social context, those structures and causal powers do not exist independently of the activities they influence, or social actors’ conceptions of what they are doing in these activities. In virtue of this, one may consider this type of domain is substantial (Blaikie, 2007).

That is to say, the implication of the depth realist ontology is that it appreciates the possibility that “powers may exist unexercised, and hence that what has happened or been known to have happened does not exhaust what could happen or have happened” (Sayer, 2000: 12).

Table 5.1 Bhaskar’s three domains in critical realism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Domain of Real</th>
<th>Domain of Actual</th>
<th>Domain of Empirical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mechanisms</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiences</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: adopted from (Bhaskar, 1978: 13)

5.2.2 Epistemological assumption

Epistemology is a theory of knowledge, and concerns the question of ‘What is (or should be) regarded as acceptable knowledge in a discipline?’ (Bryman, 2008); in the social sciences
context, it offers answers to the question: ‘What we claim to understand?’ and ‘How can social reality be known?’ (Blaikie, 2007). Epistemological assumptions provide a philosophical grounding for establishing ‘what can be known’ and the ways in which knowledge of social reality can be obtained and also judged as being both adequate and legitimate (Crotty, 1998).

The development of different types of epistemologies derives from the different ways of thinking about the relationship between researchers and the ‘things’ of which they wish to have knowledge. On one hand, as what have been discussed in the Section 5.2.1 Ontology assumptions, there is a fundamental distinct when we view ‘things’ – reality, either real or ideal. On the other hand, researchers give meaning to the reality in different ways: one may view reality as having intrinsic meaning, and believe that the meaning of any reality is independent of human consciousness therefore all researchers should discover the same meaning of a certain reality; one may suggest as reality itself has no meaning yet people impose meaning on it, reality may be given different meanings by different researchers; one may argue meanings of reality are constructed by researchers, rather than discovered. The process of construction is, in some degree, restrained by the nature of the reality itself, and is the result of the engagement of researchers with the reality (Blaikie, 2007). In this regard, it explores the three mainly types of epistemology, empiricism (objectivism), rationalism (subjectivism), and constructionism, as well as another three – falsificationism, neo-realism, and conventionalism.

**Empiricism & Constructionism**

*Empiricism* is most clearly associated with the realist ontology. It is based on the idea that knowledge comes from ‘observing’ the world around us and then is produced by the use of the human senses (Blaikie, 2007). As *realist* ontology claims that reality exists independently from actors, *empiricism* bases on this idea and suggests that the way of knowing reality is via human’s sensory perceptions. A key empiricist tenet is that “*any scientific idea that cannot be confirmed by observation is meaningless and has no role in science*” (Blaikie, 2007: 20). The form of explanation advocated in *empiricism* is known as the ‘pattern model’ of explanation, which means through generalising from observed regularities between events explanations, i.e. ‘constant conjunctions’, can be provided to explain or predict an event (Blaikie, 2007). This epistemology is also regarded as being *foundationalist* as it asserts that
there are certain final criteria can determine whether knowledge is a true representation of an external world (Blaikie, 2007).

The epistemology of constructionism is associated with the idealist ontology which believes reality is what human beings make or construct. Constructionism suggests that the way of knowing reality is not to use human senses to produce a certain or true representation of an external world as it is impossible for fallible human beings to observe an external world unencumbered by background knowledge and past experiences (Blaikie, 2007). In short, as there can be no theory-free observation or knowledge, it is impossible to produce theory-free knowledge (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000). This epistemology focuses on the nature of meaningful social action and its role in understanding patterns in social life. Social regularities thus can be understood, explained by constructing models of particular meanings used by particular social actors engaged in particular courses of action in a particular situation (Blaikie, 2007).

Consequently, constructionism is regarded as being anti-foundationalist as there are no permanent criteria for determining whether knowledge can be treated as true, and there are no absolute truths (Blaikie, 2007).

**Neo-realism**

As critical realism incorporates the depth realist ontology and the epistemology of neo-realism, which is the research paradigm of this study, more detailed discussion on neo-realism is given as follows.

As discussed above in the ‘Depth realist’ Section, objects have certain structures, causal powers, and mechanisms. There is a possibility that although no event or change is observed, powers may exist unexercised due to opposing internal forces at work. In neo-realism, “a scientific theory is a description of structures and mechanisms which causally generate the observable phenomena, a description which enables us to explain them” (Keat & Urry, 1975: 5).

Compared to the empiricism which believes knowledge comes from ‘observing’ the world around us, and then by generalizing from observed regularities between events, explanations are attained, neo-realism rejects this argument and believes that establishing regularities is only the beginning of the process, since there is a subsequent need to locate the structures or mechanisms which have produced the pattern. Moreover, both neo-realism and empiricism hold a common view on the idea of there is an external, independent reality which does not
determine the behaviour of individuals but is responsible for producing what happens in the empirical domain (Blaikie, 2007). However the former also acknowledges that there are underlying causal powers to this reality.

5.2.3 **Research paradigms**

The reason for demonstrating and explaining the key concepts of ontological and epistemological assumptions is that, in any social research project, ontological assumptions are essential as they are not only embedded in the theoretical ideas that are used to guide researchers, but also implanted in the research strategies and methods that are adopted.

The overlaps in different ontological and epistemological assumptions create different research paradigms. In other words, the discussions below on the features of some key research paradigms are derived from their different ontological and epistemological assumptions. Table 5.2 displays the five ontological positions against the five epistemological positions summarised by Blaikie (2007) in order to make logical sense by presenting these combinations. Being aware of some key research paradigms’ respective assumptions which are embedded in, and consequences that they have for research practice and outcomes, consequently assists the arguments on why the *critical realist* position was chosen for this study in Section 5.2.4.
Table 5.2 Combinations of ontological, epistemological, and research paradigms categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ontology</th>
<th>Empiricism</th>
<th>Rationalism</th>
<th>Falsificationism</th>
<th>Neorealism</th>
<th>Constructionism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shallow realism(^{35})</td>
<td>Positivism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual realism(^{36})</td>
<td>(\checkmark)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cautious realism(^{37})</td>
<td>(\checkmark)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth realism</td>
<td>Critical Realism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealism</td>
<td>Interpretivism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: adopted from (Blaikie, 2007: 26)

In general, all social researchers are seeking to explore the sorts of connections that are possible between ideas, social experience, and social reality, - which are considered as the fundamental methodological problems (Blaikie, 2007). The creation of various research paradigms offers different ways of making connections between ideas, social experience, and social reality. In this sense, a specific research paradigm that one adopts expresses one’s ontological and epistemological assumptions, namely, one’s way of looking at the world and his ideas on how it can be understood. Types of research paradigm include, what Blaikie calls ‘classical’, i.e. positivism, critical rationalism, classical hermeneutics and interpretivism, which were derived from the nineteenth century and the early part of the twentieth century. In addition, in order to answer the key question in the social enquiry - ‘Can the social sciences use the same methods and procedures as the natural sciences?’ contemporary research paradigms provide another range of responses to it. Typical contemporary paradigms include critical realism, critical theory, ethnomethodology, contemporary hermeneutics,

---

33 Rationalists think knowledge comes from the direct examination of the structure of human thought. Evidence for an unobservable collective consciousness can be found in the consequences it has on people’s lives, or in thought processes and structures of the mind itself. Logic and mathematics provide the standards for judging knowledge claims.

34 Falsificationists consider knowledge is produced by a process of trial and error in which theories are proposed and tested against empirical evidence. Because of our inability to observe reality directly, tests of theories must be directed towards trying to falsify rather than confirm them. As it is not possible to establish whether knowledge is true, it must be regarded as tentative and, therefore, open to revision.

35 Shallow realists believe phenomena we study exist independently of us. They can be observed (experienced by the senses), and only that which can be observed is relevant to science. In addition, there are patterns or sequences in observable phenomena, and the challenge for science is to discover and describe them.

36 Conceptual realists suggest that reality has an existence independent of human minds. It is not the property of any individual or the construction of a social community. It is a collective consciousness, or structure of ideas, and is not directly observable.

37 Cautious realists also consider reality has an independent existence. However, because of imperfections in human senses, and the fact that the act of observing is an interpretive process, it cannot be observed directly or accurately. Therefore, a cautious and critical attitude must be adopted.
\textit{structuration theory}, and \textit{feminism}\textsuperscript{38}. Especially, in contemporary research, the use of the term ‘critical’ in critical theory refers to the ‘emancipatory’ function of a theory. In other words, it is about the extent to which a theory explains and provides solutions for the problems of power imbalances in society.

\textbf{Paradigms}

Given the two mutually exclusive ontological assumptions, i.e. \textit{realist} or \textit{idealist}, there are two major camps of epistemological positions. The representatives from the first camp are \textit{positivism}, \textit{critical rationalism} and \textit{critical realism}, which all accept that social reality has an independent existence that can be observed and explained, although in the \textit{critical realism} case it is also socially constructed (Blaikie, 1993). There are some other subtle differences between those three research paradigms, in term of their view of the elements that constitute social reality and on whether this reality exists independently of social actors.

\textit{Positivism} claims that only phenomena experienced by the senses can be regarded as real knowledge (Bryman, 2008). Moreover, value judgements are excluded from scientific knowledge as their validity cannot be tested by experience (Blaikie, 2007). There is a philosophical point here that statement of what ‘is’, and what ‘ought to be’ are fundamentally different. However, in the social world, ‘is’ statements almost inevitably carry moral implication, e.g. ‘This is a stone’ – is what people define that ‘thing’ is, but it does not mean that is what it ought to be. Research methods associated with \textit{positivism} include quantitative or experiment-based research as well as qualitative methods that are ‘rigorously defined’ (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000). The advocates claim that \textit{positivism} can provide precise measurements and objective interpretation of the results (Abbagano, 1967; Comte, 1970; Durkheim, 1964; Kolakowski, 1972). However, it is subject to criticisms. For instance, Blaikie (1993) criticises \textit{positivism} for not taking into consideration the way individuals interpret the social world, their actions and the actions of others, Sayer (2000: 13) points out that “internal relations in social systems fall outside the ontological grids of positivism, which systematically misrepresents society by presenting such phenomena as reducible to independent individuals or atoms”. Moreover, \textit{positivism} tends to provide a ‘pattern model’ of explanations, typically statistical associations, which occurs in ‘closed systems’ in order to

\textsuperscript{38}While there are numerous classifications of theoretical paradigms in social science, this study follows the same classifications that are developed by Blaikie (1993, 2007) as the author feels the design of these classifications better reflect important differences and important recent developments.
produce consistent regularities, and this is hardly achievable in the social science context as it is difficult to create such ‘closed system’ in the social world which is open and complex (Sayer, 2000). In addition, the process of so called ‘value-free’ observation is also questionable as “observers are active agents, not passive receptacles” (Blaikie, 1993: 102). Their experiences, cultural and social background may influence the observation.

The representatives from the second camp are interpretivism, critical theory, structuration theory and feminism, which suggest social reality is produced and reproduced by social actors, and propose the possibility of the existence of multiple realities.

Interpretivism focuses on the differences between people and the objects of the natural sciences, and advocates that the social scientist should grasp the subjective meaning of social action (Bryman, 2008). It suggests that the social world is interpreted by a mixture of socially constructed meanings and therefore social reality is a mixture of the different interpretations of the social world (Blaikie, 1993). It also suggests that there is a fundamental difference in the subject matters of the nature and the social sciences, therefore, different methods are required (Blaikie, 2007). The main strength of this approach is that it appreciates the existence of the ‘causal explanation’ with reference to the ‘interpretive understanding of social action’, rather than external forces that have no meaning for those involved in that social action (Bryman, 2008). However, interpretivism has its own defects. Although, some elements from interpretivism are adopted in Bhaskar’s critical realism, critical realists argue that interpretivism fails to acknowledge deeper structures in the social world, namely intransitive structures and mechanisms in the domain of the ‘real’ (Blaikie, 2007). Moreover, Fay (1975) argues that interpretivism fails to provide a subjective description of reality as it only focuses on the meanings of the social actions, rather than the factors that cause them. In addition, research methods interpretivism adopts are often challenged. Interpretivism uses qualitative methods, such as interviews and focus groups, to explain and interpret the social actions, which arguably entail bias. Therefore, interpretivists judgements of the social world will never be objective and thus this paradigm is inadequate (Devine, 2002).

Critical realism

On the one hand, given that positivism suggests experience is a sound basis for scientific knowledge, and yet all observation involves interpretation and the idea of ‘value free observations’ has been widely challenged, it raises two questions: one, how to distinguish
observational statements and theoretical statements; two, whether experience is an adequate basis for justifying knowledge (Blaikie, 2007). On the other hand, in the interpretivism, Outhwaite (1987: 76) argues that “interpretive processes are a significant part of what goes on in the social world, and ...our access to the social world is necessarily via our understanding of these interpretive processes, it does not follow that this is all that exists, or can be known to exist.” Therefore, another alternative approach in the middle, i.e. critical realism, has evolved from Harré and his students Keat and Bhaskar in the early of the 60’s.

Critical realists share the same view with positivists that there is an external, independent reality, and have the same desire to use naturalistic explanations to recognise social sciences and produce causal explanations. Even though Bhaskar argues that “social objects cannot be studied in the same way as natural objects, but they can be studied ‘scientifically’ as social objects” (Bhaskar, 1979: 26-7). While at the same time, they agree with interpretivists’ view on the nature of social reality –that is socially constructed.

Critical realism incorporates the depth realist ontology and the epistemology of neo-realism. As having discussed in the above sections, Bhaskar proposes a notion that reality has three domains: real, actual and empirical. Critical realism distinguishes not only between the world and our experience of it, but also between the real, the actual, and the empirical. One of the key points is emerged from these sophisticate definition of the reality is that Bhaskar emphasises on the existence of the underlying mechanisms, structures and causal laws, rather than patterns of events, which provide explanations on why things have to act in a particular way in particular circumstances. Bhaskar points out that the underlying mechanisms and structures are independent of the events that they generate, and may or may be (directly or indirectly) observed (Outhwaite, 1983). This point that critical realists advocate presents a sharp contrast with the one that positivists claim, i.e. the acquisition of knowledge is achievable only through direct observation (Bryman, 2008).

Bhaskar (1978) also makes a fundamental distinction between the ‘intransitive’ and ‘transitive’ dimensions of knowledge. Intransitive knowledge refers to physical processes or social phenomena, i.e. the objects of science (the world they are about), that make up the natural and social worlds. Transitive knowledge is about the theories (theories about the world) and discourses, such as media and resources of science, that scientists develop to understand and explain some aspects of reality. This distinction made by Bhaskar implies that, although the basic realist tenet is concerned with the independence of the world from our
thoughts about it, critical realists argue that the world is socially constructed and includes knowledge itself, therefore it cannot be said to exist independently of at least some knowledge (Sayer, 2000). That is to say, whereas positivism and critical rationalism confirm that, in the view of social life, social actions and interactions are the product of the operation of ‘external’ forces on social actors; critical realism accepts this view of ‘external’ forces, at the meantime, it tends to look for the forces in different places. In addition, critical realists accept knowledge of an external reality is fallible, and their mission is to see the task of science as improving our interpretations of reality, rather than seeking definitive truth (Blaikie, 2007).

Comparing with positivism and interpretivism, critical realism is compatible with a relatively wide range of research methods, i.e. both quantitative and qualitative approaches. Sayer (2000) suggests that the decision making on the research methods should depend on the nature of the object of study and what one wants to learn about it.

5.2.4 Rationales for choosing critical realism paradigm

In modern social science, the realism theory has been applied in a number of sub-disciplines, especially, it has been applied in evaluation enquiry (Henry, Julnes, & Mark, 1998; Mark, Henry, & Julnes, 2000; Pawson & Tilley, 1997). Given that the aim of this study was to evaluate the sub-regional impact of the London 2012 Olympic Games in Leicestershire, the proved empirical experience that critical realism already has can provide a solidly methodological foundation for the research.

This research project rested on critical realist position for the following reasons. Firstly, in ontological terms, realism provides a powerful abstract base to resolve the problems of explanation with regards to the nature and operation of ‘causal’ forces, comparing to idealism. More specifically, understanding the principles of generative causation is the key to knowing whether London hosting the 2012 Olympic Games had impacts (positive or negative) on non-hosting sub-region. Such is the scope of depth realist thinking and such was the scope of this research project.

Secondly, in epistemological terms, only establishing regularities is not enough, there is a need to locate the structures or mechanisms which have produced the pattern, especially in the world of social science. That is to say, because there is an underlying causal powers to the reality, only ‘observing’ - for example the economic outcomes from London 2012, and then
generalising regularities between events - for instance by comparing the GVA rates before and after the Games, to generate the conclusion that London 2012 had boosted or not the national economy, is not enough; rather finding out what policies and interventions have triggered this change, regardless it is a good or bad change, is our main purposes – to explore and understand the mechanics of scientific explanation underlying the reality.

Thirdly, the context of this study impinged us to choose critical realism. Social reality is an open, complex and messy system that has endless components and forces (Pawson, 2006). It is difficult for social scientists to focus on producing scientific explanation through observing uniform pattern of behaviours, as the behaviours are shaped by, for examples, historical forces, institutional forces, and different behavioural regularities (Pawson, 2006). Therefore, the results social scientists got may occur in one culture but not the next. The open system dilemma defines we can never provide an isolate systems, as in laboratory experiments and machines, and use randomised controlled trials as the most positivists do to produce consistent regularities. Luckily, this character of social reality has been appreciated by the critical realists as they recognise “there is more to the world, then, than patterns of events. It has ontological depth” (Sayer, 2000: 15).

In order to provide an evidence-based policy analysis, this study emphasised the importance of conducing a systematic review to look back the classic apparatus of empirical science have been used in the literature - such as conceptualization and hypothesis-making, the usage of critical comparisons, the discovery of empirical patterns and the monitoring of their scope and extent. The results and conclusions drew out from the practical examples can contribute to the generalisation of the explanatory quest (Pawson, 2006), with the attention of being conscious of the different contexts but also being critical of their claims; then the next step of this study was to apply those lessons into the evaluation methodology.

5.3 Theoretical adequacy

Evidence-based policy making has been promoted up the agenda for modernizing government in the UK since 2000. The Labour Government made a commitment to “...using information and knowledge much more effectively and creatively at the heart of policy making and policy delivery...”(DfEE, 2000: 2). In regards to this, evidence of what works requires substantially increased research and evaluation programmes. Consequently, this study was able to drawn upon a large number of previous research projects by conducting a
realist systematic review, and also, by applying Pawson and Tilley’s realist evaluation framework, and the meta-evaluation framework. It aimed to provide an evidence-based policy analysis for the regional legacy of the London 2012 Games.

5.3.1 **The rationale for using realist evaluation and meta-evaluation**

**For realist evaluation**

First of all, as discussed above, this study took *realism* as its ontological position – a position which was shared with realist evaluation, and thus the consistency of approach was likely. In addition, similar to the critical realists’ claims, Pawson and Tilley (1997) admit that evaluation is conducted in a social system which is an open system. The nature of an open system is that it can be changed and reshaped by different factors, such as political change, personnel moves, physical and technological shifts, inter-programme and intra-programme interactions and so on. That is to say, being realist in an evaluation has to go a step further in understanding the changing nature of a social system.

Pawson argues that his realist position contrasts with that of Bhaskar in that it represents a different pathway in social science, namely *empirical realism* which places greater emphasis on the notion of understanding of the mechanics of scientific explanation. In virtue of this point, it is quite understandable that Pawson, who is a social scientist, pays more attention to the application of the realist philosophy to evaluation methodology; whereas Bhaskar, as a philosopher, does also agree on the importance of the classic apparatus of empirical science – such as clear conceptualisation and hypothesis-making and so on but tends to focus on understanding of the aspects of the social condition and those responsible for it. Knowing that there is a minor difference between these two, however, both as realists, they share the same understanding, that there is a real structure or social phenomena exists (which may not be directly observable) independent of cognition and it can be explained in terms of underlying mechanisms; the task of social science is to understand the way in which mechanisms work in conjunction with contextual factors to generate social outcomes.

Secondly, the theory fitted with the requirements of this study. Olympic legacy itself as a concept has the potential of producing both positive and negative outcomes. This study sought to answer one of the key questions: *What conditions are necessary for Olympic legacy to have beneficial outcomes?* The implication of this notion is that the context in which outcomes are produced needs to be examined. In addition, the nature of the Olympic
Games, e.g. hosted in a different country or even in a different continent every four years, forces us to pay attention to the characteristics of each context and circumstance in order to draw reasonable conclusions. More importantly, recently, each Olympic Games have tried to leave lasting positive legacies in different areas, such as the economy, sport, children and young people, culture etc. Therefore, in order to do so, designing and delivering a series of programmes and initiatives across sectors constitutes the legacy foundation of the Games. With regards to this, it requires a project-orientated evaluation approach to examine the underlying mechanisms of each initiative in different contexts that produce certain outcomes. This is exactly what realist evaluation seeks to do. Furthermore, from a policy analysis point of view, Pawson and Tilley’s realist evaluation approach also addresses the same point that this study tries to provide – evidence-based policy analysis, as in the context of social science they are concerned to render policy-making more evidence based as well. It provides the basis for a theoretically-grounded understanding of transferable lessons about what works and why (Pawson & Tilley, 2004).

For meta-evaluation

As to the value of the meta-evaluation framework for this study, an interesting aspect was its ability to elaborate the evidence collected both from primary data and secondary data. It provided guidance on what secondary source data that this study should draw, what primary research would be needed to fill these, and how to synthesise multiple evaluations of Games-related programmes/initiatives. Such evidence aggregation provided a relatively rich understanding of the scale, range and diverse nature of the Games legacy/impact at the local level. In addition, meta-evaluation also serves the function of assessing the quality of included evaluations, and further develops formative feedback for a planned or on-going study. These assessments involve, for example, examining the usefulness of a study to determine whether the results of a study can be relied upon (Stufflebeam, 1974); or evaluating the adequacy or audit of a series of studies usually by a research team or organisation (Schwandt, 1992). It was thus critical for a study, such as this, which incorporated a relatively large number of data gathered from both primary data and secondary data with different research methods adopted, to appraise the quality and relevance of evaluations.

Finally, this framework also provided an opportunity to incorporate the ‘bottom-up’ and ‘top-down’ research approach. In order to collect evidence to develop the baseline, counterfacture
and the assessment of additionality and impacts of the Games-related programmes/initiatives, this study recognised that evaluations need to comprise both bottom-up and top-down analysis, in which: evidence can be drawn from a ‘top-down’ analysis of secondary data (e.g. national survey or statistical data) to identify lessons learned and to establish additionality, and to guide primary research; the ‘bottom-up’ approach was supplemented and synthesised with the identified impacts from project-level evaluations to fill major evidence gaps.

5.3.2 Approaches to the research frameworks

Both realist evaluation and meta-evaluation have no particular preference for either quantitative or qualitative methods. In fact, it advocates the use of multiple methods so that both programme processes and impacts may be investigated (Pawson & Tilley, 1997; Stufflebeam, 1974). Although Pawson and Tilley point out that “the precise balance of methods to be used is selected in accordance with the realist hypothesis being tested, and with the available data” (2004: 9). Up to this point, it is in line with the other realists who encourage that evaluation should be focused on explaining and understanding how policies achieve their effects by using multi-method approaches (Sanderson, 2002).

5.4 Research framework and key principles

Among the four fundamental research strategies that are generally adopted in social research (i.e. inductive, abductive, deductive and retroductive), the retroductive research strategy was seen as most appropriate for this study, after the consideration of the research questions and purposes. Firstly, the retroductive research shares the same ontological and epistemological assumptions with critical realism. Secondly, this particular type of research strategy offers a logic of social enquiry that explores underlying mechanisms that explain observed regularities in particular contexts (Blaikie, 2010). It has also been seen by Pawson and Tilley as the appropriate strategy for carrying out realist evaluations (Pawson & Tilley, 1997). Finally, the retroductive research strategy offers appropriate set of steps to try to answering the research questions of this study: firstly, by conducting a systematic review of the Olympic legacy/impact context, this study can establish an adequate description of the identified legacy outcomes; and then what followed after this was to examine the characteristics of the Leicestershire 2012 context, and to explore what mechanisms were working to produce London 2012 related evidence identified in those case studies. In sum, by adopting a
retroductive strategy, this study aimed to discover what the underlying generative structures might be which were responsible for these outcomes and the context in which they operated.

Before decisions can be made about how to collect the data required to answer the research questions, consideration needs to be given to the sources and selection of data. This study selected the case study as the method for investigation. The research design for this study used mixed methods that combined quantitative and qualitative approaches, including questionnaire surveys and semi-structured interviews. It also incorporated analysis of strategy documents and reports. The following sections discuss the rational and limitation for adopting the case study method, the strengths and limitations of those selected research techniques.

5.4.1 Case studies

As being a method of selecting the source of data, case studies have been used in a number of areas, e.g. political science (George & Bennett, 2005), sociology (Hamel, 1992), business management (Voelpel, Leibold, Tekie, & von Krogh, 2005) etc. In particular, as Yin (2009) suggested, it has a distinctive place in evaluation research (Cronbach, 1980; Patton, 2002; U.S. Government Accountability Office, 1990) as its four significant applications, i.e. describing, explaining, illustrating, and enlightening. In specific, firstly, it serves the function of describing the overall context of a specific project, and helps to explain the presumed causal links underpinning the intervention, which in some cases are too complex to use survey or experimental strategy. Then, case studies can illustrate emergent themes within an evaluation, and may be used to enlighten those situations in which the intervention being evaluated has no clear set of outcomes.

In addition, the type of research questions being investigated, and the purposes of the research determine what method could be used (Blaikie, 2010). The case study method is most likely to be appropriate for the forms of the research questions such as ‘how’ and ‘why’ (Yin, 2009). As the research questions of this study are: to what extent the London 2012 Games’ legacies had impacts for Leicestershire; and, if any, why there were differences, in terms of gaining London 2012 Games’ legacy outcomes, that existed between host and non-host regions, using case study method was satisfied.

Furthermore, using case study was suitable for this research project as it required a limited budget, and that the study of one case (in this case, the boundary is Leicestershire) provided a
manageable size of research for the researcher to study one aspect of a problem (in this case is the regional London 2012 Olympic Games’ legacy/impacts) in some depth within a limited time-scale (Bell, 2010; Blaxter, Hughes, & Tight, 2006).

Case study method has been defined by different academics in different ways. However, as this study supports the view of Blaikie (2010), Goode and Hatt (1952) who see case studies as a method of selecting the source of data, rather than a type of research design (e.g. surveys, experiments and ethnography etc.), the definition of case studies is described as a single bounded entity, studied in detail, with a variety of methods, over an extended period (Creswell, 2009). The purpose of using case studies is to support investigators to retain the holistic and meaningful characteristics of real-life events, such as small group behaviour, organisational and managerial processes etc (Yin, 2009).

As Yin (2009) and Creswell (2007) suggested, the case study method is not just a form of ‘qualitative research’. It can include quantitative evidence as well. Therefore, a mixed quantitative and qualitative method for data collection has been used in this study. Main techniques of data collection of case studies include such as questionnaire survey, interview, and the study of documents. A comparative overview of strengths and weaknesses of the six major techniques of data collection is provided in Table 5.3. By highlighting and contrasting the six most commonly used techniques, Table 5.3 not only illustrates, to some degree, the reasons for the selection of particular techniques in this research, but also demonstrates that as there is no single manner has a complete advantage over all the others. Therefore, mixed various techniques were compatible with this case study:

- Document analysis
- Semi-structured interviews
- Questionnaires

The questions, such as whether the selected methods are feasible for this study, and whether a particular method can generate the information required, will be explored in detail in the next section. In sum, by adopting document analysis, semi-structured interviews and questionnaires it should be possible to triangulate data gained from interviews or questionnaire with analysis of policy documents relating to the case context.
### Table 5.3 Six sources of data collection techniques: strengths and weaknesses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Techniques</th>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Documentation</strong></td>
<td>- Stable – can be reviewed repeatedly</td>
<td>- Retrievability – can be difficult to find</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Unobtrusive – not created as a result of the case study</td>
<td>- Biased selectivity, if collection is incomplete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Exact – contains exact names, references, and details of an event</td>
<td>- Reporting bias – reflects (unknown) bias of author</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Broad coverage – long span of time, many events, and many settings</td>
<td>- Access – may be deliberately withheld</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Archival records</strong></td>
<td>- [same as those for documentation]</td>
<td>- [same as those for documentation]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Precise and usually quantitative</td>
<td>- Accessibility due to privacy reasons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interviews</strong></td>
<td>- Targeted – focuses directly on case study topics</td>
<td>- Bias due to poorly articulated questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Insightful – provides perceived causal inferences and explanations</td>
<td>- Response bias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Inaccuracies due to poor recall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Reflexivity – interviewee gives what interviewer wants to hear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct observations</strong></td>
<td>- Reality – covers events in real time</td>
<td>- Time-consuming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Contextual – covers context of ‘case’</td>
<td>- Selectivity – broad overage difficult without team of observers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Reflexivity – event may proceed differently because it is being observed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Cost - hours needed by human observers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participant-observation</strong></td>
<td>- [same as above for direct observations]</td>
<td>- [same as above for direct observations]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Insightful into interpersonal behaviour and motives</td>
<td>- Bias due to participant-observer’s manipulation of events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical artifacts</strong></td>
<td>- Insightful into cultural features</td>
<td>- Selectivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Insightful into technical operations</td>
<td>- Availability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: adapted from Yin (2009: 102)*

### Limitations of using case studies

Concerns over the use of case studies in social research have been mainly focused on two issues. The first frequent complaint about case studies is the issue of lack of rigor particularly in the case selection, or bias existed when investigator has tried to influence the direction of the findings and conclusions (Yin, 2009). However, as Yin argued, such bias also can be found in the experimental research, or in the survey research when designing questionnaires. The difference is that, comparing to other research methods, there are relatively less
numerous methodological texts providing investigators with specific procedures to be followed, which results in such problem may have been more frequently encountered and less frequently overcome. Therefore, when it comes to apply case studies to this research project, lessons learned from this particular issue was that researcher had to follow systematic procedures, and report all evidence fairly.

The second issue has to do with the possibility of generalising findings from case study research. Case studies have long been challenged that provide little basis for scientific generalisation due to the requirements for generalising to population were not met, especially, comparing to the experimental research design. Similar to some qualitative researchers who argued for the need to generalise findings in their research (e.g. Denzin, 1983; Lincoln & Guba, 1985), Yin argues that “case studies are generalizable to theoretical propositions and not to populations or universes” (p.15). In this sense, the goal of conducting a case study was not necessarily to provide statistical generalisation, but to generalise theories – so called ‘analytic generalisation’. Even thought, judgements on the basis of knowledge of the characteristics of the case and the target population still need to be made, rather than probability sampling techniques, e.g. selecting typical cases, using multiple-case studies, and applying depth description to facilitate transferability (Blaikie, 2010).

5.4.2 Document analysis

Document analysis can be used for both methods of qualitative and quantitative data collection. The application of qualitative document analysis has now been widely used in social research (Bryman, 2008). There is a wide range of documentary sources available for research, as defined by Bryman (2008), including personal documents (e.g. diaries, letters and autobiographies); visual objects (photographs); official documents deriving from the state (e.g. statistical information); mass media outputs (newspapers, magazines); virtual outputs (documents on the internet).

Documents are useful to understand meanings that make up social reality shared by members of society (May, 2001). The purpose of applying document analysis for this study was to review the salience of Games policy-related documents at national, regional, and sub-regional levels. The meaning and significance of all documents reviewed for this study were analysed through qualitative thematic analysis of documents, and were informed by the researcher’s perspective.
This study aimed to evaluate the legacy/impacts of the London 2012 Games for Leicestershire by particularly examining four legacy-programmes. Thus by collecting empirical evidence from the programme-level, for example, interviews with key actors who were involved with the sub-regional legacy policy developments, with an analysis of, for instance, policy documents relating to Leicestershire 2012 legacy policy processes, it should be possible to identify multiple views on legacy development and examine different interpretations of the Games legacy for the sub-region.

However, there are a number of issues and potential problems that may be involved with when using documentary sources (MacDonald & Tipton, 1993). Thus when assessing the quality of evidence available from documentary sources, there are four key criteria to consider: authenticity, credibility, representativeness and meaning (Scott, 1990). The issue of authenticity is a fundamental criterion in document analysis, which concerns with whether it is actually what it claims to be. Platt (1981) provides a useful checklist for deciding on the authenticity of a document (see below), which can be used as an instructive guide for the study. Credibility refers to who produced the document, why, when, for whom and in what context. A possible solution, as May (2001) suggests, is that other data sources can be used in a form of triangulation in order to establish the social and political context in which the document was produced. Thus semi-structured interviews with key stakeholders should aid the process of triangulation. The problem of a document’s ‘representativeness’ involves a judgement as to whether the documents used were representative of the totality of relevant documents. In order to decide whether a particular selection is representative of the totality of the documents, the researcher should have an idea of the number and type of relevant documents that might have been produced in the first place (MacDonald & Tipton, 1993). Finally, meaning involves with the understanding of the meaning and significance of what the document contains. As suggested by MacDonald and Tipton (1993), content analysis in which important themes are quantified can be seen as a way of obtaining and understanding the deeper meaning of the document.

The checklist for ensuring the authenticity of a document:
1. Does the document contain obvious errors and/or inconsistencies?
2. Do different versions of the same document exist?
3. Is there consistency of literary style, content, handwriting or typeface?
4. Has the document been transcribed by more than one copy writer?
5. Has the document been circulated by someone with a vested interest in a particular reading of its content?
6. Does the version derive from a reliable source?

Source: Platt (1981: 34)
Rationale for the selection of documentary material

In order to gain an overall understanding of the context of this study, in particular, to understand policy change at the national level in relation to the London 2012 legacy planning and delivery, strategic documents (including policy statements published by the government and quasi-governmental organisations) and evaluation guideline for the Games were drawn for the analysis, e.g., the report “Before, during and after: making the most of the London 2012 Games” (DCMS, 2008a); the document “Plans for the legacy from the 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games” (DCMS, 2010); and the guideline “London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games Impacts and Legacy Evaluation Framework” (DCMS, 2009). At the local level, for each case study, strategic documents (including meeting notes of the Quarterly Leicestershire 2012 Steering Group meetings, and guidelines for partnership working) were selected to provide useful background data and to support the design of the questionnaire and interview questions, e.g., Annual Reports (published by LRS), Operation and Action Plans and Strategic Reviews info. In addition, in order to develop logic models for each of the case studies, marketing materials (including informational and advertising brochures, posters, presentation slides, and flyers) were also reviewed to help with identifying inputs, throughputs, and anticipated outcomes.

The selection of materials was refined by their relevance to the context (i.e. London 2012 related), and also by the nature of documents (i.e. directly associating with programme evaluations). It was also imperative to access to documents, published by the groups who were responsible for each case study, revealing indications of policies making and procedures planning.

5.4.3 Semi-structured interviews

As an approach to collecting qualitative data, interviewing aims to explore questions of ‘why’ and ‘how’ rather than the ‘how many’ and ‘when’ (Gratton & Jones, 2004). There are a variety of forms of interviewing, such as structured, semi-structured, unstructured, or the focus group. For his study, the semi-structured interview method was adopted.

The semi-structured interview applies a set of questions or schedule, open-ended questions and informal probing to facilitate a discussion of issues. Such method tends to provide much richer data where respondents are not limited to short and relatively simple responses, and allows them to talk freely and to offer their interpretation of events. The semi-structured
interview method proved to be useful for this study due to the following line of reasoning. Firstly, as suggested by Veal (2006) interviews are most appropriate when the information collected is of a complex and contextual nature, the semi-structured approach can be used to gain individual informed understanding of the legacy-developed process and developments of Leicestershire 2012 Games plan direction. In addition, it provides perceived causal inferences from the actor’s point of view, rather than the researcher’s (Yin, 2009). Secondly, semi-structured interviewing offers a greater flexibility, compared with questionnaires, that ensures that all topics required for the research are discussed with an interviewee, and still there is space for the interviewer to ask probing questions to clarity points and to explore deeper into unexpected for ambiguous responses (Bryman, 2008; May, 2001).

However, there are some factors, e.g. the issue of identification of interviewees through sampling (Devine, 2002), that need to be born in mind when carrying out interviews. For this study, the adopted sampling techniques for conducting semi-structured interviews are purposive, snowball, and stratified sampling method. First of all, the purposive sampling was employed to collect data from the key stakeholders in order to inform policy making analysis. As this study aimed to select prospective interviewees on the basis that they had been involved with strategic aspects of Leicestershire 2012 legacy process and/or decision-making, a potential pool of interviewees was identified from the observation of the quarterly Leicestershire 2012 Steering Group Board Meetings. Essentially, consideration was given to each stakeholder’s role, knowledge and experience on the board. Decisions were then made based on whether they could provide the study with relevant information, whether they were involved with the Leicestershire 2012 legacy journey as senior management roles, and whether the selection of the interviewees incorporated a group of representatives that were from one of the seven legacy strategic strands.

With regard to selected interviewees for the legacy-programme Get Set, evaluation, a snowballing method was applied. Firstly, two exploratory interviews were conducted with the Regional Children and Young People (CYP) Coordinator and a Get Set volunteer ambassador respectively, to get a participant’s understanding of how the programme worked on the ground, to discuss the evaluation plan of the programme. As part of the interview schedule, the Regional CYP Coordinator provided guidance on categorising the interview schools, in terms of the levels of engagement and participation in Get Set, judging by the length and
quantity of their Get Set involvement; and she also suggested the potential case study schools for the interviews. Thus a network of actors was established.

With regard to using semi-structured interviews for the evaluation of the Workplace Challenge programme, a stratified sampling method was adopted: a sample of six interviewees was taken randomly until the identified categories achieve theoretical saturation (Glaser & Strauss, 1967)\(^{39}\) from a sample of 126 questionnaires returned, to further identify the level of the additional impacts that the London Games had generated. The same method of sampling was used for the Games Maker interview selection. From a 62 person sample of Leicestershire Games Makers who were awarded the Games Maker Grant\(^{40}\), twelve people were taken randomly.

A further problem relating to the appropriateness of interviews surrounds the context within which the interview was conducted. The interviewees were provided with detailed information relating to their involvement in the research. It was also explained to all interviewees that they would be given the opportunity to amend the transcriptions of their responses prior to publishing, or withdraw from the interview. During the interview, a careful balance of the relationship between the researcher and interviewee was maintained, as it is noted by Gratton and Jones (2004: 143) that it is possible that researcher may add bias as a result of his/her “(often unconscious) – verbal and non-verbal reactions, for example through nodding at certain responses, which may encourage the informant to answer in the manner” the interviewee thinks the researcher wants. Thus it is suggested to use appropriate probes and neutral body language to minimise such bias.

5.4.4 Questionnaires

In contrast to qualitative methods which are used to capture meaning, process and context (Bryman, 2008), quantitative methods are generally concerned with measuring and counting aspects of social life (Blaikie, 2010). As the most commonly used quantitative data collection method, the self-administered questionnaire was adopted for this study, both for the evaluations of the Workplace Challenge Programme (WCP) and Sport Makers. SPSS statistics software was used for analysing the data.

\(^{39}\) The preliminary quantitative research of the evaluation of the programme had identified six categories of the participating organisations (see Chapter Six), thus the six interviewees, one each from six participating organisations was selected.

\(^{40}\) The Leicestershire Games Maker Grant was set up by local authorities, Inspire Leicestershire, LeicesterShire & Rutland Sport, and local communities, providing a fund of £250 to support Leicestershire Games Makers during the Games (see Chapter Eight). Thus the researcher had access to the contact details of those Games Makers in order to invite for interviews.
The rationale for using questionnaires as part of the WCP evaluation was that, firstly, this method was considered as appropriate to gather quantitative information from a large sample group (in the case of WCP, there were over 1000 participants); secondly, all the WCP participants, who provided their email address when they signed up to the programme, were contacted by email with a message to explain the purpose of the research, together with the web link of the questionnaire. It was thus considered as more convenient for respondents because they could complete the questionnaire whenever they wanted and at the speed that they would prefer (Bryman, 2008); finally, with regards to the research strategy design for the evaluation of WCP, the initial distribution of questionnaires was seen as appropriate for discovering a wide range of information about the programme participants, for example, measuring variables such as age, gender, previous and current participation level of sport and physical activity, their personal interests in the London 2012 and the Games’ potential impacts, etc.; based on the feedback collected from the survey, semi-structured interviews were then applied to further explore the identified causal links (in particular, to identify the extent to which the London 2012 Games had impacted on influencing their participation in the programme).

The questionnaire method was also employed in the context of the Sport Makers programme evaluation. Having worked together with LRS which was the body responsible for running the programme’s introductory training session at the local level, the questionnaires were distributed on-site before the end of a number of sessions. The questionnaire method was considered as a much easier and quicker way to conduct the data collection under those circumstances, gaining the most responses as possible.

There is often a concern with questionnaire surveys over low response rates that may have an effect on the reliability of the study (Bryman, 2008; Gratton & Jones, 2004). This was not particularly problematic in the case of the Sport Makers evaluation as the on-site response rate was nearly as high as 95%; whereas, in the case of the WCP evaluation, several rounds of follow-up emails were sent to achieve a desired response rate.

5.4.5 Thematic content analysis

Thematic content analysis was used in this study to make sense of the data collected through document analysis and semi-structured interviews. Thematic content analysis has been commonly used as a method for qualitative analysis to identify, report, and analyse data for
the meanings produced in and by people and events (Braun & Clarke, 2006; Floersch, Longhofer, Kranke, & Townsend, 2010; Patton, 2002). In social science, a theme refers to a “patterned response or meaning within the dataset” (Braun & Clarke, 2006: 82). As suggests by Patton, the significance of a theme is not determined by its frequency but by its substantive significance (meaning the consistency of themes across and within study participants) (2002: 467). One of the most noticeable strengths of thematic content analysis is its flexibility to analysis data. This method is seen as an alternative analysis approaches to avoid both the quantification of ‘word counting’ and open-ended discourse. It also can be used for researchers from different methodological backgrounds to analyse their data (Braun & Clarke, 2006). However, in this regard, a concern has been raised for the issue of its reliability due to its rather wide of interpretations from variety themes (Guest, MacQueen, & Namey, 2011).

The process of thematic analysis for this study followed the following steps. Firstly, all collected data was read through thoroughly, and re-read until themes gradually emerged from the data. The initial emergent themes were then coded by using the Nvivo 9 computer software, and later added to with secondary or linking themes on closer inspection of the data. The final stage of the thematic analysis was to re-evaluate all the data collected under the theme headings, which ensured that the meaning of the data once themed, remained consistent with the message it represented in its original raw format (Patton, 2002).

5.5 Data sampling and collection

Essentially, Leicestershire selected as this study’s geographic area for analysis was because there was a funding available. The consequences for choosing Leicestershire were, firstly, it ensured opening access to the key actors. Secondly, as this research aimed to draw primary and secondary analysis undertaken by actors in the system, there was a great likelihood because the Leicestershire 2012 Steering Group was funding the project they were more willing to cooperate.

Furthermore, as addressed above, the selection of the seven programmes for the whole research project evaluation, i.e. CompeteFor, Workplace Challenge, STEAM Data, My Games My Legacy, Get Set, Sport Maker, and Games Maker, had pragmatic reasons: firstly, they were proposed by the Director of Inspire LeicesterShire, Shimul Haider, as priorities for collecting empirical evidence; secondly, some of them well represented themes of the focus.
of attention that the UK government emphasised in relation to the London 2012 Games. In other words, the existence of some programmes were designed and implemented to accomplish several ambitions that the government made in the bid back in 2005, e.g. Get Set programme for inspiring a generation of young people to take part in cultural, sport and physical activity; CompeteFor project for fully exploiting the opportunities for economic growth offered by hosting the Games, etc. Thirdly, the evaluation manner, i.e. seven legacy programme case studies, was also determined by the research questions. Fundamentally, the intrinsic nature of the research project can be defined and reflected by a set of pre-determined case studies to investigate. Those seven specifically legacy programmes were, what Yin called, Units of analysis in the theory of case study method. The selection of the appropriate units of analysis was identified by study questions and study propositions. Each unit of analysis (namely each legacy programme in this case) would call for a slightly different research design and data collection strategy.

Table 5.4 summarises the underlying reasons why each of the seven legacy programmes were purposively selected for investigation, bearing in mind that originally they were proposed by the Director of 2012 Legacy team as the priorities to focus. In particular, considering the limitation of the length of the thesis, only four of the seven legacy programmes, i.e. Workplace Challenge, Get Set, Sport Makers and Games Makers, will be presented in this thesis. The reason for selecting these four programmes was mainly because the evidence of these four programmes was gathered via primary research, which seemed to provide richer data for analysis purposes.

Those seven legacy programmes were chosen based on their similarities and differences with respect to seven key legacy themes which were identified both in the systematic review and Leicestershire 2012 strategy plan: economic impact, volunteering, tourism, sport, culture, and children and young people.

The seven legacy programmes revealed similarities in the sense that:

- They all appeared to be Olympic-legacy relevant;
- All programmes were striving to maximising the London 2012 impacts for Leicestershire;
- Each programme stranded as a particular case in respectively legacy area;
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- All programmes were cooperated (to different degree) with Inspire Leicestershire team.

The seven legacy programmes were also possessed of their own characteristics in the sense that:

- Not all the programmes were sub-regional products and therefore varied in the extent to which its appropriateness to Leicestershire, which therefore may have impacts on their success;
- Individual programmes also varied in their underlying motive, their delivering strategy, the way they were organised, the way they were devolved, and their managerial structure;
- Not all of the programmes had a strong link to the 2012 Games, which therefore identifying the nature of individual programmes and assessing additionality were critical.

In the light of discussion above, each of the seven legacy programmes used for the unit of analysis in this research project was unique. Due to this individualism, it was clear that the intention of this study was not to draw conclusions that can be generalised across the nation, as we cannot deny the fact that each region had their peculiarities, and different political settings. Instead, this research strategy sought to assess the impact of the 2012 Games on Leicestershire, and to produce a benchmark evidence base for policy analysis for other parts of the nation on legacy outcomes. The realist evaluation analysis then provided explanations as to the extent to which the Olympic legacies had been promoted successfully in Leicestershire, and thus generated (positive/negative) outcomes, through revealing the underlying cause-effect relationship by referring to theoretical models, and contrasting objectives and outputs, or probably outcomes as well. It is here that this case study aimed to provide analytical theory generalisation, but not statistical generalisation (Yin, 2009).
Table 5.4 The underlying motives for including each of the seven legacy programme as a case study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of the Programme</th>
<th>The scale of the programme</th>
<th>The addressing area</th>
<th>Research strategy</th>
<th>Distinguishing quality that required its involvement in the research as a case study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workplace Challenge Programme</td>
<td>Leicestershire</td>
<td>Sports and Physical Activity Business</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>It was a sub-regional product which was not designed to link with London 2012 originally. But as a result of its success in 2011, it had been tailored and linked more together with London Games in 2012. In addition, Inspire Leicestershire collaboratively promoted it within Leicestershire businesses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport Makers Programme</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Volunteering Olympic legacy in general</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>It was a specific London 2012 programme that came along after the change of the government in 2010. The programme served three purposes: one, increasing volunteering base; two, disseminating Olympic values; three, promoting sports and physical activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Games Maker Programme</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Volunteering</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>It was a national-wide programme, and the main mission for region was to promote it according to national strategy and plan. However, as Leicestershire had allocated certain amount of money as a grant for our regional Games Makers to apply, it would be interested to explore whether the Grant has made any differences in terms of motivating their participation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get Set Education Programme</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Children &amp; Young People</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>It was the main educational programme that targets the group of children and young people. One of the Board members, Gaynor Nash (East Midlands CYP Coordinator), sought evidence of the impacts of Get Set in the region, and thus came to us for collaboration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My Games My Legacy Programme</td>
<td>Leicestershire</td>
<td>Culture Olympia</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>This programme was created and delivered by Inspire Leicestershire team, and had also won the Inspire Mark. As the main home-grown programme, it addressed the Olympic culture legacy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEAM data</td>
<td>Leicestershire</td>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Balance our focuses, covering different area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CompeteFor Programme</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>It was the main national 2012 economic project. As promoting businesses was one of the priorities of staging the London 2012, it was initially planned for conducting a primary research. However, due to strict data protection, there was limited data and information available, so that only a secondary research was carried out.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.6 Validity and reliability

5.6.1 Validity of constructs

“By validity, I mean truth: interpreted as the extent to which an account accurately represents the social phenomena to which it refers” (Hammersley, 1992: 57). In qualitative research, the question of the truth relies on how well the interpretation of the research accurately reflects the phenomena under study.

Traditional positivist scientific approach is invariably concerned about issues of internal and external validity. Internal validity in relation to policy evaluation is defined as “the degree of sureness with which we can infer that the programme actually caused the effects we find” (Garaway, 1997: 2). This notion implies that in order to infer a real causal relationship in any experimental design it requires a strict control to filter out all other possible rival hypotheses that might be affecting programme outcomes; whereas in a social science context, the filtering out of rival explanation is difficult because as social environments are open systems in which researcher is therefore cannot to control and filter out all other possible influencing factors. Consequently, given the nature of our research (i.e. social research rather than experimental enquiry), in order to draw valid conclusions about “What the real legacy/impacts that were created from London hosting the 2012 Games were”, firstly, it was essential to identify the real causation underlying events. The identification of the real causation helped to drill down the principles of generative causation in order to be aware of whether any intervention might or might not work in this specific context. Secondly, in order to avoid the common mistake that policy evaluators often make, which was considering wider impacts but not the net impacts, this study aimed to set out the counterfactual scenarios and to identify the baselines in order to assess the value of additionality. Therefore, it further ensured the degree of internal validity, and also the conclusions we drew were based on what really happened.

External validity is defined as “the degree to which findings can be generalised to other settings or to the next group of participants” (Garaway, 1997: 2). In experimental designs, generalisation can be achieved from a sample of representatives to larger population through strictly scientific random selection control. However, in social science evaluation context, the main focus has been placed on making a theoretical generalisation rather than empirical generalisation.
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There are four tests have been commonly used to establish the quality of any empirical social research (Kidder & Judd, 1986), i.e. construct validity, internal validity, external validity, and reliability test (See Table 5.5). Yin identified several tactics (See Table 5.6) for dealing with these four tests especially when doing case studies which are the same forms of research that this study applies.

Table 5.5 Four tests for judging the quality of research designs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tests</th>
<th>Case Study Tactic</th>
<th>Phase of research in which tactic occurs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construct validity</td>
<td>Use multiple sources of evidence</td>
<td>Data collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Establish chain of evidence</td>
<td>Data collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Have key informants review draft case study report</td>
<td>Data collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal validity</td>
<td>Do pattern matching</td>
<td>Data analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do explanation building</td>
<td>Data analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Address rival explanations</td>
<td>Data analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use logic models</td>
<td>Data analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External validity</td>
<td>Use theory in single-case studies</td>
<td>Research design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use replication logic in multiple-case studies</td>
<td>Research design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>Use case study protocol</td>
<td>Data collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop case study database</td>
<td>Data collection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: (Yin, 2009: 40)

Table 5.6 Case study tactics for four design tests

Furthermore, in order to improve validation in social science research, especially in qualitative research, the method of triangulation has been suggested as particularly appropriate (Cook, 1985; Denzin, 1970). Triangulation is a form of comparison – comparing different kinds of data (e.g. quantitative and qualitative) and different methods (e.g. observation and interviews) to see whether they corroborate one another (Silverman, 2001). This study aimed to adopt the method of triangulation, by adopting both quantitative and qualitative strategies, in the meantime, as outlined above, different types of data collection methods, e.g. in-depth interviews and document analysis, were selected in order to establish valid findings.
5.6.2 Reliability of data

The term reliability refers to “the degree of consistency with which instances are assigned to the same category by different observers or by the same observer on different occasions” (Hammersley, 1992: 67). Wood and Kroger (2000) consider reliability is the repeatability of findings across samples, rates, measures, parts of measures, over time, etc. – whether the findings are stable and repeatable. Lincoln and Guba developed their understanding of reliability in the social science research context. To them, reliability is referred to dependability which encompasses the idea of the changeability of conditions in a dynamic universe, with the researcher responsible for reporting these changing conditions (Lincoln & Guba, 1986a). They turn the focus to the data – is it confirmable by others? – rather than objectivity as a quality of the researcher. In addition, Marshall and Rossman (1989) argue that a concern for the reliability of observations is a different case in social science research as if we treat social reality as always in flux, then we don’t need to worry about whether our research instruments measure accurately. Although, this critical argument may be exaggerated, it emphasises the point that there is a fundamental difference between natural and social science research so that we should consider the issues of reliability accordingly.

LeCompte and Goetz (1982) summarise that the issues of reliability have derived mainly from the two focal points, i.e. ‘internal’ and ‘external’ reliability. Internal reliability refers to the concerns of ‘interrater reliability’ which relates to the degree to which other researchers applying similar constructs would match these to data in the same way as original researchers (Seale, 1999). Exercise in interrater reliability can aid confidence in the logical consistency with which data analysis has been done by using low-inference description, peer examination, record data mechanically and etc. Wood and Kroger (2000) also address this point and suggest that repeated readings of the text, the redoing of analyses both in the analysis and write-up stages can enhance the degree of internal reliability.

External reliability concerns the replicability of entire studies – Would other researchers studying the same or similar settings generate the same findings? Wood and Kroger (2000) recognise this repetition issue and distinguish it in different research context. Generally, conventional natural science research more focuses on the operational replication as they assume that as long as the replication relies upon the same measurements or movement, conclusions and concepts are the same. They also assume that reliability can be assessed independently of context. However, this is not the case for the social research which places
more emphasises on the repetition of concepts or meanings. To them, those concepts and meanings are inseparable from context. Different operational replication can have the same meaning in different contexts; or the same operational replication can have different meanings in different contexts. Therefore, external reliability can be improved by identifying the particular status position taken by the researcher in the field, by exploring and grasping a full account of the theories and ideas that informed the research, by paying more attention to methodological reporting, etc.

5.7 Conclusion

In this chapter, ontological and epistemological considerations were discussed, methodological concerns were raised, and the research strategy of the study was explained in detail. This study adopted critical realism research paradigm, which is considered, in ontological terms, to provide an abstract base to resolve the problems of explanation regarding the nature and operation of ‘causal’ forces; in epistemological terms, critical realism provides a philosophical grounding for locating the structures or mechanisms which have produced the pattern. Through applying realist evaluation framework to programme-orientated evaluations, the underlying mechanisms of each initiative in different contexts that produced certain outcomes were examined. Through document analysis, qualitative and/or quantitative data analysis for the selected four case studies, the impact of the programmes for Leicestershire was examined; the influence of the Games on boosting outputs and thus generating outcomes was identified.
Chapter 6: A Case Study of Sport Legacy: the Workplace Challenge programme

6.1 Introduction

In Leicestershire, the key priorities under the sport strand were focused on increasing community participation and supporting talented athletes. This was to be supported, as identified in Chapter 2, through delivering nationally initiated legacy programmes and sub-regionally developed sport-related programmes, new investments in infrastructure, and allocating sports funds for athletes. LRS was the agent responsible for leading the sport strand in the sub-region.

A case study of the Workplace Challenge programme (WCP) was proposed for evaluation by the Director of Inspire Leicestershire. In addition to this pragmatic reason, the programme itself had some characteristics that were worth of investigating. Firstly, the Challenge programme was a sub-regionally developed product which was not originally designed to link with the 2012 Games (interviews with programme stakeholders confirmed this point). It therefore provided an interesting starting point for the assessment of the additionality issue - that is, given that this programme would still have been implemented even without the 2012 Games taking place, when assessing the impacts of the Games on promoting sport and physical activity using this particular programme as a vehicle, teasing out the real additional impacts of the Games was critical, as simply counting all the outputs of the programme as the Games’ impact would not be appropriate. Secondly, the outcomes of the Challenge programme were also probably enhanced as the message of ‘London 2012 Games’ had been emphasized together with some of the key programme activities and events by Inspire Leicestershire’s collaborative promotion. Therefore, assessing the additionality effect of the Games would be key in this case for the evaluation.

WCP was a free online competition between businesses that allowed participants to log their activity over the course of the programme. There were many toolkits, resources and much support available to help achieve the individual’s activity goals and compete for prizes along the way. Although WCP was planned to run just in 2011, after successful outputs in Year 1, and considering the London 2012 effect may further boost the number of participants, LRS
decided to use surplus funding to replicate the success of the programme in 2012 (Year 1: Jan - July 2011; Year 2: March – July 2012). This programme was funded by Leicestershire County Council, Leicestershire Together, Leicestershire County and Rutland NHS, seven District Councils, and Corporate Games in Year 1 (in total £20,000) and Year 2 (£10,000).

The rationale for developing this programme, as reported by LRS, was firstly because national statistics demonstrated in the region of Leicestershire and Rutland, the level of adults participating in sport and physical activity was still not satisfied. The figures from Sport England (2010b) indicated that, in the East Midlands, between Active People Survey 2 (2007/8) and APS4 (2009/10), there was a statistically significant decrease in sport and physical activity participation, dropping from 601,300 to 581,000. Only 24.1% of men and 19.6% of women engaged in at least 3 days per week, doing at least 30 minutes moderate intensity participation (including sport and recreational walking and cycling). Secondly, according to the Department of Health’s (2003) findings, the workplaces provide a significant platform to promote healthy lifestyles to the adult working population. Thus, LRS aimed to use this programme to encourage and support Leicestershire workplaces to promote the benefits of taking part in regular physical activity to their staff in order to increase physical activity participation level.

6.2 Evaluation framework: methods and measures

In order to explore the possible impact the 2012 Games may have on the programme and assess the programme’s contribution towards promoting sport and physical activity participation, the following research questions were developed as the point for departure for the research:

- To what extent has the programme contributed to increased sport and physical activity participation amongst staff in participating organisations in WCP in Leicestershire and Rutland;
- To what extent can the existence of the programme be directly attributed to the effects of staging the 2012 Games;
- To what extent has the fact of 2012 being hosted in London boosted interest and outputs.
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The research design for this study used a mixed method, including quantitative and qualitative approaches. The focus of this case study was to use the results gathered from the questionnaires to measure aspects of the experience of engaging with the programme, and then use qualitative data as supplementary evidence to elaborate the procedures adopted and to interpret the results. Consequently, the following data collection approaches were used.

**Reviewing the policy documents and marketing materials:** Strategy documents (including policy statement of the Leicestershire 2012 Steering Group and LRS, guidelines for the WCP partnership, and planning materials) and marketing materials (including informational and advertising brochures, posters, presentation slides, and flyers) were reviewed. By analysis of themes in the policy documents and of the way themes were represented (or not represented) in planning and marketing materials, inputs, throughputs, and anticipated outputs and outcomes were identified for the purpose of developing the logic model, articulating implicit and explicit assumptions about causal mechanisms linking these elements, and these insights were subsequently drawn upon to support the design of survey and interview questions in order to test and evaluate the underlying validity of the assumed causal links.

Two sets of survey data were collected respectively after the completion of each year’s programme:

**Wave 1 data collection (August-September 2011)**

- **Survey of the nature, rate, and the rationales for participating in the programme:** From the questionnaires distributed by email to the 827 people from 67 workplaces taking part in the 2011 WCP, 15% returned usable completed questionnaires (a small but usable response rate in the context of our aims, n = 125, thus with a 95% confidence level, giving a confidence interval of ±8%). The survey questions explore the extent to which the programme contributed to increased sport and physical activity participation amongst staff in participating organisations in Leicestershire; the work-performance and social related benefits had been gained through the programme; and the extent to which the fact of the 2012 Games being hosted in London had boosted interest and the level of outputs achieved.
- **Interviews with internal stakeholders:** A small number of interviews with stakeholders were undertaken. There were two groups of internal stakeholders being interviewed. The first was with two officers of LRS operating the programme. These sought to
identify what, if any, additional policy and promotional support had been provided by virtue of the London 2012 Games. Given that preliminary quantitative results indicated that the London Games had motivated participants to undertake more physical activity, another interview group representing a total six internal stakeholders, one each from six participating organisations, was selected to tease out the level of the additional impacts that the London Games had generated.

**Wave 2 data collection (August-September 2012):**

- Survey of the nature, rate, and the rationales for participating in the programme: another round of questionnaires was distributed by email right after the 2012 WCP finished. Within the 1176 participants taking part in the 2012 WCP, 7% returned completed questionnaires survey (n = 77, thus with a 95% confidence level, the confidence interval is ±10%). A majority of the survey questions were kept the same as had been the case for the previous year, with a few additional questions. These sought to identify, for example, whether the participants had been involved with the programme during the previous year; if yes, had there been any change in the frequency/intensity of participation; the level of awareness of physical activity related knowledge (e.g. the national recommended physical activity levels for adults); a pre-programme question on ‘how many days per week on average were you taking part in moderate intensity physical activity for at least 30 minutes’.

### 6.3 Analysis of the two waves of data

Considering the space limit of the thesis, only that part of the results which was relevant to the thesis is presented below\(^{41}\).

The personal details of the two waves of survey respondents are summarised as follows.

---

Table 6.1 The demographic details of two waves of survey respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Wave 1</th>
<th>Wave 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td>65% female (n=78), 33.3% male (n=40), and 7 respondents do not want to disclose (1.7%);</td>
<td>61% female (n=47), 38% male (n=29), and 1 respondents do not want to disclose;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td>age 16-25: 12.50% age 26-34: 28% age 35-44: 27.50% age 45-54: 25% age 55-64: 5%</td>
<td>age 16-25: 7% age 26-34: 38% age 35-44: 23% age 45-54: 27% age 55-64: 4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital status</strong></td>
<td>68% married or have a partner 28% single 4% others</td>
<td>70% married or have a partner 26% single 4% others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family with children</strong></td>
<td>67.3% have a child (or more than one) 32.7% no children</td>
<td>69% have a child (or more than one) 29% no children 2% respondents do not want to disclose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnic origin</strong></td>
<td>85% White-British 12.5% others 2.5% respondents do not want to disclose</td>
<td>86% White-British 7% others 7% respondents do not want to disclose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health condition</strong></td>
<td>87.5% good, or very good, or excellent health 12.5% have a disability or long term health issue</td>
<td>88% good, or very good, or excellent health 9% have a disability or long term health issue 3% respondents do not want to disclose</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Types of organisation employing respondents

In terms of the types of organisations that the respondents worked for, there were mainly four categories identified in the data: Local Authorities, Education (e.g. universities and colleges), Public sector/Sport Organisations (e.g. Volleyball England), and Private sector/Others (e.g. marketing companies) (see Figure 6.1). As can be seen from the figure, a majority of the respondents came from Local Authorities in the first year of the programme as LRS maintained frequent contact with this particular sector of organisations thus it was relatively easier to recruit from this source. The 2012 marketing strategy changed to target Leicestershire workplaces as widely as possible.
Results from two years’ surveys indicated that the most effective way of promoting WCP within different types of organisations were by email or by one person⁴² (see Figure 6.2). Among the other factors (i.e. By senior management, By human resource, At a team/staff meeting, Staff newsletter, Notice board, and others), promoting by human resources seemed to have been less effective.

**Figure 6.2 How was the Challenge promoted within your organisation?**

Around half of the respondents from Education sector reported that they would like LRS support for their workplace to increase participation in the programme by ‘helping with setting up activities at/for their workplace’. A considerable proportion of respondents from Local Authorities (43%) and Public Sector/Sports organisations (40%) considered that ‘attending a meeting at the workplace to discuss the programme’ would be an effective way to help their workplace to increase participation in the programme (see Figure 6.3).

---

⁴² No distinction is made in the questionnaire to establish whether the ‘one person’ is an individual responsible for promoting the Challenge programme, or an individual who had volunteered to promote the Challenge programme.
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Figure 6.3 How could LRS support your workplace to increase participation in the programme?

Among the six types of incentives or prizes to encourage participation (i.e. Money, Sports equipment, Training, Tickets to events/matches, Gym membership/sports activities, and Vouchers), the majority of the respondents from the category of Local Authorities reported that they would like Tickets to events/matches or Vouchers; over a half of the Education respondents preferred Ticket to events/matches and Sports equipment as incentives; 70% of the Public sector/Sports Organisation staff reported Money, Ticket to events/matches, Gym membership/sports activities; the majority of the Private sector/Others preferred Sports equipment Ticket to events/matches or Vouchers (see Figure 6.4).

Figure 6.4 What prizes or incentives may encourage you to participate in future programme?
**Personal behaviours**

In general, since taking part in WCP, around half of the respondents either agreed or strongly agreed that they **had increased the overall amount of physical activity they did**, which was reported in both of the surveys. In particular, a half of the 2011 survey respondents indicated that it was the **WCP which had motivated them to do more in sports and leisure activities**. This figure slightly increased by 1% in the 2012 survey. In addition, 40% of the 2011 respondents and 39% of the 2012 respondents either agreed or strongly agreed that **they had participated in new sport and leisure activities** (see Figure 6.5). The detailed results of the above three statements from both surveys are presented in Figure 6.6.

Furthermore, although the sample size of the respondents who participated in the two years of the programme was relatively small (n=36), around 41% of them reported that they continued to increase their participation in play sport and physical activity, with only 5 people acknowledging that the programme had directly or indirectly motivated them.

**Figure 6.5 Comparison of the proportion of the respondents reported either agreed or strongly agreed the following statement for 2011 WCP and 2012 WCP**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>2011 WCP</th>
<th>2012 WCP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Challenge motivated me to do more in sports and leisure activities</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in NEW sports and leisure activities</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do more physical activity</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 6.6 Since taking part in the workplace challenge, how much do you agree with the following statements?

Tests of differences generally assess whether differences between two samples are the result of the effort of a particular variable. In order to do so, t-test, one-way ANOVA, and Chi-squared tests were carried out. These tests are based on measuring whether the mean scores of two or more different groups can be considered as being significantly different, for example, whether the frequency of sport participation was significantly different for men and women. Similar to Pearson correlation tests, the guidelines (i.e. value of Eta squared)\textsuperscript{43} that

\textsuperscript{43}The effect size statistics provide an indication of the magnitude of the differences between the groups. For example, if the value of the effect size is 0.06 for the case of whether the frequency of sport participation was significantly different from men and women, it means that the magnitude of the differences in the means was moderate --- 6 per cent of the variance in the frequency of sport participation is explained by gender.
was proposed by Cohen (1988) for interpreting the effect size value are adopted (see Table 6.2).

Table 6.2 The guidelines of the effect size for independent-samples t-test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect Size</th>
<th>Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small effect</td>
<td>(0.01 \leq \text{Eta squared} &lt; 0.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate effect</td>
<td>(0.06 \leq \text{Eta squared} &lt; 0.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large effect</td>
<td>(\text{Eta squared} \geq 0.14)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The design of the 2012 survey was slightly changed by the WCP organisers in order to determine the impact of the programme on promoting sport participation. The 2012 programme participants were asked to indicate their sport and physical activity participation frequency. There was one group of differences that had been captured:

- A paired-samples t-test was conducted to evaluate the impact of the 2012 Challenge programme on the level of physical activity participation from Time 1 (prior the Challenge programme) to Time 2 (after the Challenge programme). There was a statistically significant increase in the level of physical activity participation from Time 1 (\(M = 4.62\), \(SD = 1.71\)) to Time 2 (\(M = 5.95\), \(SD = 2.18\), \(t(60) = -5.81\), \(p = .000\), two-tailed) (see Figure 6.7)\(^{45}\). The mean increase in the level of physical activity participation was 1.33 with a 95% confidence interval ranging from 0.87 to 1.79. The eta squared statistic (Eta squared = .36) indicated a large effect size.

\(^{44}\) The means expressed here relate to the unit of measurement used in this study. An increase of one unit equals an increase of one day of at least 30 minutes of moderate intensity physical activity (MIPA) per week. The values thus represented the following: 1 = zero days of at least 30 minutes of MIPA; 2 = one day of at least 30 minutes of MIPA; 3 = two days of at least 30 minutes of MIPA; 4 = three days of at least 30 minutes of MIPA; 5 = four days of at least 30 minutes of MIPA; 6 = five days of at least 30 minutes of MIPA; 7 = six days of at least 30 minutes of MIPA; 8 = seven days of at least 30 minutes of MIPA.

\(^{45}\) The use of different scales of participation in the two surveys was the result of a decision by LRS in order to cater to physical activity guidelines which had been updated over the year. This therefore necessitated conversion of one of the measures to generate a common frame. The measure of “how many days per week on average have you taken part in at least 30 minutes or more of moderate intensity exercise?” was used in the pre-programme survey. The post-programme survey asked “how many minutes per week on average do you undertake moderate physical intensity activity?”. A conversion of the latter measure was undertaken by dividing the inputted minutes by 30 which provided us with a conservative estimation of the count of days of at least 30 minutes spent on MIPA per week, thus facilitating a workable comparison of data for the two surveys.
As further explored in the interviews, general feedback from the participants indicated that being attracted and hence taking part in WCP was a product of the design of the programme as competitive and motivational.

‘I think, it is...it (WCP) can be quite motivational, it could be competitive. Particularly, when involving the 'activity log' section of it.’ (Interview:20.01.2012)

‘It was a motivator! And it also gave me a chance to raise a little bit money as well. From 6-8 weeks period of that, I actually raised about £400, or something, by cycling to work, nearly 30 miles every day. I think the programme is a really positive thing. And, I've also signed up for 2012 WCP.’ (Interview:24.01.2012)

**Psychological impacts**

A similar research project (Bull, Adams, & Hooper, 2008) shows that taking part in regular physical activity in the workplace can not only have physical health-related benefits, but also may have positive psychological impacts and work-related outcomes, for example, ‘I feel better about myself’, ‘I feel less stressed’, ‘I have been absent from work less’, and ‘I have improved performance at work’, etc. The survey designed a particular set of questions to explore these factors (see Figure 6.8). Among those factors, over 40% of the respondents reported that they felt ‘fitter’ (50%) and were ‘more active’ (47%). A considerable proportion of staff stated that ‘feel better about themselves’ (35%), and they ‘feel more healthy’ (38%).
Figure 6.8 Since taking part in the programme, do any of the following statements apply to you?

![Figure 6.8](image_url)

**Awareness and physical activity behaviour**

Studies of the effectiveness of many physical activity interventions exist in the literature. However, the answer to the question of why many of these interventions are ineffective remains uncertain (van Sluijs, Griffin, & van Poppel, 2007). One explanation that some commentators put forward is that whether a person intends to change his/her behaviour depends, on the one hand, on the belief that a change in behaviour will reduce health risks; and on the other hand, on the extent to which a person perceives their own behaviours as ‘unhealthy’ (Weinstein, 1988). Therefore, a lack of awareness of the recommended ‘healthy’ level of physical activity participation may have an impact on whether there will be a behaviour change in terms of participation following an intervention.

However, awareness of physical activity levels would appear to have received little attention in public health research, except for two studies conducted in Netherlands reporting that only 57% to 67% of the general population were aware of the recommended levels of physical activity (Lechner, Bolman, & Van Dijke, 2006; Ronda, Van Assema, & Brug, 2001).

---

46 It is consistent to what this study has found (51%).
In order to address this issue, in the 2012 survey, respondents were asked about their perceptions of physical activity, including their awareness of recommended physical activity levels. Some key findings were:

- Around half of respondents (33% male and 67% female) thought they knew the current recommendations for physical activity in 2012. Among those, only 42% (n=16) specified a level equivalent to the minimum target for physical activity.
- 71% of the respondents who reported that they were not aware of the recommended physical activity level for adults were inactive before they participated in the Challenge programme. This figure decreased to 43% in the post programme evaluation survey.

6.4 An analytic logic model of the programme

An illustrative logic model for explaining the programme is displayed below. As discussed in Chapter 3, mapping out the logic model at the beginning of the evaluation proved to be a valuable exercise. It should be noted however that, for this case study the long-term outcomes (such as reducing the level of obesity) may be hard to verify due to the evaluation taking place shortly after the programme finished. Nevertheless, the logic model does provide us with some evidence, in terms of development trends of activities based on the designed strategies and allocated resources, of the potential long-term impacts/legacy.
### Table 6.3 A logic model for the 2011 Challenge programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Context / Inputs</th>
<th>Throughputs / Activities</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vision:</strong> To encourage and support Leicestershire workplaces to promote the benefits of taking part in regular physical activity to their staff in order to increase physical activity participation levels:</td>
<td><strong>Physical context:</strong> Leicester &amp; Leicestershire Economic Context: Part of Active Together funding resource <strong>Political Context:</strong> Sport &amp; Physical Activity Strategy <strong>Stakeholders:</strong> Leader: LRS Partners: • Event Management Company Perfect Motion • Website Developer • PADOs • Leicestershire County Council / Leicester City Council • UK Corporate Games • Inspire Leicestershire</td>
<td><strong>The development of WCP micro site in order to support local organisations and their employees to increase their participation in sport and physical activity:</strong> • Established a database of local organisations to target. These organisations are then telephoned to discuss the WCP and sent promotional materials. Made follow up contract to ensure organisations sign up; • Marketing campaign to raise awareness of the health, social and economic benefits of regular participation in PA in the workplace and for individual participants; • Developed, coordinated and promoted a calendar of local sporting events between Jan – July 2011 for workplaces to compete in; • Developed a cycle/ active travel challenge in partnership with Leicestershire County Council / Leicester City Council; • Promote the UK Corporate Games by providing information about the UK Corporate Games to encourage local workplaces to take part.</td>
<td><strong>Number of employees across Leicestershire participated in the WCP:</strong> <strong>Number of workplaces across Leicestershire participated in the WCP:</strong> <strong>Number of local sporting events took place.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Short-term:</strong> • Healthy lifestyles leading to other psychological benefits, such as happiness, confidence; • Improved social networking in the workplace; • Improved work-related performance, for example, in reduction of absenteeism, increased commitment to work, increased productivity. <strong>Long-term:</strong> • Reducing a level of obesity in the workplace; • Developing employees’ interests in taking part in new sport and physical activities; • Developing employees’ habit of regularly participating in sport and physical activity; • Improving the general health-wellbeing being of employees; • Increasing morale/improving workplace culture.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As Table 6.3 outlines the flow of events anticipated, the causal relationships between inputs, activities, outputs, and outcomes were still subject to evaluation. Evidence collected from the surveys and interviews suggested the following factors:

1. Although the design of the programme was recognised as facilitating participation and enjoyment, there were some constraints on participation mentioned by the respondents, e.g. lack of facilities at workplaces (particularly showers), time barriers (e.g. shorter lunch breaks, and too much workload), and lack of support from their own organisations.

2. Among the listed activities that this programme provided, the website Log Section received positive feedback in terms of keeping the participants motivated. However, the Log Section was considered by some respondents to lack clarity regarding the differences between each ‘Activity Intensity’ level (i.e. light, moderate and heavy), which created some confusion and resulted in unfair competition.

3. The running of the 2011 WCP was considered too long, with some of the interviewees reporting that, at the end of the programme, they felt this task had become a bit tiresome. This recommendation was well received by LRS. Thus the 2012 WCP lasted only four months, instead of a half year.

4. While a healthier lifestyle leading to other psychological and social benefits was evident from the data, the findings regarding work-related performance were relatively insignificant. This may be due to the short period of implementation so that the respondents found it difficult to detect relevant changes.

6.5 The impact of London 2012

In order to assess the London 2012 impact, in terms of whether the fact of the 2012 Games taking place had boosted interest and outputs, a series of the London 2012 related questions were intentionally put into the survey. Firstly, as evidenced in both surveys, a majority of the respondents indicated their general enthusiasm for the Games: around 76% of the respondents reported that they either strongly agreed or agreed that ‘they are interested in the London 2012 Games’ (See Figure 6.10). Secondly, around 30% of the respondents suggested that the London Games had increased their awareness of the benefits of taking part in sport and physical activity. Thirdly, in terms of the motivational impact of the Games, people’s perception of the most likely sporting impacts of the London 2012 Games for them were as
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follows, 33% of respondents reported themselves ‘to be more interested in sport’, 31% ‘to be more active’, and 25% to be willing ‘to try a new sport/activity’ (see Figure 6.9).

Figure 6.9 Perception of the most likely London 2012 legacy for the respondents

![Figure 6.9](image)

If there are any, what do you think the most likely sporting impacts are for you from the London 2012?

- 33% to be more interested in sport
- 31% to be more active
- 25% to try a new sport/activity
- 17% to volunteer in sport/PA

The proportion of the respondents, who considered that the Games coming to the UK had ‘inspired’ them to take part in the programme, was relatively small (around 15%); in other words, a majority of the respondents would have participated in the programme regardless of the staging of London 2012. However, in the London Games’ year, the 2012 survey indicated a slight increase in this figure, which suggests that the publicity materials for the Games worked better on attracting people to undertake the programme. A graph illustrating the comparison between 2011 and 2012 survey results in the proportion of the respondents who either strongly agreed or agreed on London 2012 related statements is provided in Figure 6.11.

Figure 6.10 London 2012 related questions: how much do you agree with the following statements?

![Figure 6.10](image)
Figure 6.11 Comparison of the proportion of the respondents reported either agreed or strongly agreed the following statement for 2011 WPC and 2012 WPC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I am interested in the London Games</th>
<th>The publicity material for the London Games has motivated me to participate in the Challenge programme</th>
<th>The publicity material for the London Games has had influence on my decision to participate in the Challenge programme</th>
<th>The publicity surrounding the 2012 Games made me more aware of the benefits of taking part in sport and physical activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012 WCP 76%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 WCP 76%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With the purpose of assessing whether any two variables are associated (e.g. whether the influence of the Games, for example, in raising people’s awareness of the benefits of taking part in sport and physical activity, would trigger behaviour change, in terms of participating more in sport and physical activity), Pearson correlation tests were undertaken. The vocabulary is used in the commentary which follows to refer to the strength and direction of association is in accordance with the table below (Cohen, 1988) (See Table 6.4).

Table 6.4 The guidelines of the strength of the relationship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlation Value</th>
<th>The Strength of the Relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>r = ± .10 to .29</td>
<td>Small, positive / negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r = ± .30 to .49</td>
<td>Medium, positive / negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r = ± .50 to 1.0</td>
<td>Large, positive / negative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In total, there are three sets of variables with statistically significant correlations:

- There was a moderate, positive correlation between perceived level of agreement with two statements, namely ‘the publicity surrounding the 2012 Games made me more aware of the benefits of taking part in sport and physical activity’ and ‘I have increased overall amount of physical activity’ \[ r = .43, n = 185, p < .000 \].

47 Preliminary analyses were performed to ensure no violation of the assumptions of normality, linearity and homoscedasticity.
There was a small, positive correlation between the level of agreement on the statement ‘the publicity surrounding the 2012 Games made me more aware of the benefits of taking part in sport and physical activity’ and on ‘I have participated in new sports and leisure activities’ \[r = .21, n = 184, p < .005\].

There was a moderate, positive correlation between the level of agreement on ‘the publicity surrounding the 2012 Games made me more aware of the benefits of taking part in sport and physical activity’ and on ‘The London Games has motivated me to participate in the programme’ \[rho=.32, n=185, p<.01\].

From the above findings, it could be inferred that, for the respondents whose awareness of the benefits of taking part in sport and physical activity had been raised by the London 2012 were likely to be motivated to participate in the programme. In other words, the motivational factor of the Games had created or more accurately can be linked (albeit weakly) to increases in sport and physical activity participation and/or participation in new sports and leisure activity through taking part in the programme. Having identified these limited positive links between the Games and WCP, a further step in the analysis is to conduct qualitative research through semi-structured interviews with participants to explore the underlying causal relationships between factors associated with the London 2012 Olympic Games, WCP, and levels of participation in sport and physical activities.

Indeed, the inspirational effect of the Games, in terms of inspiring participants to play more sport or different sport, was evident in the interviews, e.g.

‘I guess I am going to come away from sort of post-Olympics more inspired I guess. …. you know hopefully it would inspire me to stay motivated and stay healthy.’ (Interview:20.01.2012)

‘I think, I suppose, sub-consciously, having 2012 coming up this year has made me perhaps work a lot harder on my own training for running.’ (Interview:24.01.2012)

However, in the small number of exploratory interviews which were undertaken in relation to this aspect (n=6) there was little evidence of the Olympic Games being hosted in the UK having a direct influence on decisions to participate in the WCP. This may be due partly to the relatively small interview sample and partly to a majority of the interviewees either working in sport-related environment or already being relatively active. However, some of the interviewees pointed out that the Games did encourage them to sustain their current level of participation in sport and to try different sports.
6.6 Assessing additionality

The main difficulty associated with this research design and methodology, in terms of assessing attributable impact of the London 2012 Games, is how to isolate other ‘effects’ in order to estimate the ‘net’ impacts, and assess the counterfactual scenario (i.e. what would have happened without the Olympic Games taken place.). The core question in relation to the additionality issue is what additional impacts (or outputs, outcomes) were achieved exclusively as a result of the programme. The first step in addressing additionality is thus to identify whether the programme is a Games-related initiative, and to identify the counterfactual scenario.

Identifying the nature of the programme and counterfactual scenario

If a programme was a product that was invented because of the London 2012 Games, e.g. the Get Set programme, it can be defined as a London 2012 legacy programme and any gross impacts that the programme generated would be attributable to the Games. However, to reach such a conclusion is not always easy. A programme could be simply defined as a London 2012-related product based on the fact that it was led by LOCOG, or the ODA, for instance, the Games Maker programme was led by LOCOG, and the CompeteFor programme was supported by the ODA and LOCOG. The majority of national London 2012-related programmes indicated their nature clearly in their outline report or implementation strategy. Whereas, the nature of some sub-regional programmes was rather ambiguous, which then requires further investigation. WCP was a classic example.

In theory, there are two ways to set out the counterfactual scenario in order to determine whether an intervention would still be delivered in the absence of the Games: (a) by examining what is said in annual or project reports; or (b) by interviewing the programme leaders who are aware of the history of the programme. A review of the programme related documents and interviews with the key stakeholders suggested that LRS would still have used the surplus budget from the Active Together programme\(^48\) to deliver WCP even if the London 2012 Games had not taken place. However, the scale of these activities, including marketing and promotion efforts, might have been negatively affected as the programme was promoted together with some of the key sub-regionally based London 2012 events and

---

48 Active Together was a county wide programme across Leicestershire that aimed to increase the number of participating in sport and physical activity, running from 2007 to 2011.
activities. As a result, the programme was promoted under the London 2012 banner, which might thus have had more influence on participants’ decision to take part in the programme.

In terms of report-based evidence, according to the Challenge programme documents (LRS, 2011), the programme was developed as a means to increase participation in physical activity at workplaces in order to increase physical activity participation levels, and to act as a pathway to the UK Corporate Games. Even though, it was launched after 2005 and led by LRS, there is a lack of evidence to indicate that the existence of the programme was as a result of the staging of the London 2012 Games.

Information provided from the Programme Leader in Year 1 of the programme also confirmed that the programme was developed initially without reference to London 2012:

“This is recognised as a good market to target due the nature of a captive audience in the work environment. The programme has not been developed because of London 2012 but we are keen to ensure opportunities and ambitions linked to Inspire Leicestershire are incorporated into the challenge.” (Interview: 10.01.2011)

In Year 2:

“...Because of the success of the 2011 Challenge programme, LRS decided to keep it running, especially, considering that this is the Games’ year, people may get excited about doing more sport and physical activity.....” (Interview: 09.01.2012)

The above conversation suggested that, it is very likely that the 2011 WCP would have gone ahead without the Games; however, the nature of the 2012 WCP was changed to make it more ‘London 2012’ related. One thing which needs to borne in mind is that, even without the Inspire Leicestershire team’s involvement, employees may also behave actively due to the fact that London 2012 was going to take place.

The four key elements of additionality

As indicated in the earlier chapter, the process of identifying the additional impacts generated from the UK hosting the Games is less about a series of quantifications referred to in the additionality formula (see Figure 3.4), and more about acknowledging and operationalising those four key concepts (i.e. leakage, displacement, substitution, multiplier effect) from the observed outcomes (see Table 6.5). Through identifying the four elements of additionality, together with the evidence identified of London 2012’s impact discussed in Section 6.4, the net London 2012 impact on promoting sport and physical activity participation using WCP as a vehicle, can then be assessed to some degree.
Table 6.5 Defining the four key additionality related concepts in the case of WCP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concepts</th>
<th>Key questions</th>
<th>WCP</th>
<th>Finding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leakage</td>
<td>How much have the outputs/outcomes benefited non-target group at the expense of the target group?</td>
<td>Refers to the WCP participants worked in one of the Leicestershire organisations, but residing outside Leicestershire, which means non-Leicestershire had benefited from the programme. It can also refer to that, as the programme was intended to target ‘less active’ adults in the workplace to become active, there is a possibility that in fact a large number of ‘active’ adults benefited from the programme.</td>
<td>WCP demographics(^\text{49}) indicated that majority of participants residing in Leicestershire. There was a leakage in the programme in the sense that, as identified in the interviews, majority impact was reported by a group of people who were already active.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displacement</td>
<td>Whether the intervention reduces existing activity from within the target area?</td>
<td>Refers to the case which LRS displace an existing programme which targets the same area with the WCP.</td>
<td>It was evident from the key stakeholder interviews and document analysis that there was not any similar scheme existed before WCP, targeting encouraging the Leicestershire staff to regularly take part in sport and physical activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substitution</td>
<td>Whether the intervention results in organisations substituting an activity or input for a similar one to take advantage of public funding?</td>
<td>Refers to as the consequences of taking part in the sporting competitions or mini-league provided by WCP, participants substituted other activities that they used do but provided by other health club or local authorities).</td>
<td>Interestingly, it was evident from the qualitative data that some of the workplaces were designing a similar initiative within their organisation, or had already running their own workplace challenge programme. While WCP was taking place, they either linked the two programmes together or stopped their own programme and took part in WCP, simply because WCP was better organised and the mini-leagues between different organisations were more fun. In this respect, the substitution impact did exist in this case, which therefore should be borne in mind when summarising the final impacts of the programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiplier effects</td>
<td>The extent to which direct benefits from an intervention trigger further additional</td>
<td>Refers to, for example, after six months of doing regular exercise, the participants feel happier and healthier, which may results in a decrease in the number of daily patients and therefore saving</td>
<td>The multiplier effect is certainly the case in this pilot study as being evident from the qualitative data that, the message of “it is good for your health and wellbeing if you regularly take part in sport and physical activity” has been spread out by</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| indirect benefits | the running costs for a local hospital; another example may be that, after recognising and experiencing those physical related or mental related benefits as a result of regularly taking part in sport and physical activity via WCP, the participants may start to encourage their friends and family to join the scheme or doing exercise on their own. | participants word of mouth, which therefore encouraged people who is not a full-time employee (e.g. house wife) to start to do exercise. However, in terms of whether WCP would result in a positive impact on cutting the medical expenses, it seems difficult to identify and pinpoint as firstly determining whether any changes had happened can be counted as the result of engaging WCP seems difficult because broader changes and other external factors may have had a stronger influence as well, e.g. having / not having a stable family life (not even mention those reports are highly subject to individual). Secondly, as the WCP programme was carried out in a relatively short period (i.e. two years), those health-related changes probably not be able to recognised as normally it requires a longer period of time of consistently exercising. |
6.7 Realistic evaluation

This section summarises the outcomes achieved in the programme, using the realist evaluation approach, linking what was achieved in each area with the inputs and mechanisms used, in order to draw out what worked, for whom, in what circumstances. In this way, as Pawson and Tilley have suggested, a more complete understanding of how the mechanisms have worked (or not) can be achieved, and there is more potential for generalising lessons from this case study, when seeking to use such mechanisms in similar contexts might be attempted.

The following tables summarise findings from WCP using two matrices of Context-Mechanism-Outcome (CMO) configurations to capture the unique characterises of each implementation. Two CMO configurations draw together the key conclusions across the internal stakeholder interviews and surveys reflecting upon the implementation of the programme to different intensity level of sport and physical activity participation (see CMO1), and different types of participating organisations (see CMO2).

The hypothesis outlined in CMO1 (see Table 6.6) was that participants with different exercise intensity levels (i.e. **Type 1** - people who did not participate in any sport or physical activity at all, **Type 2** - people who participated in sport and physical activity but relatively less often, **Type 3** - People who regularly participate in sport and physical activity) might react to different mechanisms thus generating different outcomes.

For the Type 1 participants, before the launched of WCP, it was presumed that people who were inactive often came from an office-based job background; and London 2012 might inspire them to take part in this programme and start participating in sport. The collected data suggested that, first, a majority of this type of participant lacked awareness of the recommended physical activity level for adults, which as discussed in the earlier section may explain their inactive lifestyle since they may have considered themselves as being ‘active’ already. Secondly, despite limitations in facilities (e.g. lack of showers) in their workplaces, this type of participant acknowledged that the London Games had raised their awareness of the benefits of taking part in sport and physical activity. They also reported that they had already started off participating in some sport and physical activity through taking part in WCP, e.g. via the Cycle/Active Travel Challenge scheme. Among a range of incentives provided by the programme which might motivate participants to do more sport in the future,
provision of vouchers was cited by respondents as the option most likely to be effective in encouraging additional participation. In terms of outcomes, a willingness to participate regularly in sport and physical activity in the future was reported in the survey by this type of participant. In addition, other social impacts, e.g. increasing confidence in the workplace, were also suggested.

Regarding the characteristics of the Type 2 participants, a preference for doing sport and physical activity as an individual was identified. The log section provided by WCP was considered as a motivational tool encouraging them to take part in more sport and physical activity. As a result, an increase of sport and physical activity participation was reported.

Various sporting competitions and the mini-leagues offered by WCP proved to be effective in attracting the Type 3 participants, which may reflect on their competitive nature anyway. Although it was acknowledged by the participants that due to time constraints, their total number of hours of sport and physical activity participation was not able to be increased further, they still indicated that the WCP offered different types of sport and physical activity for them to try, and helped them to sustain existing participation levels.
Table 6.6 CMO\textsubscript{1} for the WCP in terms of different intensity level of sports and physical activities participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contexts</th>
<th>Conjectured</th>
<th>Observed</th>
<th>Mechanisms</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New crew who are willing to take part in sport and physical activity regularly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• General marketing in order to increase the awareness of WCP and the benefits of participating in sport and physical activity</td>
<td>• Moving towards to regularly participation in sport and physical activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The majority work as office – based employees</td>
<td>• Lack of awareness of the recommended physical activity level for adults</td>
<td>• Starting to log their activities on website;</td>
<td>• Increased their confident at the workplace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Inspired by the London Games thus started engaging in the programme</td>
<td>• The publicity surrounding the London Games made them more aware of the benefits of taking part in sport and physical activity</td>
<td>• Participated in the Cycle/Active Travel Challenge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Potential constrain – a lack of shower</td>
<td>• The effective incentives: Vouchers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People who have participated in sport and physical activity but relatively less often (1-3 days a week)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The Log Section motivated them to participate more in sport and physical activity;</td>
<td>• An increase in sport and physical activity participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Be aware of the benefits of participation in sport</td>
<td>• Reported time barriers</td>
<td>• Participated in the Cycle/Active Travel Challenge</td>
<td>• Achieved a sense of achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Have some interests in sport and physical activity</td>
<td>• Normally preferred doing sport and physical activity on their own</td>
<td>= • Improved social networking in the workplace;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Potential constrain – a lack of shower</td>
<td>• Had a chance to try new and different sport and physical activity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People who regularly participate in sport and physical activity (more than 4 days a week)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Engaged in different sporting competitions</td>
<td>• Had a chance to try new and different sport and physical activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• their sport-related job role heavily influence on their decisions to participate in sport</td>
<td>• No more free time had left for doing more sport and physical activity</td>
<td>• Joined the mini-leagues</td>
<td>• Kept them sustain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Strong interests in sport and physical activity</td>
<td>• 2011 WCP was a bit of too long</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Met more colleagues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Be aware of the benefits of participation in sport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Increased social conversation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It was also one of LRS’s intentions, through evaluating WCP, to identify the mechanisms which were effective in a variety of Leicestershire workplaces to take part in future WCP. The nature of the organisation from which the WCP participants came was quite different in terms of, for example various types of organisation (i.e. local authorities, educational institution, Public sector/Sport Organisations, and Private sector/Others).

In terms of different context, features of the four types of organisations are summarised in the CMO\textsubscript{2} configuration (see Table 6.7). For example, it was evident from the quantitative and qualitative data that, as participants from Educational Institutions were normally aware of the benefits of taking part in sport and physical activity, a sport and physical activity programme (such as WCP) thus relatively easily attracted their attention and interest. In addition, their comparatively flexible working hours and convenient facilities had made their participation simpler. In terms of organisations from among the Local Authorities, as LRS maintained a close working relationship with a number of local authorities on a daily basis, it was therefore easier to promote WCP within them, which may explain a relatively higher number signing up from Local authorities in the programme.

In terms of mechanisms, different marketing strategies may have different appeal to different types of organisations. While the two most effective communication channels identified for promoting WCP for all four types of organisations were emails/newsletter and one-to-one direct ‘selling’ by LRS team, a large number of workplaces from Local Authorities and Public sector/Sport Organisations were recruited into the programme because of their previous involvement in the Active Together programme provided by LRS; in particular, for the Private sector/Other participating organisations, LRS proposed attending a meeting at their workplaces to discuss the programme which may have help them to understand it better thus making them more likely to be willing to take part. To further identify what kinds of incentives may increase participation in future programme, the CMO\textsubscript{2} configuration summarises the slightly different preferences for the four types of organisations respectively (see below).

In terms of outcomes, through taking part in WCP, a variety of physical, psychological and social benefits were reported across the four types of organisations (summarised in the following table), with two types of organisations (i.e. Local Authorities and Public sector/Sport Organisations) indicating their interests in participating next year’s programme.
Table 6.7 CMO$_2$ for the WCP in terms of different categories of participated organisations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contexts</th>
<th>Mechanisms</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Authorities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| • Worked closely with LRS on a daily basis; | ● Promoting WCP by the following three main communication channels:  
- LRS team;  
- Active Together Partners;  
- Emails / newsletter  
+ • Often visiting the WCP website (Once or twice a week);  
• The effective incentives:  
- Vouchers  
- Tickets to events/matches  
- Sports equipment  
• Strong management support was viewed as critical | ● Over half of the respondents reported that the level of sports and physical activity participation had increased since taking part in the WCP;  
● Over half of the respondents reported that they felt ‘fitter’ and ‘active’;  
● Looking forward to more sport competitions next year’s WCP; |
| **Educational institutions** | | |
| • Their employees normally have knowledge of the benefits of taking part in sport and PA, and comparatively flexible working hour, with changing and shower facilities in place; | ● Promoting WCP by:  
- LRS team;  
- Emails / newsletter  
+ • Often visiting the WCP website (Once or twice a week);  
• The effective incentives:  
- Sports equipment  
- Tickets to events/matches | ● Over half of the respondents reported that the level of sports and physical activity participation had increased since taking part in the WCP;  
● Over half of the respondents reported that they felt ‘fitter’, had ‘lost weight’, felt ‘more healthy and better’; |
| **Public sector/Sport Organisations** | | |
| • Staff in sport organisations had participated frequently in sports and physical activity before the WCP (4-5days a week);  
• The majority of staff would be interested in receiving training to help become a champion for sport and physical activity at their workplace; | ● Promoting WCP by:  
- LRS team;  
- Active Together Partners;  
- Emails / newsletter  
+ • Sometimes visiting the WCP website (at least once a month);  
• The effective incentives:  
- Money  
- Gym membership/sports activities  
- Tickets to events/matches  
• It had been recognised that having a management team championing employee’s involvement in the WCP would bring out a better result | ● Over half of the respondents reported that they had tried new sports and physical activity since taking part in WCP;  
● The amount of cycling (from and to work, during lunch-times at work, other times during the working day, or for leisure purposes) had increased;  
= ● Over half of the respondents reported that WCP fostered social conversation between work colleagues;  
● Looking for more sport competitions in next year’s WCP;  
● Suggestions for improving the inter workplace competitions include: more sports; events in the evening, creating local leagues |
| **Private sector/Others** | | |
| • The majority had their management team championing employee’s involvement in WCP;  
• The majority of staff would be interested in receiving training to help become a champion for sport and physical activity at their workplace; | ● Promoting WCP by:  
- LRS team;  
- Meetings;  
- Emails / newsletter  
+ • Often visiting the WCP website (Once or twice a week);  
• The effective incentives:  
- Vouchers  
- Sports equipment  
- Gym membership/sports activities | ● Over half of the respondents reported that the level of sports and physical activity participation had increased since taking part in WCP;  
● Over half of the respondents reported that they felt ‘fitter’, more ‘healthy’ and ‘active’;  
● Suggestion for improving the inter workplace competitions was creating local leagues. |
6.8 Conclusion

With reference to the Challenge programme objectives, data collected suggested that the programme had contributed to increasing sport and physical activity participation amongst staff in Leicestershire. The mean increase among the whole of the 2012 participating group was approximately 1.5 more days per week in which 30 minutes of MIPA had taken place. In the meantime, positive psychological and social impacts, for example, ‘I feel better about myself’, ‘I feel less stressed’, ‘the programme helped to foster social conversation’, and ‘meeting new people’, were also claimed by participants. Although the findings regarding work-related performance were not marked, this might be due to a short of period of implementation time so that respondents found it difficult to detect longer term change.

With regard to assessing the London 2012 impact, this programme evaluation proved to be an interesting case since it was not originally badged as a legacy initiative (thus not all the outputs of the programme could be counted as impacts of the Games’). However, the programmes’ objectives and marketing strategy soon evolved into a Games-related format following the commencement of the programme. It was also logical to assume that, during the period when the programme was running, the festival atmosphere around, and media attention to, the Games would have been likely to have raised the level of excitement among participants and thus may have boosted outputs (thus assessing the Games’ additional contribution was critical).

Specifically, although more than half of the survey respondents did not think that the London 2012 Games had a great influence on their decision to participate in the programme, of the respondents who agreed on the London 2012 motivational effect, a statistically significant increase was found in the level of their physical activity participation between pre-programme and post-programme in the 2012 survey analysis; it was also identified that the London 2012 Games had made a positive impact on motivating participants to take part in new sports and leisure activities. Thus it may be inferred that, the motivational factor of the Games could be linked (albeit weakly) to an increase in sport and physical activity participation for those taking part in WCP.

Pawson and Tilley’s Realist Evaluation (1997) has proved particularly useful in turning the research findings into useful policy insight. The use of the framework has supported the understanding of i) how the programme worked in different ways in attracting different
Leicestershire workplaces (identifying the salience of the workplaces’ specific features in explaining different types of response); ii) the different patterns of exercise behaviour identified among the participants who had gained different (or similar) results from taking part in WCP, despite similar mechanisms being applied (although different elements of the mechanisms appeared to different types of participants), because their personal circumstances varied greatly. Through explicitly presenting the factors that served as constraints or enablers via CMOs, further actions can be taken to apply the best suitable mechanisms for implementation in different target group or different context.

More importantly, the sustainability of the Challenge programme was recognised as an important legacy benefit of the Games. Sufficient funding was allocated by LRS to ensure the programme continues in 2013. In addition, following the success of the programme in 2011 and 2012, LRS are working with County Sports Partnership Network to translate the effectiveness and impact of the Workplace Challenge into a national, cross sector programme.
Chapter 7: A Case Study of Children and Young People Legacy: the Get Set Programme

7.1 Introduction

In the East Midlands, a group of local authority Chief Executives and politicians were brought together and set up the East Midland Advisory Group for leveraging London 2012 related activities, with a particular focus on children and young people related impacts across the region in 2009. As a result, a pool of money was gathered from all nine East Midlands local authorities to recruit a Regional Children and Young People (CYP) Coordinator on a five-year contract with responsibility for promoting and delivering London 2012 benefits for children and young people, which proved to be unique to the region, and probably to the nation. In addition to the post, a total of £10,000 of funding was gathered to support the delivering of children and young people activities across the region (from which Leicestershire was allocated £2000 and decided to spend this on hosting of a celebration event: ‘5 Schools, 500 children, 500 days to the Games: what’s in it for me and my school’ in March 2011).

In Leicestershire, the importance of a children and young people legacy was recognised and promoted together with Inspire Leicestershire. In particular, the regional CYP Coordinator worked closely with Inspire Leicestershire on the following five areas:

- promoting greater sport and physical activity;
- increasing the number of children and young people volunteers;
- promoting the Cultural Olympiad amongst children and young people;
- promoting internationalism;
- emphasising a national educational programme (i.e. Get Set).

The Get Set programme was chosen as a case study for evaluating the children and young people impact of the London Games for Leicestershire mainly because it was one of the national major and official educational programmes related to the Games, and had a clear operational strategy in the sub-region and region.
There is a developing trend that organising committees and national governments have attempted to gain some educational added value from the hosting of a mega event. In the context of the Olympics, the quote below taken from the Olympic Charter highlights one of the fundamental principles relating to educational values that the IOC aims to address. It suggests that the history of the Olympic Movement, its values, inspiring stories of the Games and its athletes are worth sharing with students (IOC Olympic Games Executive Director Felli, 2010).

Olympism is a philosophy of life, exalting and combining in a balanced whole the qualities of body, will and mind. Blending sport with culture and education, Olympism seeks to create a way of life based on the joy of effort, the educational value of good example, social responsibility and respect for universal fundamental ethical principles. ----Olympic Charter (p.10)

The educational benefits are generally derived through the activities delivered as part of structured educational programmes/initiatives. There is some evidence from the wider literature to indicate the links between physical activity participation and educational outcomes but which were subject to criticism due to methodological issues (CASE, 2010). A literature review of the culture, arts and sport policy, conducted by the Scottish Executive Education Department summarises possible improved educational outcomes of cultural and sport activity participation (2004). Specifically, a curriculum-based and after-school-club physical activity programme in primary schools resulted in more than 80% of children being more physically active.

However, there is still a lack of consistent evaluation of the impact of the Olympics on educational legacy. Therefore, this case study aimed to capture and evaluate educational related benefits in a specific context generated by the London 2012 Games through the Get Set programme.

The Get Set programme: the national and Leicestershire context

Get Set was the official London 2012 educational programme, run by LOCOG and working in partnership with the Department of Education and other key national education providers and Olympics Sponsors, which provided an online library of a whole range of interactive learning resources across the curriculum designed to get schools and colleges to learn about the Olympic and Paralympic values and the London 2012 Games. It aimed to inspire children and young people through the excitement and values of the Olympic and Paralympic Games engaging them in learning.
The Get Set programme was launched in September 2008, immediately after the Beijing 2008 Games, targeting 3-19 year old children and young people. It aimed to enhance teaching and learning by helping teachers to link learning to the 2012 Olympic Games and Olympic and Paralympic values.

The Get Set Network (GSN) was the London 2012 reward and recognition scheme for the active Get Set schools and colleges that were demonstrating a commitment to the Olympic and Paralympic values. Members of the network gained the right to use the London 2012 education logo, gained a plaque and certificate of their achievement, and were given priority access to the most exclusive prizes and opportunities (e.g. visits from athletes, Olympic Park tour, 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games tickets).

Among those programmes, well-known examples included a sport related programme - the ‘Lloyds TSB National School Sport Week’, which involved UK schools using the London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games and the values to engage their pupils and communities in a week celebrating achievements in sport and physical activity; and a non-sport related programme - ‘Have You Got What It Takes’ - which requested students to work in teams to research, prepare and then present their bid to host a pre-Games training camp in their fictional sports facility.

**Leicestershire**

In Leicestershire, driven by the regional CYP coordinator who worked closely with partners in Leicester and Leicestershire local authorities, LRS, School Sports Partnerships, the LeicesterShire 2012 Steering Group, and national governing bodies, a strategic plan of how to engage Leicestershire children and young people to Get Set, together with detailed deliverables, were articulated at the beginning of the programme (see Table 7.1), achieving leading KPIs (see Table 7.2).
Table 7.1 Leicestershire Get Set strategic plans and results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aims</th>
<th>Major actions</th>
<th>Headline achievements (Nov, 2012)50</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• To increase the number of schools and colleges registered on the</td>
<td>• Conference: ‘London 2012: What’s in it for me and my school’ at Loughborough University’ (Nov</td>
<td>• 91.5% of Leicester schools registered for the Get Set programme;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get Set programme and those are members of GSN in Leicester and</td>
<td>2009);</td>
<td>• 90.2% of county schools registered for the Get Set programme, compared with 88% of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leicestershire;</td>
<td>• Marketing promotion (website, monthly updates, meetings and presentations with local</td>
<td>regional schools;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To support schools and colleges delivering Get Set programme</td>
<td>partnership, media interviews)</td>
<td>• 81.5% of Leicester schools were members of GSN;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>activities in their schools;</td>
<td>• School visits (both to the schools which haven’t registered on Get Set, and GSN schools)</td>
<td>• 78.1% of county schools were members of GSN, compared with 69.3% of the regional schools;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To use the Get Set programme to maximise children and young</td>
<td>• Presenting Get Set awards and giving speeches at local authorities and schools events;</td>
<td>• 8 Leicestershire schools51 were represented at the Games Opening Ceremony as they had</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>people’s awareness of and engagement with the London 2012 Games;</td>
<td>• A number of Inspire Mark projects were promoted and sometimes delivered together to schools</td>
<td>received funding from ‘Plan Your 2012’, from a total of 21 East Midlands schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To use the Games to enhance learning opportunities for young</td>
<td>and colleges to achieve better outcomes (e.g. Musubi project, EM-powered, Big Dance project);</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>people within existing educational priorities;</td>
<td>• Celebration event: ‘5 Schools, 500 children, 500 days to the Games: what’s in it for me and my</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To create a network of schools and colleges living their</td>
<td>school?’ (March 2011)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>commitment to the Olympic and Paralympic Values;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To support children and young people in the development of their</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leadership, personal, thinking and life skills.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At national level, the latest evaluation of the programme conducted by Nielsen indicated that, there were around 85.4% of schools registered in Get Set (June 2012); and 20,471 schools (66.4%) were awarded network status across the UK (LOCOG, Oct 2012). At the sub-regional level, there were 90.5% of Leicestershire schools registered in the programme; and in terms of the total percentage of schools and colleges in the GSN, Leicestershire had 78.4% of take-up. These two figures suggested that Leicestershire ranked in the top position within the region, and was well above both regional and national statistic, while the East Midlands retained 5th place amongst Nations and Regions.

---

50 Figures provided by Regional CYP Coordinator.
Table 7.2 A comparison of the key performance indicators of Get Set in the region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Eligible Establishments</th>
<th>Registered</th>
<th>% (Ranking Position)</th>
<th>Applied to Get Set</th>
<th>% (Ranking Position)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Derby</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>90.5%</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>69.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derbyshire</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>89.0% (3)</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>69.8% (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leicester</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>91.5%</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>81.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leicestershire</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>90.5% (2)</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>78.4% (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincolnshire</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>82.5% (6)</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>64.8% (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northamptonshire</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>91.6% (1)</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>67.6% (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nottingham</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>89.4%</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>69.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nottinghamshire</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>86.1% (4)</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>63.5% (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutland</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>84.6% (5)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>69.2% (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,302</td>
<td>2,030</td>
<td>88.2%</td>
<td>1,596</td>
<td>69.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: provided by Regional CYP Coordinator

7.2 Evaluation framework: methods and measures

This evaluation focused on examining the extent to which Get Set had any impacts on, for example, educational attainment and students’ behaviour in schools, and identifying the implication of learning the Olympic and Paralympic values to children and young people. It attempted, by identifying the underlying factors which led to a divergence of the level of engagement with the Get Set programme between schools, to inform stakeholders and practitioners that different strategies would need to be effectively implemented.

The evaluation contained qualitative research with students and teachers at Leicestershire Get Set schools and regional operational practitioners. A comparison was made between aggregate changes in relevant outcomes between non-registered, registered, and more engaged schools in Get Set to explore any correlation between improvement and legacy activities, and identify any potential factors that constrained schools from engaging more with Get Set.

There were three aspects to the research which involved:

- An initial interview with the regional CYP coordinator, to discuss the proposed method, to clarify the policy issues and to agree key measures;
- Two exploratory interviews with the regional CYP coordinator and a Get Set volunteer ambassador respectively, to gain a better understanding of what was happening at school level, and their perspective of the Get Set programme; to identify the case study targets and who the appropriate respondents from each case study school were;
After developing the interview questions for the case study schools, there were a total of four case study schools, comprising seven interviews with teachers and one group interview with students.

The sample pool initially included a mixed of primary schools and secondary/high schools, representing four types of schools\textsuperscript{52}, i.e. 1) schools who were proved to be the first-generation of Get Set schools in the county, 2) schools who were more committed to the programme, 3) schools who were less committed to the programme, and 4) the ones who did not register on Get Set. The research strategy was thus designed: for primary school case studies, interviews were conducted with the Head Teacher and another teacher who had been heavily involved with Get Set activities in the school (normally a PE teacher); for secondary schools, interviews were carried out with one teacher who was leading Get Set activities, and two students who engaged with Get Set.

However, it was evident that schools who did not register on Get Set appeared less willingly to participate in the research, and thus it became difficult to obtain data for these cases. Other constraints and concerns on data collection also emerged especially in relation to time and resources. As a result, there were a total of four case studies that were completed for this evaluation between June and July 2012 (see Figure 7.1).

\textsuperscript{52} Regional CYP Coordinator provided guidance on categorising the interview schools in terms of the levels of engagement and participation in Get Set, judging by the length and quantity of their Get Set involvement.
The case studies presented here demonstrated how individual primary and secondary schools from Leicestershire had engaged with the programme. The four case studies offered a comparison of the level of engagement with the Get Set programme. They clearly presented the variety and depth of the educational activities that have been inspired by Get Set, and the range of approaches that schools have taken to deliver.

The main aims of this case study were set up to identify:

- the extent to which schools and colleges were utilising the Get Set programme and the Olympic and Paralympic Values both inside and outside of curriculum time;
- the extent to which schools and colleges utilised the programme in order to encourage a greater interest and uptake of sport;
- the challenges that schools and colleges faced in using the programme in their school strategy;
- what impact the values had on students and schools;
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- the extent to which the 2012 Games had positively impacted on school attendance as well as educational attainment;
- the extent to which these activities would be sustained.

All interviews were digitally recorded and interviewees were informed that they would not be identified when quoted. The transcripts of the interviews were subject to repeated readings, and a thematic content analysis was developed\(^\text{53}\).

### 7.3 Analysis of the qualitative data

This section provides a structured account of each case study, with a basic description of individual schools, the kinds of Get Set activities delivered in the schools, reasons for their participation in the programme, the nature of teachers’ and students’ responses to the programme, and the impact of the London 2012 and the Olympic and Paralympic values.

#### 7.3.1 Case study 1: a school registered at a very early stage

This school was a large secondary school, with specialist sports college status (with a strength in rugby and football) serving more than 1300 students, aged 14-19. It joined Get Set in 2009 and was identified as the first secondary school in Leicestershire to receive the Get Set Network status, with over three years’ involvement in the programme.

As a reflection of the work they have undertaken in promoting the values associated with the Olympics and Paralympics, the school was granted the ‘Plan Your 2012’ fund (which only another seven Leicestershire schools received).

The interviews were conducted with the Head of PE, and two students (Young Ambassadors for sport at school).

---

\(^{53}\) The analysis was undertaken employing Nvivo software for qualitative data analysis.
Table 7.3 Case study sample profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of School</th>
<th>Secondary</th>
<th>Number of students</th>
<th>1313</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% minority ethnic</td>
<td>Less than 5%</td>
<td>% of students on Free School Meals</td>
<td>Less than 5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get Set journey began</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Get Set activities were delivered</td>
<td>Outside of curriculum time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Event involvement
- Young Ambassadors Programme

Other events or activities linked to the Olympic and Paralympic Games
- Assemblies to promote the Olympic and Paralympic values
- Olympic-themed school sport day or event
- ‘Mini-Olympic’ style games
- A trip to Olympic Park
- Athletes visiting school
- Meeting the mascot
- Sports Day related to Olympic and Paralympic Games
- Paralympic Week
- Events related to Olympic Values (e.g. Lock-in)

Reasons for joining Get Set

As sport was seen as one of the strengths of the school, the Head of PE indicated that the school wanted to be at the forefront of London 2012, and was one of the first 50 schools to become a Get Set network member across the UK. The uniqueness and impact of the London 2012 Games were highly recognised by the teacher, who wanted his students to experience the Games and get involved in it.

“It is a cliché to say, that 2012 Olympics is a once-in-a-life time opportunity. It is good to be involved in it as it is not going to come to here again. As a PE teacher my job is to be an advocator for physical activity and PE and sport, so therefore, from our point of view, we should promote the biggest sporting event in the world. Therefore it just seems as an obvious thing we should do, to engage students with it. Also the Olympic Games is a very important thing to learn, and Get Set is a resource, which has been excellent in terms of sending useful information in support of our teaching - excellent!” (PE teacher)

The London 2012 Games were also seen by the school as a special event which cannot be missed.

“My school has very strong interest in being involved with London 2012. We certainly did not do these sorts of things for the World Cup, or Euro Champion.” (PE teacher)

Delivered Get Set activities

This school has undertaken a range of activities as a result of its engagement with Get Set. Assemblies were delivered to all students surrounding the values which were continually promoted in PE.
The school specifically wanted to promote the Paralympics as well. They hosted a Paralympian as a guest speaker, enabling students to learn more about the Paralympics and its values. In particular, an event related to the Paralympics, called the ‘Paralympics week’, was also organised that gave students a chance to try Paralympic sports such as wheelchair basketball, sitting volleyball and goalball.

“We really wanted to focus on the Paralympics, so we had speakers to come in, from a Paralympic athlete. We do activities (that) they would not normally access. So the wheelchair basketball, sitting basketball, which we never heard of in our school and certainly they don't have a chance to play...to give students that opportunity.” (PE teacher)

Inspired by the London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games, a Mini-Olympic style competition was organised annually which involved several local schools and was led by the school’s young leaders. Last year’s Mini-Olympics had over 400 primary schools students taking part in different Olympic style activities throughout the day, including netball, football, tennis, and long jump, and so on. Each primary school represented an Olympic nation and took part in a parade as part of the opening ceremony which included a display from the school’s cheerleaders.

In particular, the school also gained a visit from the official Paralympic mascot, Mandeville, which lit up students’ excitement about the Games.

“Last year, we had mini-Olympics. That’s when the big mascot, Mandeville, came....We got it! Mandeville helped us to warm up, which the kids absolutely loved.” (Student)

Another annual charity event ‘Lock in’ (a 24 hour sponsored sport event) was specially tailored to the Olympics for the last couple of years to promote the Olympic and Paralympic sports and values. The latest event attracted more than 150 students from all year groups to participate in over 15 activities (football, dodgeball, hockey, netball, badminton, skipping, volleyball, goalball, etc.) throughout the 24 hours, raising money for local charity and future sporting events at the school. Especially, at the start of the event, students paraded with team banners and displayed Olympic and Paralympics themed cakes which they had baked.

“There were about 150 students. We stayed for 24 hours. We played sport like badminton, skipping, netball, basketball. Literally, every sport you can imagine was included within those 24 hours. Then, throughout that week, we try to encourage Olympic values there, so e.g. the respect, we are the officials, we respect them, the determination keeps going, if it is like 3 o’ clock in the morning, if it is like doing for charity. More Olympic values like encouraging you keep going, friendship” (Student)
The partnership working between this school and other neighbour schools was improved as a result of a series of sports events inspired by London 2012. Its Sport Ambassadors were regularly deployed to host family schools’ events for up to 14 primary schools including the mini Olympics and various sports tournaments (e.g. key stage 1 Multi skills festivals, netball).

**The impact of Get Set on the school and students**

The profile of the school has been improved since Get Set, with its sporting achievements and successful Sports Ambassador programme being more widely recognised in the local community and sport partnership. The media were attracted by the school’s activity, which helped to raise the awareness of the work that this school and students did.

“Definitely raise the profile in sport partnership, in County Sport Partnerships; and definitely raise the profile in event national meetings. I mean, for planning of the 2012, there were only 40 schools across the country were invited to go down to London by the Olympic Park for a meeting about it.” (PE teacher)

“That (Mini-Olympics) attracted also media’s interests. So we have photographer, radio. That, I think, helped sort of bring spotlight to our school.” (Student)

The Get Set and Olympics Games were also recognised by the PE teacher as a useful teaching vehicle for promoting different values, not only just for promoting sporting performance, but other roles.

“I think there were different roles in sports. Often, when I was a kid, things about sport was always aiming for performing, playing in sport. I think one of the good things, well many good things... one major thing has been promoted is the different roles you can get involved. So people say, actually I can get involved in sport from different ways, leadership, things like that. I think the GS programme would like to send a message to students that, you know, it is not always about winning; there are other things can be taken for consideration. Also, there are different opportunities to be able to allow participation, different sport for students to try.” (PE teacher)

In terms of Get Set’s impacts on their students, the most noticeable benefits gained by the students from being involved with the Get Set activities were leadership and communication skills, in particular for those Sports Ambassadors. For example, one of the Sports Ambassadors was selected as Olympic Torch Bearer because of her commitment to the leadership programme and volunteering work. In addition, it also helped with boosting students’ confidence; other benefits, e.g. the personal development and career development were also reported from the interviewees.
“Definitely, I mean in terms of things like the team working skills, the cooperation, communication, just generally personal development. Some of our ambassadors are great examples. One of our students is going to carry the torch. She is the official Olympic Torch Bearer. Our own ambassador who left last year, came back to see me yesterday who did a loads of student-led activities. Really really good. She is going to help the VIP at the marathon at the Athletic centre. She actually will be dealing with the medal awarding ceremony. I think that indicates the whole stuff they got out from the programme. They did loads of presentations at the county hall…. things like that, students have got fantastic experiences, particularly, the girl I just mentioned, would not be doing these things if she did not have the experiences that she had, like, speaking to Olympians and politicians, receiving rewards,…those sort of things.” (PE teacher)

“Definitely it improves my skill of how to talk to different people. One minute your talking to a professional in a meeting, and next minute you got four year olds surrounding you, you got to be so happy so loud just to help them to switch on. I definitely learned how to be dedicated. Because I did struggle with that....” (Student)

“Confidence is a big one. Like at the start of the year, I wasn't confident of talking to a big group of people, and we had an athlete visit, we have to do talks to a room of people. We also have been to the County Hall. We just have been grown I think.” (Student)

### 7.3.2 Case study 2: a more engaged school

This case school was a community primary school, with over 340 students (aged 3 -11) of which around a quarter of pupils came from ‘struggling’ families (that received Free School Meals), and more than 10% of pupils were of the category non-White British.

The school joined the Get Set programme in early 2011, led by a passionate head teacher who was a true advocate of everything to do with PE and sport. Their enthusiastic engagement with the programme was recognised and rewarded, for instance through free Olympic Games tickets and representing Get Set schools at local 2012 events.

The interviews were conducted with the Head teacher and a PE teacher.

**Table 7.4 Case study sample profile**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of School</th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Number of students</th>
<th>344</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% minority ethnic</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>% of students on Free School Meals</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get Set journey began</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Get Set activities were delivered</td>
<td>Inside and Outside of curriculum time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event involvement</td>
<td>UK School Games (launch event at Downing Street, London) Lloyds TSB National School Sports Week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other events or activities linked to the Olympic and Paralympic Games</td>
<td>Assemblies to promote the Olympic and Paralympic values Get Set to make your mascot; Meeting the mascot World Sports Day Inter-school competitions Curricular activities related to the Olympics and its Values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Reasons for joining Get Set

Similar to the previous school, London 2012 was regarded as a once-in-a-life time opportunity for pupils at this school, and Get Set was considered to have the potential to offer different elements as a consequence of the Games, not only sport related. Therefore, the school decided to be part of GSN.

“Because well, it is a once in the lifetime opportunity really for them, and I am really into sport. I have done sports throughout my life. So you just don't want them to miss out. There are some other sports that I personally haven't engaged with at all, and it is such a shame.

It is not just the one off event; by passing the Olympics.... we need all the children in my care, to get something out of it, to take it on to other opportunities. Not necessarily sport, but from it. Not everyone likes sport, we got the dancers, singers, it is the whole cultural aspects of it as well. So it leaves us with something. After all the flurry of it, there is something left at the end.” (Head teacher)

It is perhaps worth mentioning that the Head teacher who was interviewed for this study was appointed only 18 months previously. It was after her appointment that the school registered on Get Set, which reflects the point made in Section 7.6 regarding a decision-maker’s personal influence on whether not or the school should sign-up for Get Set.

“I registered this school about 18 months?! When I came, it was probably about 18 months ago. The school I worked before, when I worked there, I registered as soon as the programme started; I forget how long ago it was.” (Head teacher)

“This is just because it is Olympic year, and we got a new head. So she does things differently. That last head wasn’t like this head.” (PE teacher)

Delivered Get Set activities

The Olympic and Paralympic Values reached across the whole curriculum and after school clubs, and built on an existing educational programme (called SEAL). The resource and information offered by Get Set helped to consolidate their activities (relating to science, cultural, and sport lessons). For instance, each year group adopted a country to support and learned about the country’s flag, culture and well-known athletes for a whole week.

All year groups made extensive use of the Get Set resources, for example, using the films in their curricular activities and school’s assembly. Pupils also entered ‘Get Set to make your mascot’ competition’ and won a visit from the Mascot.

The school developed the sports on offer, and gave students the chance to take part in various new Olympic and Paralympic sports (e.g. trampolining, wheelchair basketball, and
archery). The example given below was an after school club that was redesigned to embrace the Olympic and Paralympic values.

“In my club, what we have done this year was, the students divided themselves into 4 equal team and they choose an Olympic country to represent. We got Team GB, Team USA, Team Brazil, Team Jamaica... They have been competing against each other, at various team games, e.g. hockey, dodgeball, what they do was they get so many points from a win, but they also get points for good sportsmanship, kindness, they get points when that’s been shown within a team. So when you see good sportsmanship happen, they might get another point on that. That’s been accumulating since September. It really creates a good atmosphere. We also take away points for bad sportsmanship.” (PE teacher)

The impact of Get Set on the school and students

Get Set’s resources were considered by teachers to be helpful, and provided good teaching materials.

“Err, being able to have something to access, you know, all the information, all the different events have been organised. It has been a good back up, a good source of information to get them all together sorted.” (PE teacher)

Involvement with GS activities proved to be helpful in terms of bringing school staff together, creating links with other schools in the community, benefiting from utilising other schools’ facilities and equipment.

“Well, it has got the whole community involved. It’s got all the staff involved, even those who aren’t sporty. It has given them an opportunity as well to get involved. I hope it helped us to set up the ethos for school. I have tried to set up, since I have been here, tried to get this ethos of community, all working together, you know, respect to each other. Really, what I have said to the children, the values of Olympics and Paralympics are the exact values that we want to reflect it to elsewhere. It’s ideal to promote... that’s certainly had an impact, and then they will remember.” (Head teacher)

“It (Get Set) certainly helped with building up inter-schools links. We have done lots of inter-school links. You know, it has been good for the school, for the children, and for the whole community. Because we have linked with other schools through it, we had inter-schools cross county races... just a friendly thing. There is another primary school, just up there. We raced against them, they came here, and we have gone there. There is another school further down. We have done the same thing. There is a new college, a secondary school. They have come in to help out, and done lots of little bits here and there. We often go up there to do trampolining, using their facilities, because they have got fantastic facilities. So we all worked as one” (PE teacher)

Regarding impacts on pupils, teachers reported that participation and engagement with after school clubs were improved. In addition, the kinds of sport activity offered by the
After School Clubs were increased - not limited to ‘traditional’ sport, e.g. football, but something **new and different**.

“**You know, they never get that opportunity in a primary school, so they had a wide range of opportunities in that, we got wheelchair basketball this afternoon, and other Paralympic sports coming for them to try, it makes them more confident in their own abilities, because they can find something, it is not just football. Obviously, it tends to be in primary schools, because it is easy. And if you don’t like football, well, you don’t get the chance. So you know, we got athletics, swimming, you know, Paralympic sports, they might be good at, it is just to open it up for them, really.”** (Head teacher)

Learning about different countries was seen as **broadening pupils’ horizons**, igniting their **excitement around the Games**, and bringing the Olympics to life which hopefully would leave a **lasting memory**.

“**Well, they have learned lots about different countries. All the sorts of how the Olympic works; learned about the Paralympic games, which I personally certainly hadn’t known. So there is lots of stuff which you weren’t necessarily needed to know or want to know. But when you do, that’s really interesting; and helps you to understand other people, what other people are doing in the world.”** (Head teacher)

“**I mean learning about knowledge of different countries, and physically taking part in things as well. And it gets everyone a chance, not just the sporty ones, it gets the whole school, everybody a chance, from 3 year olds to 11 year olds, from the able, to the not so able. Nobody has been excluded. It has been the whole...”** (PE teacher)

The impact of learning the Olympic and Paralympic values proved to be positive, with a clear change of **pupil’s attitudes towards each other and teachers**.

“**We were very much into trying to get these ideas of respect for each other, fairness, friendship, all that kind of things going through a year. It brings all these kind of things, and I would say that the attitudes that children towards each other, towards staff has changed because of that.”** (Head teacher)

“**Anybody and everybody can take part. Anything is achievable. It is good to have fun, it is good to be friendly, and it is good to get along well with everyone ... the ability goes long way. There has been approved on that, that's definitely, that is...showing determination, pulling together and stuff like that”** (PE teacher)

**7.3.3 Case study 3: a more engaged school**

This case school was a primary school with strong sport interest and benefiting from its outdoor sports area and sporting facilities, and working within the local Schools Sports
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Partnership. It joined Get Set over 18 months previously (at the time of interview), and has actively engaged ever since.

The interviews were conducted with the Head teacher and a teacher.

Table 7.5 Case study sample profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of School</th>
<th>Number of students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>575</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% minority ethnic</th>
<th>% of students on Free School Meals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.2 %</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Get Set journey began</th>
<th>Get Set activities were delivered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Inside and Outside of curriculum time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Event involvement**

- Local Inspire Mark Projects
- UK School Games
- Lloyds TSB National School Sports Week

**Other events or activities linked to the Olympic and Paralympic Games**

- Assemblies to promote the Olympic and Paralympic values
- World Sports Day
- Inter-school Torch Relay
- Athletes visiting school
- Sports Day related to Olympic and Paralympic Games
- Curricular activities related to the Olympics and its Values

Reasons for joining Get Set

This school usually engaged with on-going big-events, and tried to bring various learning aspects to their pupils. Understandably, the scale and recognition of the Olympics attracted this school’s attention and consequently they wanted to be part of the programme. Having recognised that Get Set offered a wide range of learning resources and assisted school inclusion, the Head aimed to raise the awareness of the event among the pupils.

“Oh yes, we always want to do something about the Olympics. We do that for big events anyway. So we did for the Jubilee, we did it for the World Cup football. So we tend to, because it's all really in the children's mind, so we tend to adopt it and use it for research.” (A teacher)

“I think one of the main things actually was getting children and staff inspired by the Olympic and Paralympic Games, because it is such a massive opportunity for people who live in this country to join and to experience a world-wide event. What we really want to do is to make sure children have the best experiences and also a good understanding of the Games. Because for the age that we teach, the Olympic Games actually don't mean that much, they won't remember their last games…..So it is really... we thought it as a means to try to raise the profile of the Olympic and Paralympic Games. For all children and staff just try to get everybody on board.” (Head teacher)

---

54 Although Schools Sports Partnership was terminated generally across the UK, funding to sustain SSP in the school’s area was secured by local authorities.
Delivered Get Set activities

As a recognition of its active involvement with Get Set, this school won an ‘Olympic Park Visit’, which lifted enthusiasm for London 2012, and thus the activities started to build themselves within the school. A main example of Get Set activities delivered in the school was that, each year group adopted a country to support and learn about.

Activities inspired by Get Set and London 2012 and delivered in this school included promoting the values in assemblies for a seven week period, participating in School Sports Week and organising Olympic style Sports Day. Many other local Inspire Mark programmes were adopted to meet the school’s particular needs, e.g. Patchwork Pledge (targeting non-sporting students), and Big Dance (targeting non-sporting students, girls in particular).

The school placed the Olympic and Paralympic values at the core of its daily life. The values were embedded in all parts of the school to inspire pupils’ learning, in areas as diverse as geography, research elements, cultural activities and PE. In addition, a ‘sticker’ awarding system linked to these values was introduced in schools.

A wider range of sports were on offer (Paralympic in particular) to students and staff both in lunch time clubs and after school clubs, aiming to improve sport participation. For instance, under the help of the apprentice sport coach, all school staff were trained in Boccia, and they introduced it to the students. An all-school competition (Teachers Team VS Students Team) was also organised.

The impact of Get Set on the school and students

The Head Teacher was very proactive about the Olympics, aiming to raise the profile of the Olympic and Paralympic Games, and to get everybody (both students and teachers) on board. Subsequently, through teaching the values and engaging with Get Set, it was evident that not only teachers’ interest in the Games increased, for example around 40-50 members of the staff went down to see the Olympic Park during the Easter holiday; but also they were more engaged with team sport events, such as Boccia, which helped to build positive friendships and a strong sense of community across the school.
Comments from the teachers regarding Get Set were generally positive in which Get Set provided **good learning resources** that could be pulled out from the website.

In general, the impact on the students at the school was significant and wide-ranging. For instance, learning about the values produced noticeable improvements in **social behaviour** (e.g. increasing self-esteem, showing respect to teachers and students).

“I do think they (i.e. the values) are good values to help to talk to all the children about. It is very inclusive.....because through sports, we can include everybody, whereas academically you get children who are really high flyers, and children who struggle. For sport, everybody can do something. They often, for those who struggle academically they can achieve something through sport, it does build up their self-esteem. Let them feel that they can be good at something.” (Head teacher)

“I think, things like the older ones supporting younger ones. Yes, in many ways, it has brought schools together as a community. And you saw that when we had things like the opening ceremony and closing ceremony, for example in the closing ceremony every child and every class received a medal, but it was lovely to see the ways that older ones were cheering the younger ones. Because in a school like this size, sometimes, the 4 year olds and the 11 year olds don't mix that much. So it was really nice to see that happening.” (A teacher)

In addition, the positive effect on **sport participation** (both evidenced by the after school club and the lunchtime club) was significant.

“Yes, the number of children attending the after school clubs has increased. There is not just the after school; there were the lunch time clubs as well. The number of lunch time clubs has been increased.” (Head teacher)

In particular, in order to motivate girls’ engagement with sport, the school introduced a 'single gender after school club', offering a relatively more ‘fair’ environment.

“Our attendance at the after school clubs has been up. One thing is that... as an example... this year we introduced a 'single gender class'. Giving you an example, we had a football club which has about 60 children go in each week, but which only has one a girl. So a PE teacher went to interview the other girls, basically they were saying we don't want to play with the boys. Hehe, understandably, so the PE teacher said girls' football club which was full within a week and for the first time ever we had girls' football team, and you know, there was a girl I was talking to her mother just back in March, who said to me she would never ever play football, she hates the games, she was in our football club yesterday. Hehe, you know things like that where we really developed.” (Head teacher)
7.3.4 Case study 4: a less engaged school

This case school was a small primary school in Leicestershire, with around 200 students, of which 39% received Free School Meals and more than 9% were non-White British.

The school was relatively new to the GSN. By using Get Set’s resources, several topics related to the Olympics were delivered across the school in the 2012 summer term.

The interviews were conducted with the Head teacher and a PE teacher.

Table 7.6 Case study sample profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of School</th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Number of students</th>
<th>200</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% minority ethnic</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>% of students on Free School Meals</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get Set journey began</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Get Set activities were delivered</td>
<td>Inside and Outside of curriculum time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other events or activities linked to the Olympic and Paralympic Games</td>
<td>Assemblies to promote the Olympic and Paralympic values</td>
<td>Athletes visiting school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sports Day related to Olympic and Paralympic Games</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Curricular activities related to the Olympics and its Values</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reasons for joining Get Set

The school believed that the London 2012 Games were an exciting opportunity of which its students ought to take full advantage. The Get Set programme appeared to offer a way of broadening horizons and subjects across the curriculum, helping the children to increase their overall awareness and knowledge of what the Olympics and Paralympics and their values represent. In addition, it was hoped to use the values to stimulate not only sport improvement but also other academic achievements.

“Firstly, it is for the children. You know, we think, for the children...giving them the information....Cause our children probably wouldn't do a lot with their parents at home. So we are the main people to give them the things about the Olympics. So it was mainly for the children. And then, throughout our teaching, that's how we are going to do it. So there are resources on there (Get Set website), we knew that everything that's goanna help us is on there, just to get it across to the children.” (PE teacher)

“Olympics 2012 in London is obviously a huge event and we could not not be part of it. The Get Set Network enabled us to work to a common theme across the school. We want all the children to learn about the values that are inherent in sport and competition and this was a good opportunity to do that.” (Head teacher)
Delivered Get Set activities

Inspired by London 2012 and drawing on the resources and activities accessed through Get Set, this case study school has led several **curriculum innovations** in the subjects of maths, geography, and physical literacy. For example, a whole term of the ‘Olympic Relay Story’ enabled students to collaborate different themes related to the Olympics (e.g. imagining they were torch bearer on the day) into their writing and research.

Work on the values was also consolidated **through regular assembly and classroom activities**, in which Olympic related videos were played, exploring and demonstrating each of the values and how they relate to students’ life, organising the Olympic torch, athletes’ uniforms, and medal design competitions.

Outside of the curriculum, Get Set related activities included an **Olympic theme Sports Day** and **Olympic related football tournament**, and **inviting athletes to visit** etc.

> “We have done lots of activities...... using the Olympics to improve physical literacy, to improve maths, to improve all subjects, really. So using that stimulus....because of the London Olympics are here, the children are excited about that, using that to improve all areas of the curriculum of the children. Just letting them know about what the Olympics are, just giving their chance to, you know, get them to know what are the Olympics and Paralympic, what's involved in and what is the country doing that for, just bring in every subjects, geography, history, all those kinds, in one. ” (PE teacher)

The impact of Get Set on the school and students

Teachers reported that they enjoyed the opportunity offered through Get Set. They tried to be creative about London 2012 and to embrace different learning aspects which fitted easily into the curriculum.

> “Even if you just use it as a resource bank of ideas and things, yes.... we as a school have enjoyed using it” (PE teacher)

The respondents also indicated that Get Set videos were useful materials to assist teaching and to help children to understand the Games.

> “I really like the fact that videos are useful, you know, you can explain something, but actually having that video just pop on, and show, straight away there, pictures and things, so like that kind of practical resources, which has been really useful.” (PE teacher)
In terms of the impacts of the Get Set programme on the students, teachers reported that as a result of their involvement with Get Set, particularly the learning of those values, students were more confident and skill rounded, and understood the meanings of those values and could apply those to daily life.

“'All our children now value the Olympics and know what it means to achieve something in life.'” (Head teacher)

“I think the Olympic Values have the most impact on the children. They really have gone into their heads. The majority of the children would have known all the Olympic Values and Paralympic Values. And I think, because we spent time to link those to our lives - what's it like in our school? Not just sport... They understand what they mean. They could explain what they mean. And then it has helped people, definitely, socially. So they know, we don't give up; we encourage people; we keep going is because we are not going to lose, even we are not going to win, but it doesn't matter, we keep going.

As an example, in our Sports Day this year, one of our Year 5 boys fell during a race. Another boy from the same class stopped running and went to pick him up instead. You know, it is like you talking about the values, then say...cause they watched the videos, one of the mascots does that, stops and goes back to help the others. It is just really nice. So they see a little bit and then they do. I mean, I think they did think initially it is just sports, and when they see the other things, friends, and other bits going on.

I think they are more rounded. They are more confident, they all accept that we are not all going to be brilliants runners, or brilliant swimmers, you know, but we are all good at something, and then seeing that in each other, yes, they don't worry. They don't worry if they don't win something.” (PE teacher)

The school’s determination to encourage sporting participation and school inclusion was effective in motivating so-called ‘harder to reach pupils’. Specifically, the school created a unique After School Club, especially for pupils who were not sporty or struggled with sport competition, aiming to motivate this particular group of children participating in sport. Subsequently, teachers observed a steady take-up throughout the term, improved behaviour and self-esteem among pupils.

“I mean we have run a club for children who are less confident and less sporty, normally not attenders. We had it this term at school. Normally children at our school started a club, say we have 20 students at the club, and then by week 4, you down to about half. With this one, where we target at the children who are less confident and not likely skilled, the attendance figure has been really high. They want to carry on, which is very nice.” (PE teacher)
7.4 An analytic logic model of the programme

An illustrative logic model for Leicestershire Get Set programme is provided in Table 7.7. It presents how inputs relate to activities, outputs and final outcomes expected to be delivered by the programme. This logic model was developed before the evaluation of the programme, by consulting with the regional CYP coordinator and reviewing reports and marketing materials related to Get Set.

The key assumptions and programme theories were then subject to evaluation through data collection and analysis. Findings include:

1. One of the main rationales for taking part in Get Set reported by teachers was that they wanted their school to be part of the Games, and Get Set provided an opportunity to engage pupils and teachers;
2. The design of Get Set, and a series activities and events that the programme offered, received overall positive feedback from all of the interview schools, in terms of providing a wide range of teaching materials and opportunities to engage students and teachers;
3. It was evident from the interviews that the commitment and dedication offered by the programme staff (such as the regional CYP coordinator and Inspire Leicestershire) led to a relatively high percentage of resignation rate of the programme;
4. The underlying factors which led to a divergence of the level of engagement with the Get Set programme between schools included:
   - The levels of engagement and support offered by the Head teachers and other staff;
   - The early decision on not registering on the programme until it was closer to the Games time in order to bring better outcomes had led to a relatively short period of time for preparing and planning activities, and thus less engagement with Get Set;
   - The conflict between existing school curriculum requirements and the introduction of new initiatives;
   - Time and resources (both human and equipment related) constraints.
5. Although there was some evidence indicating an improvement on educational attainment and school attendance, it proved to be difficult to pinpoint whether those were the direct impacts of the Olympics and Get Set;
6. In terms of the sustainability of the programme within each case school, strong views were expressed regarding the intention to maintain such an initiative.
### Table 7.7 A logic model for the Get Set programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Context / Inputs</th>
<th>Throughputs / Activities</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vision:</strong> inspire children and young people (CYP – 3-19 year olds) to</td>
<td><strong>Physical context:</strong> Leicester &amp; Leicestershire</td>
<td>In addition to the GS national <strong>marketing campaign</strong>, central message that highlights</td>
<td><strong>Number of schools and colleges engaged in learning about and through the London Games values;</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aim higher and achieve better outcomes (social and educational)</td>
<td><strong>Economic Context:</strong> Emda &amp; Local Authorities</td>
<td>the value of being part of GS was passed via different Media channels (e.g. National Official</td>
<td><strong>Number of schools and colleges across Leicestershire registered on GS;</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>through initiatives inspired by the 2012 Games and the Olympic and</td>
<td><strong>Political Context:</strong> East Midland &amp; Leicestershire</td>
<td>Website - provided resources kits and information; Local Newspaper &amp; magazine articles;</td>
<td><strong>Number of schools and colleges across Leicestershire obtaining the GSN status;</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paralympic values.</td>
<td><em>Children &amp; Young People Legacy Strategy</em></td>
<td>newsletters, etc.)</td>
<td><strong>Number of children in each school and college involved in GS;</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**• To enhance young people’s learning right across the curriculum –</td>
<td><strong>Stakeholders:</strong> Leader: Regional CYP Coordinator</td>
<td>Delivering a number of <strong>activities</strong> to embed the GS into schools and colleges (e.g.</td>
<td><strong>The extent to which the awareness of the 2012 Games and its values amongst participating pupils / students had been increased</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>through sport, culture and education;**</td>
<td><strong>Partners:</strong></td>
<td>Mascot Competition; Inspire Mark projects – Musubi project &amp; EM-powered; Get Set</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>• To support and drive existing educational priorities and agendas;</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Goes Global; World Sports Day; Flame Followers competitions; 500 Days to the Games</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**• To involve as many CYP as possible in the excitement (the face of</td>
<td></td>
<td>workshop; Big Dance Schools Pledge 2012, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kids, their mood, how to translating it into something meaningful) of the</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>School visit</strong> to non-affiliated schools to talk to heads, and also to GSN schools – to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Games;</td>
<td></td>
<td>see their work in action; Attended partnership <strong>Meetings</strong> &amp; gave <strong>Speeches</strong> on school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**• To take the magic and inspiration of the London Games to classrooms,</td>
<td></td>
<td>assembly &amp; Co-organising <strong>Conferences</strong> (e.g. 2009 ‘London 2012: What’s in it for me and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>playgrounds and into the lives of young people across the UK;</td>
<td></td>
<td>my school’ at Loughborough University)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**• To support children and **young people across the UK in the</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Get Set workshops</strong> – provided advice and information and presentation on how to get</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development of their leadership, personal, thinking and life skills</td>
<td></td>
<td>registered on GS; showcase top GS or GSN activity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Get Set +</strong> - powerful links to curriculum areas, (e.g. National School Sports Week;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Let’s Get Cooking Around the World - cookery and languages; STEM projects - linked to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Science Technology, Engineering and Maths; Have You Got What it Takes - Business and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Enterprise, etc; <strong>Presenting awards and giving speeches</strong> on ‘Awards Evenings’ for local</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>authorities and schools; <strong>Media interview</strong>, e.g. local radio and newspaper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>BT Story Teller:</strong> sharing Get Set legacy story through BT teller site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Number of schools and colleges</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Outcomes</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Short-term:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Increased interest in / improved <strong>attendance</strong> at school amongst participating pupils;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Higher aspirations and increased <strong>commitment</strong> to education amongst participating pupils / students;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>More <strong>active</strong>, improve their diet;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Increased number of registration in club membership as a result of interested in different sports.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Increased the club membership. <strong>Long-term:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Increased <strong>participation</strong> in sport and culture;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>More <strong>cohesive</strong> and inclusive communities;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Increased self-esteem, self-regulation, social competence, and development of other <strong>soft skills</strong>;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improved <strong>social</strong> outcomes for children and young people;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improved <strong>educational</strong> attainment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.5 The impact of London 2012

The Get Set programme aimed to use the London 2012 Games as a ‘hook’ for longer term engagement with the London Games and the Olympic and Paralympic Values, and to motivate children and young people. It was considered as additional legacy programme as this intervention would not have taken place in the absence of the Games. It was therefore assumed that any gross outcomes achieved by Get Set were additional.

The counterfactual scenario would have been a continuation of existing educational inputs and of existing trends in pupil attainment and behaviour at the school level. However those Games related values and London 2012 related factors would not be otherwise provided to students (although a majority of those values were commonly recognised as merit goods and echoed for some schools their ethos).

The top down approach was employed here, aiming to provide a national picture of the impact of Get Set by looking at the data collected from the national scale evaluations of Get Set (conducted by NielsenOct 2011). However, it proved to be difficult to access the detailed data of this national evaluation. The following figure was taken from the national London 2012 Games Meta-evaluation report 4 (Grant Thornton, Ecorys, Loughborough University, & Oxford Economics, 2012). In this case as the data cannot be broken down by local authorities these data were used only to show a general impact of Get Set across the UK. Thus the evaluation of the impact of Get Set undertaken for Leicestershire encompassed a bottom-up approach, and relied on the data collected through the in-depth case studies at the local level.

---

55 LOCOG in effect owned the project report commissioned from Nielsen but at the time of writing had only published a brief executive summary.
At the national level, while the percentages of pupils increasing their social-confidence, more engaged in learning, and exhibiting raised aspirations all exceeded 75%, there were relatively fewer schools (around 50%) which reported that there had been a positive change on pupils’ behaviour and attainment. These findings were consistent with the qualitative findings for the Leicestershire results. However in the local case studies while there the reported level of noticeable social impacts was positive, little evidence of change in school attainment/attendance was identified by respondents.

In Leicestershire, collected data suggested that all of those case study schools had organised some Olympic and Paralympic-inspired events and activities, during which Olympic and Paralympic values were promoted, including e.g. organising assemblies relating to Olympic values, Olympic themed School Sports Days, and curriculum lessons integrated with the values. Teachers who were interviewed all reported that the Olympic and Paralympic Values had a positive influence on school activities and students (e.g. the values were interesting topics to teach, students enjoyed learning about them and applied those to their daily lives, in terms of showing respect to teachers, valuing friendship).

“What I have said to the children is the Olympic Values and Paralympic Values; they are not just something for the Olympics. They are something for life really. If you transfer them into your life you then can go a long way. ” (Head teacher)

The frequently reported benefits of the 2012 Games for the students appeared to be gaining the knowledge of the Olympic and Paralympic Games, bringing social impacts (e.g. confidence and respect, leadership), offering opportunities to try different sports
(Paralympic sports in particular). However, the impact on sport participation as a result of being involved with Get Set activities varied in different schools, with some reporting a noticeable increase.

“Say in my club alone, there are 35 students from year 5/6; 28 of those come to the Friday after school sports clubs. Three other students wanted to come but they have committed elsewhere. So there has been a massive boost; and I have run that for five years; so this year it has been the biggest amount of children I have had. I quite like to think it has to do with Get Set and Olympics. The after school sports clubs... there are different kinds of clubs that they can choose. The clubs are not just sport. It is dancing and things like that. It is not all field sport...e.g. running. There is something else which is good.” (PE teacher)

“Yes, the number of children attending the after school clubs has been increased. There is not just the after school; there were lunch time clubs as well. The number of lunch time clubs on going now has been increased.” (Head teacher)

Some schools reported a slow increase in sport participation. However, it was difficult to isolate Get Set’s impact on the sport participation improvement.

“To be honest, it always probably was because it was just a one-off event. Like we did a sport football event that was so successful, but then if you said do you want to come to football training every Thursday 3 o’clock - probably not, cause people work, people have A levels to do. So it is the risk, I wouldn't say it has been a total change. It is progressing, but it is slow.” (Student)

“So there definitely has been a big increase in after-school clubs. Whether you can put that down to Get Set I couldn't really say, because we would have just encouraged them to do that anyway.” (Head teacher)

“I think of the other thing which I notice this year is that there has been a great uptake interest in sport in the school. I would like that to be continued. That's partly through Get Set, and so partly because we have had the apprentice sport coach, has been putting on extra things at lunch time. But we introduced new sport this year, such as Boccia. We had staff training, all the teachers involved in Boccia. We had an all school competition, we ended up Teacher's team vs Students team, and the children won. Ha-ha. It is very inclusive.” (Head teacher)

Assessing the net impact

There were some limits to the nature and quality of the data that required to be considered. The qualitative interviews conducted with the Get Set programme deliverers, rather than the direct programme beneficiaries (i.e. students), probably reflected the fact that evidence collected for the evaluation of the programme was indirect and represented practitioners’ perspectives on the effectiveness of Get Set. In the sense, it can be argued that the case study

---

56 Although there was one focus group of two secondary students participated in the research, the majority of the interviewees were drawn from the sample of teachers and programme practitioner.
may lack the direct evidence to provide anything more than the ‘insights’ of one type of stakeholder (which may tend to be overly positive due to the practitioners’ close relationship with the programme). Our response to this concern is to point out that given the pragmatic methodological concerns underlying gaining access to the children and young people within the framework of the evaluation by the author, the adopted research strategy for the Get Set programme evaluation was initially aiming to adopt a secondary analysis of the national Get Set evaluation to complement the in-depth interviews. However, access to all but the brief executive summary of the national study proved to be impossible (LOCOG declined to publish the full report). Thus, although there were some legitimate doubts about the limitations of the data, the material nevertheless provides an analysis of the perspectives of those responsible for implementing the Get Set programme.

Qualitative evidence collected from the project-level evaluation in Leicestershire assisted the assessment of the net impact of the programme. The issues of displacement and leakage were not associated with this case. However, a certain degree of substitution was evident from the data, as for the schools which already had an existing educational programme and/or a sports day scheme, the teachers simply plugged the Olympic and Paralympic values into the existing educational programme, and/or organised an Olympic-style sports day. Interestingly, one element of the multiplier effects, referring to the inter-school competitions might also benefit schools which were not part of the Get Set programme, was also found in the data. However, attempting to pinpoint whether an increased local sports clubs’ memberships (if any) was as a result of increased interests in sport through Get Set (i.e. the existence of multiplier effects) is problematic, and further investigation is required to identify if this link had been effected.

Although the process of assessing the net impact of the programme, through distilling the key information into answering the above key four elements was difficult and complex, with only qualitative data available, the above discussion is an attempt to draw these various threads together for this case.
7.6 Realist evaluation

The Context-Mechanism-Outcome (CMO) configurations of the Get Set programme were derived after the data were collected and analysed to present the unique features of each type of schools, the precise way in which mechanisms worked within the given context to produce certain outcomes (see Table 7.8). Effort was made to differentiate those peculiarities to Type 1: *the schools which were more committed to the programme*, Type 2: *the schools which were less committed to the programme*, from Type 3: *the schools which did not register on Get Set*.

The Type 1 configuration proposed that the key stakeholders of the schools (normally were the Head Teachers in the case of primary schools and PE teachers in secondary schools) had a significant contribution towards driving their schools to be more engaged with Get Set. It was evident from the interviews that their positive attitudes towards Get Set were either (or both) derived from their personal interest in the Olympics or/and their recognitions of the significance of the London 2012 Games. Another feature of this context worth noting was that, as for schools with a relatively lower percentage of Free Schools Meals, which suggested a majority of students were from relatively ‘well-off’ families, those students’ parents tend to value the importance of their children’s academic achievements as well as other educational attainments. Under this ‘pressure’, schools were actively seeking for educational related initiatives and programmes, such as Get Set, and bringing them to the students. As a consequence, while fully utilising the teaching resources offered by the programme, those schools often developed other 2012-related events relating directly to their own needs. The results of this intensive engagement with Get Set generated relatively more significant and wide-ranging outcomes not only for their students but also for schools themselves, for instance, improving students’ social skills, an increase in sport participation, improving school inclusion, raising the schools’ profile, and contributing to a more cohesive community.

The context of the schools which were less engaged with the programme was characterised by a number of factors, e.g. shortage of staff, limited resources and time constraints, or a struggle between existing school curriculum requirements and the introduction of new initiatives. This meant that extra effort was required from the programme to encourage those schools to engage with the programme. In effect, evidence from interviews indicated that some schools even gained specific one-to-one help from the programme volunteers to deliver
Get Set activities for them within the schools. In this case, another recognised effective mechanism provided by Get Set was the teaching materials and templates related to the Olympics and Paralympic values and the London 2012, which appeared to provide a useful off-the-shelf teaching tool. The emerged outcomes for this type of school were mainly related to gaining knowledge of the values and the London 2012 Games, with some schools reported a significant improvement on social outcomes for students.

Although no in-depth interview data was gathered directly from schools which did not register on the programme, evidence collected from the programme practitioners and other participating teachers who happened to know some non-Get Set schools’ circumstances suggested a number of potential elements that might restrain schools from registering on the programme. Firstly, as identified from the interviews, the encouragement and support that Head teachers and PE teachers gave to other teachers were viewed as a key factor that influenced the school’s engagement with Get Set, and the implementation of the activities within the school. Thus, if she/he were not interested in the Olympics at all in the first place, or it seemed difficult for them to understand what kinds of potential benefits the programme could offer to their students, she/he would have made a decision on not signing up. Once the decision was made by that particular person, it proved to be difficult to change his/her mind set, and thus would have failed to encourage schools to be involved with the programme. Secondly, the process of registering on the programme and being part of the Get Set Network seemed to be rather ‘complicated’ and overloaded with paperwork (one Get Set volunteer reported that she helped out seven schools with their paperwork), which therefore put off some schools from registration. Thirdly, the schools were overwhelmed by a number of Games-related initiatives in the 2012 Olympic year. There is a possibility that, with limited available resources, some schools may select other initiatives but Get Set. Finally, similar to what was reported from the case of less engaged schools, time, staff and facilities constraints were also evident here.
Table 7.8 Get Set CMO configurations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Mechanisms</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Schools which were more committed to the programme</strong></td>
<td>• Invited to attend local GS promoting events from which schools were encouraged to register on the programme; • Regional CYP coordinators and SSP coordinators promoted hardly to these schools to try to get them involved with the programme by attending meetings, giving speeches; • Some schools gained specific one-to-one help from GS volunteers to deliver activities for them within the school; • Benefited from a wide of off-the-shelf teaching resource offered by GS; • Assemblies to promote the Olympic and Paralympic values; • Athletes visiting school; • Sports Day related to Olympic and Paralympic Games; • Curricular activities related to the Olympics and its Values; • Might not be in GSN thus were not entitle to apply for Olympic tickets.</td>
<td>• Increased the awareness of the 2012 Games and the Olympic and Paralympic values; • Some students were found that their self-esteem, self-confidence and the development of other soft skills were improved; • Some evidence was found that the GS activities helped to facilitate school inclusion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Schools which were less committed to the programme</strong></td>
<td>• Invited to attend local GS promoting events from which schools were encouraged to register on the programme; • Regional CYP coordinators and SSP coordinators promoted hardly to these schools to try to get them involved with the programme by attending meetings, giving speeches; • Some schools gained specific one-to-one help from GS volunteers to deliver activities for them within the school; • Benefited from a wide of off-the-shelf teaching resource offered by GS; • Assemblies to promote the Olympic and Paralympic values; • Athletes visiting school; • Sports Day related to Olympic and Paralympic Games; • Curricular activities related to the Olympics and its Values; • Might not be in GSN thus were not entitle to apply for Olympic tickets.</td>
<td>• Increased the awareness of the 2012 Games and the Olympic and Paralympic values; • Some students were found that their self-esteem, self-confidence and the development of other soft skills were improved; • Some evidence was found that the GS activities helped to facilitate school inclusion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Schools which did not register on Get Set</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Key persons (e.g. Head teacher and PE teacher) were interested in the Olympics and recognised the potential benefits of Get Set for their students;
- The nature of some schools was sport oriented;
- For some schools, the majority of students were from relatively more ‘well-off’ families which tend to value success not only in academic achievements but also other educational attainments.

- Invited to attend local GS promoting events from which schools were encouraged to register on the programme;
- Regional CYP coordinators and SSP coordinators promoted hardly to these schools to try to get them involved with the programme by attending meetings, giving speeches;
- Some schools gained specific one-to-one help from GS volunteers to deliver activities for them within the school;
- Benefited from a wide of off-the-shelf teaching resource offered by GS;
- Assemblies to promote the Olympic and Paralympic values;
- Athletes visiting school;
- Sports Day related to Olympic and Paralympic Games;
- Curricular activities related to the Olympics and its Values;
- Meeting the Mascot / visiting the Olympic Park;
- Winning Olympic tickets under LOCOG’s Ticket Share scheme.

- Increased schools’ profile in the community;
- Some reported that Get Set helped to bring school staff together, create links with other schools in the community;
- Improved self-esteem, self-confidence and the development of other soft skills for children and young people;
- In the context of secondary school students, it was evident that students improved social outcomes and gained personal development for (e.g. leadership, communication);
- Increased the awareness of the 2012 Games and the Olympic and Paralympic values;
- Students were found to be more active; it was also reported that students had opportunities to try different sports, Paralympic sports in particular;
- An increase in school attainment and attendance was reported. However, the interviewees also acknowledged that it might be due to some other factors, e.g. improved school management systems.
Chapter 7 A Case Study of Children and Young People Legacy: the Get Set Programme

7.7 Conclusion

Key performance indicators (KPIs) of the Get Set programme put Leicestershire in the top position amongst the region and nation. Analysis of the key stakeholders’ interviews suggested three key focal points that perhaps explain such high performance: firstly, the promotional approach to Get Set in Leicestershire was different to other sub-regions. A classic example given by the CYP coordinator was that, each sub-region was entitled to apply for a funding of £2000 to support their delivery of the Get Set programme. As for Leicestershire, it was considered as a case of money “well spent” on the **5 Schools, 500 children, 500 days to the Games** event which attracted widespread media attention and created a successful campaign; whereas for some other sub-regions, the ways of using the funding were considered as “inappropriate” and “diluting the Get Set message”. Secondly, the contribution of Inspire Leicestershire towards promoting the programme was considered as non-negligible. It acted as a valuable publicity platform and offered a supportive partnership. Finally, the fact that the regional CYP coordinator worked at the same office with Inspire Leicestershire and LRS seemed to facilitate communication and information exchange, which thus boosted the outputs. The KPIs however related to outputs rather than outcomes, the latter being reflected in the preceding qualitative discussions.

Qualitative case studies showed that teachers were using the programme and resources in a variety of ways ranging from a whole school adoption of the values, cross curricular work featuring Olympic related themes, to focused work with specific young people. Having benefited from Get Set in various ways, all the case study schools reported that they would definitely recommend it to other schools.

The encouraging results around the impact that Get Set had on students were also evident. Students and teachers who participated in the interviews reported a number of changes and improvements in students’ attitudes and sporting behaviours, including better social skills and enhanced confidence and self-esteem, increased activity in sport and a greater understanding of the Olympic Games and its values, and living them in their everyday lives (in for example demonstrating increased sensitivity to fair play, and respect for others).

Overall, the gross impact of the London 2012 Games on affecting and inspiring children and young people through educational activity and Olympic and Paralympic values was claimed to be significant by providers and school personnel interviewed. However, as discussed
within the chapter, there is still a gap between the current results and the actual net impact. Further investigation is therefore required.

In terms of the future development of Get Set, at national level, after the London 2012 Olympics and Paralympics Games, the British Olympic Association and the British Paralympic Association announced that they would partner together to sustain the Get Set programme. Recently the Big Lottery Fund confirmed a further £5.3 million investment that seeks to support nationally significant community-related activities that embody the spirit of 2012. From which, BOA was awarded £2 million in partnership with the BPA to sustain the Get Set programme (Big Lottery Fund, 2013). When asked by the chairman of the House of Lords Select Committee on Olympic and Paralympic Legacy, Sue Campbell (Chair of Youth Sport Trust) (2013a: Q159) explained the rationale behind keeping this kind of educational programme in place:

“All these things (Get Set resources are available online) are complex to get on the ground for everybody, but this notion of using sport for the wider curriculum and using it as a stimulus to learn other things is very positive, and it resonates with what we are trying to say, which is that sport can be a doorway for better learning in maths, English, science, geography and a whole host of subjects, because it is something that interests young people and you can use it as a doorway into many other subjects.”

At the local level, the case study schools reported a strong interest in and engagement with all elements of the London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games and the values, and their intention of keeping those related activities sustained after the Games.
8.1 Introduction

In Leicestershire, the priority in relation to volunteering legacy was set to increase volunteering opportunities and to get more people to become volunteers, using the 2012 Games and the 2009 Leicester Special Olympics. This was to be supported through delivering nationally initiated legacy programmes and sub-regionally developed volunteer-related programmes. In particular, two volunteering programmes were considered as the major focus for the evaluation of the volunteering legacy: Sport Makers and Games Makers programmes.

The Sport Makers programme was one of the major national volunteering programmes related to London 2012 Games, aiming to attract 40,000 new adult volunteers nationally into sport. Given it was too early at the time of writing to assess the effectiveness of the initiative in promoting volunteering work and sport participation, the evaluation was thus designed to identify the motives of volunteers taking part in the programme, explore demographic information of the programme participants, and to identify the extent to which London 2012 had influenced people’s decisions in terms of taking part in the programme. It attempted, by understanding different volunteers’ demographic characteristics, to inform stakeholders and practitioners what different strategies would be required to effectively recruit, train, and retain diverse volunteer workforces with different motives.

The Games Makers programme was chosen not only because it was the official London 2012 volunteering programme; but also because the Games Makers programme was given a local boost to promote and financially support volunteers’ activities by Inspire Leicestershire and local authorities. It was thus interesting to consider the impact of such additional support. Thus the evaluation was conducted to explore the Leicestershire Games Makers’ volunteering experience during the Games, to identify volunteers’ motivations and satisfactions towards the volunteering experience, and to evaluate the extent to which the Grant Scheme had made a difference to people in their voluntary work.
This chapter firstly provides the empirical data analysis of the Sport Makers and the Games Makers programmes respectively; then discussion around the impact of London 2012 on generating volunteering legacy for Leicestershire is presented; finally, logic models of the two volunteering programmes and an overall realist evaluation are outlined.

8.2 Analysis of the Sport Makers programme

The Sport Makers programme was part of the ‘People’ strand of Sport England’s participation legacy programme - Places People Play, which commenced in October 2011. Funded by the National Lottery, Sport Makers aimed to recruit new\textsuperscript{57} sporting volunteers aged 16 years and over to organise and lead community sporting activities across the country.

This volunteering programme was designed to use the inspiration of the London 2012 Olympic Games to recruit, train and deploy volunteers. Each of the Sport Makers was given an introduction to the programme and sporting volunteering via a series of workshops delivered locally by a training provider and in conjunction with a County Sport Partnership. In particular, the Olympic and Paralympic values were learnt via on-site workshops. Sport Makers were then supported to find local opportunities to activate sport for their friends and community.

**LRS Targets (2011-2013):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>National</th>
<th>Leicestershire and Rutland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of volunteers deployed for a minimum of 10 hours</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of volunteers retained beyond 10 hours</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of workshops organised</td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: adapted from LRS Sport Makers programme update*

In Leicestershire, LRS was critical to the running of Sport Makers as it coordinated the work of various agencies and was responsible for the delivery of the programme. It is worth noting that Inspire Leicestershire gave support in promoting the programme and identifying volunteering opportunities; also efforts were made to link the Sport Makers programme with as many as possible of Leicestershire’s London 2012 related activities.

\textsuperscript{57} The target of recruiting 40,000 new volunteers was later relaxed to any volunteers who had not been involved in this type of activity before, rather than who had no previous volunteering experience.
In total, there were 561 Sport Makers from Leicestershire and Rutland registered in the system by the end of 2012, of which 548 people attended one of the 24 Sport Makers’ conventions or workshops, and 73 Sport Makers logged over 10 hours of volunteering activities.

**Method**

The aim of the overarching evaluation was to provide empirical research on the measurement of motives to volunteer for Olympic related activities. Importantly, it sought to explore the extent to which the Olympic Games had boosted the interests of volunteering participation by applying an Olympic volunteer motivation scale proposed by Bang et al (2008)\(^{58}\). The approaches adopted for this evaluation included: questionnaire surveys, consultations with key delivery partners; and a review of marketing and policy materials review.

The questionnaires were distributed on-site before the end of a number of Sport Makers training sessions between January and September 2012. With 548 people taking part in the Sport Makers programme in Leicestershire between 2011 and 2012, 17% finished the survey (\(n = 94\), thus with a 95% confidence level, the confidence interval was a maximum ±9.2% if the population size of 548 was selected. However, if the population size of the Sport Makers who registered between January and September 2012 was taken into account, with a 95% confidence level, the confidence interval was then ±7.5%). SPSS statistics software was used for the data analysis. The following sections provide a basic description of the statistical data, together with a discussion section of the emerged key findings.

**8.2.1 Statistical data analysis**

The personal details of the survey respondents are summarised as follows.

---

\(^{58}\) There has been an evaluation of the Sport Makers programme at national level. However, since the first report had not yet been published at the time of writing, a comparison of the achievement of Sport Maker’s KPIs between CSPs cannot yet be undertaken.
Table 8.1 The demographic details of the survey respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Details</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>44% female (n=41); 56% male (n=53);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>age 16-24: 52%; age 25-44: 30%; age 45-54: 18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td>67% single; 30% married or have a partner; 3% others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family with children</td>
<td>77% no children; 23% have a child (or more than one)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic origin</td>
<td>60% White-British; 40% others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment status</td>
<td>54% students; 32% full-time workers; 10% part-time; 4% retired or looking after their family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>36% worked in managerial and professional occupations; 24% worked in Intermediate occupations; 14% never worked or long-term unemployed; 26% others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education levels</td>
<td>49% obtained Higher education degree &amp; professional/vocational equivalents; 26% had experienced ‘Higher education below degree level’; 25% obtained the other types of occupations (e.g. A levels, vocational level 3 &amp; equivalents, Trade Apprenticeship/O level grade A*-C, or Less than 5 A*-C, or other qualifications)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteering experience</td>
<td>82% of the respondents had some volunteering experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sporting volunteering experience</td>
<td>among the ones who had volunteering experience, 68% did sport related voluntary work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General volunteering motivation

Respondents were asked to indicate the importance of each of the 11 items in influencing their decision to take part in the Sport Makers programme. Those 11 items, outlined in Table 8.2, were adapted from Bang et al’s scale (2008) which was developed based on a major investigation in sport volunteering for the Athens 2004 Olympic Games, and they also were in line with the sports volunteering motivations that Sport England (2003) summarised from the literature.

These motivational dimensions were a modified version of the scale that was mainly drawn from Bang et al’s (2008) (including: Expression of values, Patriotism, Interpersonal contacts, Personal growth, Career orientation, and Extrinsic rewards) and Giannoulakis et al’s (2008) work (i.e. the factor of Olympics related). These 11 factors including in the scale adequately represented most of the volunteer dimensions identified in the review of the literature. Despite most volunteer motivation scales include more than 20-scale items, such a lengthy instrument may have disadvantages. In particular, in the Sport Makers context, the survey was distributed on site before the Sport Makers workshop finished, while participants may be
pressed for time. With an effort to accommodate time demand, to facilitate ease of survey administration, and to maximise response rate, a short and concise scale was developed.

The internal consistency of the scale was tested to be acceptable after examining the Cronbach’s alpha\(^59\). Table 8.2 outlines the ranking of motives for volunteering in Sport Makers. The most important item, with a mean of 4.69 on a 5-point Likert scale\(^60\) was “I enjoy being involved in sport activities”; the least important item, with a mean of 3.38 was “I can earn awards/get free stuff”.

Table 8.2 The importance of the motives to be a Sport Maker

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Love of sport</td>
<td>I enjoy being involved in sport activities</td>
<td>4.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I am interested in sport</td>
<td>4.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expression of values</td>
<td>I feel it is important to help others</td>
<td>4.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I want to do something worthwhile for my community</td>
<td>4.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal contacts</td>
<td>I want to work with different people</td>
<td>4.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympics related</td>
<td>I want to be part of the London 2012 Games</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career orientation</td>
<td>Volunteering experience will look good on my CV</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal contacts</td>
<td>I want to meet people</td>
<td>4.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career orientation</td>
<td>I want to gain work-related experience</td>
<td>3.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic rewards</td>
<td>I have a chance to get free London 2012 tickets</td>
<td>3.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I can earn awards/get free stuff</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Volunteering experience

Among 94 respondents, 82% had some previous volunteering experience. In order to understand the key motives that drove people taking part in this voluntary work, in particular, for the respondent group who did not have any volunteering experience, independent-sample t-tests were conducted. A significant difference was found in eleventh motivation factors. The result indicated that, in terms of the factor “I want to do something worthwhile for the community”, there was a significant difference in scores for the respondents who did not have any volunteering experience (M=4.06, SD=.556) and the respondents who had (M=4.45, SD=.575; t (24) = 2.59, p=.016 two-tailed). The magnitude of the differences in the means

\(^{59}\) Alpha values above .7 are considered acceptable, according to DeVellis (2003). In this case, the Cronbach’s alpha score was .78.

\(^{60}\) The means of each point of the Likert scale were: 1=strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Neutral, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly agree.
(mean difference = .389, 95% CI: .079 to .698) was moderate (eta squared = .069). This can be further inferred that the willingness of doing something worthwhile for the community was stronger among those volunteers who had volunteering experiences, than those who did not. Thus a further examining of the most important motive to become a volunteer for the people who had no volunteering experience was needed.

As presented in Table 8.3, in this case, the main factors that attracted people to start volunteering via the Sport Makers programme were highly influenced by their strong interests in sport, career orientation, and the Olympics.

Table 8.3 A comparison in terms of the importance of the motives to become a Sport Maker between groups who had volunteering experience and who did not

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Mean (having volunteering experience)</th>
<th>Mean (not having volunteering experience)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Love of sport (M=4.67)</td>
<td>Love of sport (M=4.59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Expression of values (M=4.50)</td>
<td>Career orientation (M=4.24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Interpersonal contacts (M=3.28)</td>
<td>Olympics related (M=4.18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Olympics related (M=4.27)</td>
<td>Expression of values (M=4.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Career orientation (M=3.99)</td>
<td>Interpersonal contacts (M=3.91)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Extrinsic rewards (M=3.52)</td>
<td>Extrinsic rewards (M=3.15)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not surprisingly, the respondents who had volunteered in a sporting context scored higher in the motivation dimension of Love of sport than the ones who had not (results are summarised below). Among those volunteers who have had volunteering experience but have not had sporting volunteering experience, the desire to get involved with sport activities was stronger (M=4.88) compared with the ones who did some sporting voluntary work (see Table 8.4).

Table 8.4 Statistical results for subgroups: volunteering experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivation factors</th>
<th>The respondents who did sport volunteering</th>
<th>The respondents who did not do any sport voluntary work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I was interested in sport</td>
<td>M=4.81, SD=.476; t(34) = 3.235, p=.003 two-tailed</td>
<td>M=4.32, SD=.69; The magnitude of the differences in the means (mean difference = .49, 95% CI: .182 to .798) was moderate (eta squared = .11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy being involved in sport activities</td>
<td>M=4.40, SD=.577; t(33) = 3.813, p=.001 two-tailed</td>
<td>M=4.88, SD=.378; The magnitude of the differences in the means (mean difference = .479, 95% CI: .224 to .735) was large (eta squared = .15)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Differences in motivation scores in terms of demographic (age, gender, marital status, employment status, family status, and education level) were examined with a MANOVA\(^{61}\). The MANOVA results are provided as followings.

### Age

In terms of subgroup age differences, significant result was found in one of the six dimensions that young people (age of 16-24) were more motivated by *Career Orientation*, than older volunteers (see Table 8.5).

**Table 8.5 Statistical results for subgroups: age**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivation dimensions</th>
<th>Age 16-24</th>
<th>Age 25-44</th>
<th>Age 45-64</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Career Orientation</td>
<td>M=4.36, SD=.119</td>
<td>M= 3.87, SD = .157</td>
<td>M=3.25, SD = .218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F (2, 85) = 10.809, p = .000, partial eta squared = .203.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ethnic origin

A series of independent-sample t-tests were conducted to compare the motivation scores for White-British respondents and Non-white British. For White British, the mean scores for the motivation factors: “I want to meet people”, “I feel it is important to help others”, and “I want to work with different people”, were statistically significant lower than of which scored by Non-White British (see Table 8.6).

**Table 8.6 Statistical results for subgroups: ethnic origin**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivation factors</th>
<th>The respondents who were White British</th>
<th>The respondents who were Non-white British</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>I want to meet people</strong></td>
<td>M=4.00, SD=.867</td>
<td>M=4.35, SD=.753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>t (90) = -2.017, p=.047 two-tailed</td>
<td>The magnitude of the differences in the means (mean difference = -.351, 95% CI: -.697 to -.005) was small (eta squared = .043)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I feel it is important to help others</strong></td>
<td>M=4.38, SD=.561; t (90) = -2.111, p=.038 two-tailed</td>
<td>M=4.62, SD=.492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The magnitude of the differences in the means (mean difference = -.240, 95% CI: -.465 to -.014) was small (eta squared = .047)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I want to work with different people</strong></td>
<td>M=4.11, SD=.786; t (90) = -2.157, p=.034 two-tailed</td>
<td>M=4.46, SD=.730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The magnitude of the differences in the means (mean difference = -.35, 95% CI: -.673 to -.028) was small (eta squared = .049)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{61}\) using a Bonferroni adjusted alpha level of .008.
Employment status

With regards to subgroup employment status differences, significant results were found in two of the six dimensions that student were more motivated by Career Orientation and Lover of sport, than respondents who were working (either as full-time or part-time) and who were retired or looking after their family (see Table 8.7).

**Table 8.7 Statistical results for subgroups: employment status**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivation dimensions</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Full-time/Part-time</th>
<th>Retired or Looking after family/home</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Career Orientation</td>
<td>M = 4.33, SD = .674</td>
<td>M = 3.74, SD = .965</td>
<td>M = 3.0, SD = 1.35  F (2, 6) = 8.497, p=.000. The effect size, calculated using eta squared, was .15, which indicates a large effect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love of Sport</td>
<td>M=4.73, SD = .074</td>
<td>M= 4.65, SD = .084</td>
<td>M=3.66, SD = .300 F (2, 88) = 5.916, p = .004, partial eta squared = .119</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Marital status

In terms of subgroup marital differences, significant result was found in one of the six dimensions that the volunteers who were single were more likely to be motivated by Career Orientation, than the ones who were married, had a partner, or other situation (see Table 8.8).

**Table 8.8 Statistical results for subgroups: marital status**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivation dimensions</th>
<th>Single</th>
<th>Married, have a partner, or others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Career Orientation</td>
<td>M=4.28, SD=.721</td>
<td>M=3.53, SD=1.024; t (43) = 3.611, p=.001 two-tailed  The magnitude of the differences in the means (mean difference = .753, 95% CI: .33 to 1.174) was moderate (eta squared = .12)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responsible for child

With regards to subgroups that had or did not have a child, significant results were found in one of the six dimensions that for the respondents who did not have any child more motivated by Career Orientation, than the ones who had (see Table 8.9).
8.2.2 Discussion

By dividing the respondents into two groups (i.e. who have volunteering experience and who have not done any voluntary work before) and testing if there were any behavioural and motivational differences existing between these two, the result indicated that the notion of “doing something useful and contributing to society” was more strongly evident in the group of the respondents who have done some voluntary work, which seemed to suggest the decision to participate may be influenced, to some extent, by individuals’ level of recognition of the importance of social justice.

Further testing of the motivational reasons of those “not having volunteering experience” was conducted in order to explore what the real ‘attractions’ were that motivated their behaviour change. As the rank order of the mean responses to motivational factors displayed (see Table 8.2), the predominant top three motives were: Love of sport, Career orientation, and Olympic related. There are some reasonable assumptions which can be made based on that: firstly, the context of the Sport Makers programme was very sporting orientated, which therefore attracted people with strong sport interests; secondly, having a strong Career orientation motive seems also quite rational, given the majority of this group were single, had no child, and were relatively young. Thirdly, two core messages that the Sport Makers programme was trying to promote, i.e. the Olympic & Paralympic values and sporting volunteering, seemed to work effectively to attract potential volunteers. Even for the group of respondents who had previous volunteering experience, the mean score of the motivation dimension Olympics related was relatively high at 4.27 (although it was not listed in the top three). Indeed, the evidence collected from reviewing the marketing and publicity material surrounding the programme suggested that individuals’ involvement in Sport Makers can contribute to creating a London 2012 sports legacy; and those volunteers can also have a chance to become a sporting hero. These results confirmed again that a mega-event, such as
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Olympic Games, seemed to have a wide-reaching appeal to potential volunteers (how many of them will be sustained is another matter). It also provided useful information that could further support the Olympic volunteer movement in terms of effective volunteer recruitment.

Significant subgroup differences in terms of some demographic characteristics were also found from the data analysis. Young volunteers (aged 16-24) more motivated by Career Orientation than older volunteers, which is understandable as, for the older volunteers, their career route presumably has been relatively well developed before their middle-age; therefore, the purpose of doing voluntary work seems less about career development. Similar arguments can be applied to different subgroups, in terms of employment status, when comparing the scores of Career Orientation between students, workers (referring to those having either a full-time or part-time job), and people who did not work (e.g. retired, or looking after family/home). Students had higher scores for Career Orientation than workers and people who did not work. In addition, students were more willing to take part in the programme as they had strong interests in sport, comparing to the other two subgroups. This information has strong implications for volunteering recruitment, e.g. practitioners can highlight the idea of playing sports when targeting potential student volunteers.

The significant differences of the motivation factors between White-British and Non-White British in relation to social interaction items, e.g. “I want to meet people”, “I want to work with different people”, may infer that White-British tend to be socially ‘conservative’ and less open. On the other hand, for Non-White British, the result suggests that they have a stronger desire to use voluntary work as a channel to interact with the public, and to work with people from diverse cultural background (like themselves).

Furthermore, it was evident that single volunteers expressed a higher score for Career Orientation than married volunteers. This finding was consistent with the result reported by Bang et al’s studies (2003; 2008), where they argue that single volunteers tend to be young and unemployed, who may place more emphasis on career orientation issues. Similar patterns in relation to the mean scores of the Career Orientation dimension can be found between those groups who had a dependent child and those who did not. Those who did not have a child were usually young and tended to regard the volunteer experience as a chance to practice in working conditions (Gidron, 1978).

It should be noted that there were no significant gender-specific motivational factors.
8.3 Analysis of the Games Makers programme

Led by LOCOG, Games Maker was the official London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games volunteering programme which was developed to assist with delivering the Games. In total, 70,000 Games Makers (fifty thousand people at the Olympics and twenty thousand at the Paralympics) were selected from 240,000 applications (LOCOG, 2012), with 40% of applications indicating that London 2012 inspired them to volunteer for the first time (DCMS, 2012). It was estimated that those volunteers had worked eight million volunteer hours throughout the summer and gone through a million hours of training for their 800 different roles (Hirst, 2012).

The Grant Scheme

Despite the enthusiasm for being Olympic and/or Paralympic volunteers, people from outside of the host city may encounter problems for example finding appropriate accommodation during the Games within commutable distance, and dealing with the increased accommodation costs (Chalip, 1999). The implication is that those geographic and financial issues could undermine the promise of getting a broad geographic spread of public volunteers participating in the Games.

Inspire Leicestershire recognised the importance of supporting local people volunteering for the Games, and the challenges that they might face (as discussed above). Actions were taken consequently to raise those issues with local authorities and to lobby for a potential funding proposal. In the end, a Grant Scheme was set up by local authorities, Inspire Leicestershire, LRS, and local communities to support a total of 62 Leicestershire Games Makers (see Table 8.10). Each of the supported Leicestershire Games Makers was given a fund of £250 to go towards travel and accommodation expenses. In addition, other facilitating support mechanisms regarding accommodation had been developed, unfortunately with no achievable solutions. For example, effort was made to identify whether there was any accommodation ‘hub’ existing in London, and a volunteer forum was created that facilitated information sharing and established a volunteer network via social media. Alongside with the Grant Scheme, there were some Leicestershire Games Makers related events that were organised and delivered by Inspire Leicestershire to celebrate the inspirational impact of the London

63 There were estimated to be over 150 local people who volunteered for the Games.
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2012, notably e.g. the Grant Scheme award celebration event pre-Games, and the “Our Games Our Legacy” event with special guest Lord Sebastian Coe after-Games.

Table 8.10 The stats of the Leicestershire Games Maker Grant Scheme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Authority</th>
<th>Games Makers awarded the Grant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blaby</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charnwood</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinckley &amp; Bosworth</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harborough</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leicester City</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melton</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW Leicestershire</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oadby &amp; Wigston</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>62</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Authority Funding</th>
<th>£6,500</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LRS Funding</td>
<td>£3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspire LeicesterShire</td>
<td>£5,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Fund</td>
<td>£500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>£15,700</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Method

As outlined above, this case study evaluation aimed to explore the Games volunteers’ experience by adopting the following approaches: semi-structured interviews with volunteers, consultations with key local stakeholders, and a review of marketing and policy materials.

Semi-structured interviews were carried out with twelve Leicestershire Games Makers who were selected from 62 of representatives from the Olympic volunteers, the Paralympic volunteers, with and without mega-event volunteering experience. The interviews were concerned exclusively with the experience of engagement in the London Games as Games Makers, their attitudes towards voluntary work, and their perspectives of the support and training they received (both nationally and locally) in order to further examine what approaches might be needed to support non-hosting volunteers for the future mega-events.

In addition, from Leicester City’s point of view, the evaluation of the Leicestershire Games Maker programme would be a good opportunity to further identify any continuity of the volunteering impacts of the 2009 Leicester Special Olympics (four out of the 62 Grant Scheme receivers had volunteered for the Special Olympics, of which three participated in interviews). A study of the 2009 Special Olympics suggests that, after the success of the
event and its volunteer programme, it was anticipated that a trained and motivated group of volunteers would remain engaged or volunteer again in the future (Barton, Carter, Holt, & Williams, 2011). Thus, one of the objectives of this study was to provide a qualitative analysis of the Games Makers who also had volunteered for the Special Games, in order to further examine this potential causal relation.

All interviews were digitally recorded and interviewees were informed that they would not be identified when quoted. The transcripts of the interviews were subject to repeated readings and a thematic content analysis was developed. The following sections provide a basic description of the interview sample, together with a structured account of the themes that emerged from the analysis of the interviews.

8.3.1 Description of the interview sample

The interviews with Leicestershire Games Makers took place immediately after the London 2012 Games had finished, except for one Trailblazer interview completed before the Games. Thus it was for most possible to capture their volunteering experiences of the London Games while they still remembered them vividly.

The sample of interviews is summarised in Table 8.11. It consisted of Olympic (n=7) and Paralympic Games Makers (n=6) (two of whom volunteered for the both Olympic and Paralympic Games), and one Games Maker Trailblazer, with different ethnic and national backgrounds. In particular, there were three interviewees who had volunteered for the 2009 Leicester Special Olympics and another two who had volunteered for other mega sporting events (e.g. Beijing Olympic Games, Commonwealth Games).
Table 8.11 Sample of Leicestershire Games Makers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volunteering experience</th>
<th>No. of the interviewees</th>
<th>Demographic data</th>
<th>No. of the interviewees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Games Maker Trailblazer 64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>16-24: 2; 25-44: 3; 45-64: 5; 65+: 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Olympic Volunteers</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male: 1; Female: 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Paralympic volunteers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ethnic origin</td>
<td>White-British: 7; Non-White British: 2; Non-British: 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Leicester Special Olympics volunteers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Employment status</td>
<td>Student: 3; Retired: 3; Full-time: 1; Part-time: 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous Mega-sporting-events volunteering experience (e.g. Beijing 2008, Commonwealth 2010)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Education levels</td>
<td>Higher education degree &amp; professional/vocational equivalents: 10; Other qualifications: 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roles as Games Makers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Selection Event Volunteering (n=1); Event Services Team Member (n=2); Mobility Team Member (n=2); Way Finder (n=2); Risk Assurance Team Member (n=1); Paralympic Opening Ceremony Performer (n=1); Paralympic Family Assistant (n=1); Gymnastic Field of Play (n=1); Print Distribution (n=1).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Leicestershire Games Makers from the interview sample contributed Approximately 1500 hours in total of volunteering to the Games.

8.3.2 Themes emerging from the interviews

The rationale of volunteering for the Games

a. To be part of the Games

The most commonly identified motivation for Games Makers reported by the twelve interviewees was “the desire to be part of the Games”. The wish to get involved with the Games was strongly evident in the interviews, with willingness to contribute to a successful Games by volunteering. In addition, the uniqueness of the event, i.e. the Olympic and Paralympic Games, was recognised and appreciated as a ‘once-in-a-lifetime’ opportunity.

64 Trailblazers were part of the pre-Games volunteer programme that was responsible for recruiting Games Maker volunteers in the run-up to the Games.
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“To be part of the Games, I think it is everybody's aspiration. To have it in England, so you don't have to travel. It probably will be the only time it happens in my lifetime. I just wanted to be part of it”. (White-British, Age 45-64)

“Once the Olympics were decided to come to Britain, I was just determined to be involved; I think I was just NOT NOT going to do it. Everybody I suppose would want it in their life-time. It is not going to happen like that again. I think because the way they were saying about the volunteers were ‘the people who are really going to make the Games’. Then you felt that you can actually contribute to making the Games work really well.” (White-British, Age 45-64)

“I was interested in it because, one, I suppose I have waited 64 years for the Olympics to come to this country. I was one-year old in 1948, you know, never being able to afford to go see any Olympics elsewhere in the world. Two, I am not going to see the Olympics in this country in my life-time again, so that it is an experience and opportunity which I will not have ever, in my life time again! I just really want to be part of the whole thing, in a very small way, maybe, but, you know, just to be able to say 'I was there!'” (White-British, Age 65-74)

b. The feeling of “giving something back”

The idea of altruism (e.g. giving something back to the community) was identified both in the literature and the data, including satisfactions from for example “giving something back” or “helping to make the Games happen”.

“I think I should do something for my country! That was mainly because I couldn't participate. I thought well, at least I can help in some other ways. That was really my motivation. [...] I actually tried to encourage my husband that 'we both can do this... going with me...filling the form', at the end, he didn't get around to it. He was so jealous.” (White British, Age 25-44)

“Just because I thought it would be something really good to do. I just want to give something back to my country. I think if they wanted the Games to be a success, and they need somebody to say 'yes, I will do it.' So I want to do it.” (Non-white British, Age 25-44)

When asking the motivation of doing general volunteering work, the perspective of “giving something back” was commonly reported. This result perhaps implies that the development trend of the volunteering work was firstly derived from community volunteering and then grew to events volunteering.

“I think it is just about giving something back.... my children were born at XX, so I used to volunteer there.... all sorts of things....just really helping out....give something back.... I think when you have children, there is always something you can get involved in. You know, football club is something that I used to volunteer for on Sundays. Little things like that, I just felt .....it is really hard to put it into words really, [...] I think it is really important, you can't just go through your life and just take take
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take....give something back you know, not always for money”(White British, Age 25-44)

“I do volunteering because I want to give something back to the community. I have been fortunate enough to be able to be supported and gained a lot of skills. So through my knowledge, I want to share that with the others. Being able to volunteer, it allows me to interact with people of all ages. So as a whole, you know, being a British-born Leicester girl, I can do something for Leicester, it is just rewarding. Not for anything else, not for gratitude, just to be able to give something back.”(Non-white British, Age 25-44)

c. Olympic spirit

Some of the interviewees indicated that their involvement with the Games was from being attracted by the Olympic spirit. The greatness of such an international mega-event that uses sport to promote the harmonious development of humankind was appreciated and thus motivated them (in particular non-British people who lived in the UK during the Games) to take part in Games Maker.

“The Olympic Games is an international event. There were people from all over the world, so whether I am Maltese or British, or whatever, contributing to such an international event is....I feel it’s my duty, if I have these skills that I can help to do something better. It is helping everybody, because sport inspires everybody. At the moment, I am in the UK, so I help people out here. I want to help anyway. To me it is irrelevant to my nationality. Maybe... it was also because that I feel a connection, that I was born here.” (Non-British, Age 45-64)

“I feel proud of myself by being an Olympic volunteer. I contributed to the Olympic Movement. The fact that the Olympics is a precious heritage of mankind, so if you can contribute and make the Games happen or host successfully, I feel very lucky, proud and really happy.” (Non-British, Age 16-24)

“I think you know, just being part of the Olympics spirit! Me and my parents were actually travelling to Athens in 2004 to watch the Olympics when I was really young - about 15-16. To be honest, for me, the volunteers have made the most memorable bit. I remember going to an event to watch. It was the travelling between venues; whoever you asked the question, they (volunteers) knew the answer or they could quickly get the answer sorted. So this sort of enthusiasm was given by the volunteers that made me think I definitely want to be involved in that thing.” (White British, Age 25-44)

d. Other motivations

Amongst the respondents, other noticeable reasons for volunteering for the Games include interest in sport, wanting to meet different people, and trying to inspire their children (or grandchildren).
The benefits gained from the Games Maker experience

a. Enjoyment

The most common response to the question of volunteers’ satisfaction was the enjoyment of the Games, including comments such as “a great memory to remember”, “feel proud of myself”, and a “brilliant experience”.

“I had an absolutely fantastic time at the Olympics. I am so proud; I am so pleased that I took part in the Olympics, really. I think you know making history was fantastic! And I wouldn't hesitate to do it again.” (White British, Age 25-44)

“It was a brilliant experience. It was fulfilling. It makes you proud; it makes you happy; it was...just the whole thing, the whole experience was just brilliant. Everything was positive really. Every single day I was looking forward to going in. It was a huge positive experience!” (White British, Age 45-64)

“Yeah the feedback, the satisfaction, the feeling that you get are just incredible. I really enjoyed myself. It was just tremendous enjoyment!” (White British, Age 65-74)

“It was really a great experience, as I probably will not experience that again in my life-time. It is great! So in the future, no matter what I do, I can be proud to say that I was a London 2012 Games Maker!” (Non-British, Age 16-24)

b. Social benefits

The socially related benefits of volunteering ranked as the second noticeable dimension from a set of the benefits of volunteering for the Games, with some volunteers stating “meeting people from all over the world”, “community inclusion”, and having an opportunity to “share my experience”.

“I worked in a diverse team - people from all over the world. There was French guy, African guy, and Chinese girl. That actually was quite nice. I was just meeting so many different people from different countries, talking to them. You know meeting people coming from the countries that I never met before, like there were people from Albania, a lovely man, and two little children from Afghanistan. Also seeing famous people, sort of spotting famous people, ha-ha, I saw Chris Hoy, Jonathan Edwards. The Chief Executive of the Olympic Legacy company, Andrew something.” (White British, Age 45-64)

“I met some really wonderful people. Lots of different backgrounds and they were all coming to volunteer from different places, like one man from our team, he has been a torch bearer in Devon, and he told us all the volunteering he does in Devon. That is really interesting.” (White British, Age 65-74)
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“You can talk to anybody; you can talk to the police, talk to the army, talk to different nationalities. You are on the train to work or on the way home, you know, you see the other people with the Games Maker uniform, and you just talk to them. Even people in the street talked to me and said good luck, and thank you very much, and thank you for what you are doing. It was just...people's spirit got lifted, it was nice, and nearly everybody I talked to they really appreciated the job we were doing. One lady actually said to me that you made my day!” (White British, Age 45-64)

“It was also very nice that, apart from the uniform we were given the watch. You wearing it, you were sort giving a secret symbol, I am really one of you, you know, one of the Games Makers, just felt like a part of a huge community.” (White British, Age 45-64)

“I think it brought people together a lot. I really felt in a part of a tight community, like, even though, sort of 20 people in Excel working group on that shift. We really sort of formed the family. And then... I was working at the Dome. My last day there, they had basically a switch over, and they have to kick everything out and bring basketball in, cause that was in the following day. And it really felt like some sort of somebody stole our home. It was really weird like that. So, you know that was definitely positive of forming those relationships with people.” (White British, Age 25-44)

c. Personal development

Elements related to personal development that people gained from volunteering were also dominant in the interview responses, including “learning sporting knowledge and other skills”, “learning how to work in a diverse culture group”, “practicing things that I am good at”, and “boosting my confidence” (in particular for young people).

“Well, communication is a big thing. When I was working as a Game Maker, obviously I was interacting with spectators from all over the world. So Hindi is not my first language, but I got to converse to Hindi when people from India or from other country that is Hindi-speaking. Also I speak Spanish; I have got to speak to a lot of people from Spain or from Mexico. So yes, being able to communicate was a good skill that I got and put it into practice. Also...organising but also time-management, you know, we were working very early shifts, being on the other side of London, North London which is where I stayed, and travel to East London which is a hard journey, so organising and time-management.” (Non-White British, Age 25-44)

“You learned different skills....I was part of team where people came from different backgrounds; they came from different parts of the country. We all have different skills, but eventually you learned from each other and you find out that somebody does things in different ways to you. So you learned.” (Non-British, Age 45-64)
“I actually learned a lot more about some sports that I knew before. Because we used to get briefings as to what we were looking for, so sometimes, say the people from cycling or people from Marathon would come and talk to us about what volunteers needed to do. Sometimes, I interviewed people about sports that I knew nothing about. We had a bit of briefing that did actually help me quite lot about sport. Another benefit, about having been made redundant, that gave me confidence that I can still be doing something useful.” (White British, Age 45-64)

“I learned and practiced team work ability, which I believe is very important for a cross- culture background team. I also improved my communication skills, although we all spoke English, but because we came from different cultural backgrounds, there are some differences. I’ve learned a lot. Other things, for example, it helps to improve my English. I feel I understand more about English culture, and feel really involved with the society. London Games did a great job of promoting its own culture!” (Non-British, Age 16-24)

**The notion of inspiring a new generation**

The biggest ambition of hosting the London 2012 Games was to “inspire a generation” set by LOCOG. It is maybe too early to define whether this goal had been achieved and sustained. However, early evidence emerging from the interviews indicated some positive results and the means by which to achieve them.

In particular, a critical factor mentioned by the respondents who had children or grandchildren, or whose job was teaching, related to the intention of sharing the Games experience and further encouraging the next generation to do sports or volunteering, for example “I am going to explain to my kids this is what the Olympics is all about”, “telling my kids all sorts of this happened in London” and “showing all the pictures I took during the Games time, and telling them what sports they can compete”. It is worth of noting that the action of sharing experience may be particularly significant for the female respondents given traditional maternal role.

A British Games Maker (age of 65-74) who had four grandchildren was the most prominent example. As she indicated, her experience of the Games would be passed to her grandchildren. She created a Olympic album, hoping to use it to inspire the next generation of her family to do sports and volunteering.
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“I think the idea of inspiring a generation was a brilliant idea, because who knows I have two grandchildren who were born in 2012. Maybe they are the generation to be inspired. My family is sporty. What I have decided to do is... which is going to be the legacy for my grandchildren...is that to do an album. Like a presentation - to capture all my Olympic-related experience, pictures of me in uniform, cutting- articles in newspapers (metro, I read those everyday on the way to my working place), things like a torch bearer's photo who I am a friend with, my Olympic tickets picture, the thanking you letter from Davie Cameroon, my pins, little gifts from my Spanish Client, all the fantastic experience.[... ] I would like to encourage that generation to do sport!!” (White British, Age 45-64)

This particular case perhaps had its own uniqueness; however, it did indicate how the idea of inspiring a generation was leveraged in practice and provided some evidence of the Games’ legacy.

**Spreading volunteering spirit throughout communities**

As mentioned earlier, the importance of providing financial support to the local Games Makers was recognised by Inspire Leicestershire and some local authorities. Therefore, the Leicestershire Grant Scheme was initiated to support Leicestershire Games Makers. One of the reasons for doing so, which was emphasised by Inspire Leicestershire during the lobby process, was that those Games Makers were anticipated to carry their experience back to local communities. It was noticeable among a significant number of interviewees that they will continue volunteering for their communities and also promote volunteering in their local communities.

“I was just lucky to be selected as a Game Maker. I know that a plenty of people had applied but couldn't get the opportunity, I was very lucky to get that. Obviously, the added bonus was from the local authority to give me the funding, to make sure I have comfortable volunteering experience, which was out of my comfort zone. By saying that, I mean it was out of my city that I was going to volunteer in. So it will be very memorable. It is going to be something that I hope I will be able to share it with people from my community, and inspire them to also get into volunteering.” (Non-White British, Age 25-44)

“Because I have done quite a lot of volunteering now, I think I would more like to get the message out to people. I would like to show my children; let them understand the importance of it. And hopefully, it is getting pass on to their friends, and you know, just talking to people about it really. I think it is all about making people aware of what volunteering is all about, and why we need it, how good it can make you feel from helping people.” (Non-White British, Age 45-64)
Chapter 8 Case studies of Volunteering Legacy: the Sport Makers and Games Makers Programmes

For some respondents, the Games Maker experience had triggered their interests in volunteering for a sporting context.

“For me personally, I think it definitely inspired me to get involved in the future, involved in sporting volunteering.” (White British, Age 25-44)

“I think I would like to be able to help, or volunteer, within some kinds of sporting context. You know I have done volunteering in some football club, things like that. Now I feel passionate that something needs to be continued, really. Now I have a bit more time on my hand, so I can actually go to do some volunteering work somewhere.” (White British, Age 25-44)

The impact of the Grant Scheme

The importance of the Grant was recognised and appreciated by all the interview respondents. It was not only critical in terms of providing financial support (in particular to those who did not have incomes, e.g. students), but also was seen as local authorities’ acknowledgement of the contributions that Leicestershire Games Makers made to the Games (although all of the respondents indicating that they would still have finished the volunteering even without the Grant).

“I think the Grant meant a lot to me. I mean, it is all down to local authority supporting Games Makers; and because with that support, in this case is the funding support, we can then contribute to volunteering. Otherwise, we will have to try to sort that out by ourselves. But by giving us a grant, we will be confident to be able to volunteer.” (Non-White British, Age 25-44)

“The Grant means a lot for people who lived outside of London. I spoke lots of people about this, and I couldn't find anybody else had a grant from their local authorities. They overall were amazed that we can get some money from the council to help to do it. You know, so all credits to Leicestershire that they actually did something!”(White British, Age 45-64)

“I was pretty pleased that the local authorities were actually thought about us. […] I was surprised that how few people from Leicestershire involved within this (Games Makers). Even the ones that I know…. I mean, I only know through my sister that somebody else was a Games Maker, and I got a big family. So, you know, I was surprised that there were not that many people from outside of the London area that were volunteered. I suppose that, if the local authority would support more Leicestershire volunteers, we would have had more Leicestershire Games Makers.” (Non-White British, Age 45-64)
The Grant also made those volunteers feel valued and thus it had implications for motivating future volunteering activity.

“It (the grant) made a lot of difference! I received that money; and that money actually paid almost all the accommodation when I was in London. So it helped out immensely, really…. with the accommodation thing. It meant that I don't have to commute; it meant that I can go and enjoy the Games as well. You know, without being too sheltered from home, it helped greatly, really! I was very privilege to receive that. Actually, after received that money, it will then made me feel more inclined to do volunteer in my area. You know, if I get help…. I would certainly continue doing more voluntary work within the local area.” (White British, Age 25-44)

The volunteering journey: from the 2009 Leicester Special Olympics to London 2012

Among the twelve interviewees, three of them had volunteered for the 2009 Leicester Special Olympics. With an aim of identifying the impacts (if any) of the Special Games, in terms of motivation and satisfaction, on participating the London 2012 Olympic Games, related questions were designed and asked to those volunteers.

All of the three interviewees who volunteered for the Special Olympics reported that it was a great experience. Having had the experience of working with disabled people, it was very helpful for their voluntary work in the Olympic and Paralympic Games. In particular, it was identified by the interviewees that such ‘lovely’ experiences had boosted their confidence to volunteer for the Games; the skills they developed in the Special Olympics assisted their work in the London Games when servicing disabled people.

“The Special Olympics actually gave me the confidence to go to a bigger thing. I suppose, the Special Olympics in Leicester was quite big at the time. But having been part of that, [...] I think it gave me the confidence; if I can do that, why can't I go to something bigger. And I am really glad that I did it. I think if I haven't started the Special Olympics, I probably would not have done the London Games.” (White British, Age 65-74)

“The Special Olympics was my first sort of a major sporting event involvement. I enjoyed in the Special Olympics volunteering thing, so I am more confident to be a Paralympic Games Maker. As for the Special Olympics, I was with the Athletics. It was just lovely... lovely in a different way as well. People were just sweet....something like if they can jump off about two feet or something, they were so pleased with themselves when they had done their jump.” (White British, Age 45-64)
“Having done the Special Olympics, I learned quite a lot about people with disabilities, so I was quite pleased that I was on the Mobility Team for the 2012 Games, because the skills I learned from the Special Olympics, I practiced them and helped people with disabilities.” (White British, Age 45-64)

It is worth reporting here that the Special Olympics’ legacy, in terms of continuing volunteering to work with people with disabilities after the event, was evident in the interview. The description provided below is a Paralympic Games Maker’s experience who also volunteered for the Special Olympics.

“The Special Olympics have been held in Leicester twice - three years ago, and twenty years before that. We realised that there have been no legacy. Nothing new has happened in twenty years. And you just thought this is ridiculous. There are thousands of people that are out there with learning disabilities. And only about hundreds are taking part in sport. I mean there are sports going on in the Special schools, but not...once they have left school, it is very hard to access to more opportunities. So a group has got together, and decided that we wanted to offer more sporting opportunities to the people with learning disabilities. We set up a club for people with learning disability. It is a sporting club. And that has been running for nearly two years now. So I do that for every Thursday...it is called the Special Olympics Sport Club.” (White British, Age 65-74)

8.4 Analytic logic models of the two programmes

Sport Makers

A logic model for the Sport Makers programme is provided below (see Table 8.12), which presents the objectives, inputs, throughputs, outputs and outcomes of the programme. Evidence collected from the surveys suggested the following factors related to the underlying causal relationships between those elements of the logic model:

- There was a gap between the number of people who registered on the programme and those who actually attended the workshop. More attention should be paid to, e.g. identifying where the problems lay in the recruitment process, identifying the reasons behind it, and assisting participants to book in the future.
- The general feedback on the Sport Makers workshop was positive, with over 96% of participants finding ‘the event inspiring’, and 94% of respondents considering the workshops provided a clear instructions how to become a Sport Maker; However, low number of logging hours seemed to be a challenge, which needs further investigation;
• Given that participants showed strong interests in getting involved with the London 2012 Games related activities, more marketing input relating to the London 2012 message could have proved effective;

• Further work is needed to explore the volunteering experience, barriers to undertaking (or not undertaking) volunteer activity, and volunteers’ satisfaction, as evidenced in the literature that satisfying experience will lead to a sustainable volunteering behaviour (Cnaan & Goldberg-Glen, 1991).

Games Makers

As part of the evaluation for the Games Makers programme, a logic model was developed at the beginning of the process (see Table 8.13). In terms of further assessing the underlying assumptions between inputs, activities, outputs, and outcomes, evidence collected from interviews suggested the following factors:

• The nature of mega-event volunteering: the overall success of the Games Makers programme seemed promising; however, attentions should be paid to the nature of this particular type of volunteers: firstly, it was a specific single event. Games Makers weren’t asked to sign up as volunteers for ever. Being different from the traditional community engagement with open-ended commitments, people’s enthusiasm seemed relatively higher; secondly, as it was evident in the interviews that those Leicestershire Games Makers had already had some volunteering experience (in fact, a majority of them were highly committed to the community or club volunteering), it indicates that, for future mega-events which are hosted outside of Leicestershire, it might attract this type of volunteer but may be less effective in attracting new volunteers; thirdly, despite the glory associated with the Olympics ‘brand’, as for the volunteers who lived outside of the hosting region, any intention of volunteering for the Games was based on the premise of financial capability. Therefore, it suggests that, for future mega-events, financial support should be made available and centralised by the government or local authorities in order to involve more people from outside of the hosting city.

• Barriers to volunteering: In terms of the volunteers who come from non-host regions, two main challenges suggested by the respondents were related to finance and accommodation. The issue with money was in particular problematic for students
and retired people; in return, it perhaps explained why they had more appreciated for the Grant. In addition, a lack of support from LOCOG, in terms of centralising accommodation opportunities, was particularly addressed by the respondents.

- **More effective ways of engaging volunteers:** an important lesson learned from the Games Maker programme is an acknowledgement of the value of volunteers made by the programme practitioners and the press. Providing volunteers with a kind of personal identity, for example 'Games Makers', it seemed to facilitate them to be involved with and to shout about their experiences.

- **Grant scheme impact:** the contribution of the Grant Scheme to Leicestershire Games Maker was positively recognised and appreciated by the interviewees. The notion of appreciation of voluntary work was considered as important in terms of encouraging their participation in future volunteering activities. Therefore, sports clubs and NGBs are strongly advised to increase the recognition of volunteers by highlighting the significance of their volunteers. However, as the Grant Scheme was initiated and advertised when the gate of Games Maker application was closed. As a result, without knowing there would be some financial support offered by local authorities, potential Leicestershire Games Maker might be put off by the possible volunteering costs (in particular for young people). This suggests that if any early action could have been carried out, more volunteers perhaps would have volunteered for the Games.

- **Future direction of policy making:** a strong sense of pride and engagement that people experienced in the Games would have a significant implication for boosting motivation and excitement on future events. Therefore, a next step here is that local authorities and community agencies could ignite this raw spirit, and to deploy the vision of pride and engagement for long-term application.
Table 8.12 A logic model for the Sport Maker programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Inputs</th>
<th>Throughputs (Activities)</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vision: is to use the inspirational pull of London 2012 to recruit, train and deploy 40,000 new sports volunteers aged 16 years and over to make sport happen across the country.</td>
<td>Physical context: Leicestershire</td>
<td>Deployment:</td>
<td>• Number of potential volunteers participated in the inspiration workshops</td>
<td>Short term:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economic Context: £4m (for national) funded by the National Lottery; £45,216 (for LRS) for over the two years</td>
<td>• compiling a menu of voluntary opportunities to be promoted on Volunteer web, including one off events and ongoing opportunities Marketing/Promotion:</td>
<td>• Number of volunteers were recruited</td>
<td>• Participants had a positive and inspiring introduction to the world of sport volunteering, including basic knowledge and skills of being a volunteer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Political Context: Part of the ‘People’ strand of Sport England’s Mass Participation Legacy programme Places People Play</td>
<td>• Businesses involved in our Workplace Challenge.</td>
<td>• Number of volunteers were retained beyond 10 hours</td>
<td>• Participants gained knowledge of Olympic and Paralympic values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National Stakeholders:</td>
<td>Presentations at SDO Forum, NGB Forum, LSA Meetings, Colleges, Club, Coach &amp; Volunteer events.</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Programme participants feel part of the Olympic movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leader: Sport England Partners: BOA; LOCOG NGBs; CSPs; Local Authority Sports Development teams; Other local government partners and other national and county/sub – regional voluntary partners</td>
<td>• Sport Makers flyers to be available at all LRS events.</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Participants were supported to find local opportunities that suit them to increase participation in sport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional Stakeholders: Programme Leader Corporates: other LRS colleagues Loughborough University; Voluntary Action Leicestershire; Local Sport Alliances; Sports Volunteering Sub Group; NGBs; Inspire Leicestershire; Schools/Colleges; Local Business; Achievement Project</td>
<td>Delivery of Workshops:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Long term:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Organising and delivering a spread of 24 workshops across the county</td>
<td>• Number of workshops and conventions were organised</td>
<td>• Increased regional volunteering base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Organising and delivering conventions as part of a one day Sport Leadership Conference for young people aged 16-19.</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Legacy of the Games – inspiring them to carry on doing voluntary work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Monitoring:</td>
<td></td>
<td>• As a result of Sport Makers, people aged 16 + participate more in sport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• KPIs to be tracked and monitored via volunteerweb by CSP Sport Makers Lead Officer.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 8.13 A logic model for the Games Maker programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Inputs</th>
<th>Throughputs (Activities)</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aims (national):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- To recruit up to 70,000 volunteers from the UK to help the running of the Games</td>
<td><strong>Physical context:</strong> Leicestershire</td>
<td><strong>Preparation:</strong> Investigating any funding opportunities for supporting local Games Makers</td>
<td>Number of Leicestershire Games Makers</td>
<td><strong>Short term:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Economic Context:</strong> Inspire Leicestershire budget</td>
<td>Investigating any accommodation opportunities for supporting Leicestershire Games Makers</td>
<td>Number of Leicestershire Games Makers who were awarded for the Grant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Political Context:</strong> Inspire Leicestershire 2012 strategy</td>
<td><strong>Marketing/Promotion:</strong> Inspire Leicestershire website, e-newsletters, other social media marketing, e.g. Facebook.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>National Stakeholders:</strong> Leader: LOCOG</td>
<td>Games Maker fliers to be available at all local London 2012 related events.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Partners: McDonald’s (sponsor) GLA</td>
<td><strong>Major networking events:</strong> Pre-Games the Grant Scheme Award Celebration Event</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Regional Stakeholders:</strong> Leader: Inspire Leicestershire Partners: LRS Voluntary Action LeicesterShire Local authorities</td>
<td>After-Games ‘Our Games Our Legacy’ event with special guest Lord Sebastian Coe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aims (Leicestershire):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- To use the Games Maker opportunity to encourage people from Leicestershire to become involved in the Games</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- To investigate funding opportunities to support Leicestershire Games Makers</td>
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8.5 The impact of London 2012

Both the Sport Makers and Games Makers programmes were considered as additional legacy programmes as these interventions would not have taken place in the absence of the Games. However, due to the limitation of the available data both at national and sub-regional level, any output comparison analysis seems to be difficult and problematic. The following discussion is an attempt to at least raw some threads together.

In respect to the counterfactual scenario, as part of the Big Society agenda (HM Government, 2010), the activities and initiatives in relation to promoting volunteering would have happened anyway without the 2012 Games, but the specific Games volunteering programme, i.e. Games Makers, would not have gone ahead; and as for the Sport Makers programme would not have been in such large scale or as sport focused (Grant Thornton, Ecorys, & Centre for Olympic Studies and Research Loughborough University, 2012).

As a product of the London 2012 Games, the design of the Sport Makers programme had three tiers of implications. Firstly, through a continued involvement with community volunteering, Sport Makers may be maintained as a strong local volunteer base and this body of volunteers can ensure sustainable volunteering legacy at local level. Secondly, Sport Makers were expected to have a strong sporting impact as well because their volunteering work related to sport activities so that the grassroots level’s sport participation can be increased. Furthermore, by linking with Olympic and Paralympic values and Olympism, it was anticipated to generate a lasting educational benefit which sought to apply the educational value of good example and respect for universal fundamental ethical principles to normal life.

As the official Games volunteering programme, the underlying assumption of the Games Maker programme was that after volunteering for the London Games, those local volunteers would bring back their volunteering experience and stories to the community and subsequently raise the aspirations of volunteers in the sub-region. This was built on the lessons learned from the 2002 Manchester Commonwealth Games that individuals with prior volunteering experience are more likely to be willing to volunteer for another major (sporting) event (Downward & Ralston, 2006). In Leicestershire, as discussed above, the efforts of developing a local Games Makers Grant Scheme in order to support Leicestershire volunteers.
was unprecedented. Those supported volunteers were then expected to continue to support a variety of events for future events locally and nationally. In addition, the skills they developed through Games volunteering were thought to provide a lasting legacy for the sub-region.

The 2012 Games provided a significant increase in the supply of volunteering opportunities (although which were largely temporary in nature). In Leicestershire, there were estimated over 150 local people who volunteered for the Games65; and Leicestershire Games Makers from the interview sample contributed around 1500 hours in total of volunteering to the Games. With regard to the Sport Makers programme, there were 561 people from Leicestershire and Rutland had registered on the programme, of whom 73 had been deployed for 10 hours or more voluntary work (this compared with a regional average of 6000 and 800 respectively66).

In addition, as outlined in Chapter 2, a number of local volunteering programmes were created to support the London 2012 activities in Leicestershire, notably the Medal Makers programme for the Loughborough Pre-Games Training Camps and the Torch Relays, which provided a significant number of volunteer opportunities.

Although these two volunteering programmes finished before or in 2013, the sustainability of volunteering behaviour, in particular, for the major events, such as Glasgow 2014, was evident in the Games Makers programme evaluation. It was also acknowledged by the sub-regional stakeholders that the increased interest in volunteering was positive. This was due to the increase in the profile of volunteering that was generated as a result of the media coverage at the national level and recognition given to Games Makers at the local level. Thus as stakeholders noted the next step for the sector in Leicestershire would be to ensure more volunteering opportunities are available (and the promotion and marketing message should be made to link with the concept of ‘2012 volunteer success’); moreover, partners should work closely together, and get ready to deploy this pool of potential volunteers.

In terms of assessing the net impact of the programmes, firstly, the failure of the Sport Makers programme to recruit the priority groups was evident in the data, which were in two senses: firstly, although the programme’s objective was to ‘be fully inclusive and target

65 No data was available on the number of Games Makers from the East Midlands and other non-hosting regions.
participants including people who have a disability, both males and females and participants from BME group” (Sport England, 2011b: 11), collected evidence indicated most of the surveyed participants were still male, White-British, and without disabilities. Thus, in fact, a large number of the ‘non-targeted’ participants benefited from the programme. Secondly, as mentioned above, the Sport Maker programme was initially aimed to recruit new volunteers who had no previous volunteering experience. However, this target was later relaxed to any volunteers who had not been involved in this type of activity before. Although there was no written evidence from the national programme practitioners as to why the change occurred. One possible explanation, as suggested by the sub-regional programme leader, was that it proved to be difficult to recruit new volunteers and it was not reasonable to restrict all the other participants by this criterion. In addition, the issue of displacement may also exist in the case of Sport Makers, given that sporting volunteering is a major part of the Big Society policy (Taylor, Panagouleas, & Nichols, 2012), other volunteering programmes would have taken place had the Games not gone ahead. The issue of substitution was not much associated with the Sport Makers programme67; but there was a certain degree of substitution in the Games Makers programme, as it was evident from the data that volunteers had to stop their usual community volunteering activities in order to fulfil their roles during the Games. Again, further assessing multiplier effects is difficult and requires a long-term evaluation due to for instance it is still not clear yet whether the developed personal skills would have benefited individuals in terms of assessing employment.

8.6 Realist evaluation

Table 8.14 summarises findings from the two volunteering-legacy programmes, using matrices of Context-Mechanism-Outcome (CMO) configurations to draw together the key conclusions across the interviews and surveys reflecting upon the implementation of the programmes to different types of volunteers.

The hypothesis outlined in CMO was that, depending on the nature of volunteering activities (i.e. Type 1 – volunteering for the Olympic and Paralympic Games, in this case were those Games Makers; Type 2 – volunteering for Olympic-related sporting programmes, in this case were those Sport Makers), volunteers reacted variously and thus generated different outcomes.

67 However, there may be an issue of double counting as participants of Sport Makers might also have signed up to the other local volunteering programme, e.g. Medal Makers.
For the Type 1 volunteers, a significant rationale for becoming an official Games volunteers was that they can directly be part of the Games, and can have first-hand experience of the Games atmosphere. While the glamour of being a Games volunteer certainly appealed to a large number of people, barriers however did exist and might restrict people’s participations, e.g. a relatively long and complex application process, intensive working hours within a short period (which may result in taking days off from work), and being restricted by the geographic living location (that for people outside of London who failed to find or afford accommodations would prevent them from volunteering). In comparison to the Type 2 volunteers, engaging with an Olympic-related sporting programme seemed rather easier, in terms of being flexible with volunteering time and location. Although becoming Olympic-related sporting volunteers were not the same as those who were the official Games volunteers, the fact that the Sport Makers programme was explicitly linked with the London 2012 Games still offered participants a sense of being part of the Games, which seemed to attract participants who had a motive of being Games-related volunteers.

Both types of volunteering programmes provided trainings sessions (in various degrees) and the Olympic and Paralympic values educational sessions to the participants in order to assist their voluntary work. A major difference between these two types of volunteers, in terms of the operational process, was that, as for the Games Makers, the potential volunteers were carefully screened and matched to the roles that suited them best and made the most of their skills and personalities; whereas those Sport Makers can either organise their own sporting activities and volunteering for their friends and families or be signposted to local events where volunteers were needed. With regard to the latter scenario, the operational practitioners of some community volunteer programmes often ‘satisfice’ with anyone who steps forward, rather than attracting and deploying the ‘right’ people who can volunteer for the ‘right’ job. A possible implication may be that an unsatisfactory experience would influence their future volunteering action. Therefore, actions can be taken to focus on improving the effectiveness and quality of volunteering recruitment, rather than quantity.

In terms of outcomes, a locally-based volunteering programme was more likely to attract first-time volunteers, than the official Games volunteering programme. A possible explanation was that, in the context of non-hosting areas, going out of their ‘comfort’ zone (geographically) may be regarded as ‘daunting’ for people who had no volunteering
experience. Thus any previous volunteering experience would have helped to prepare people from outside of London to go ahead to volunteer for the Games. It was therefore the Sport Makers programme seemed to be more appealing to people with no volunteering experience and living in a non-hosting region (e.g. Leicestershire) and yet would like to be involved with the Games in some ways.

The collected evidence for both of the programmes indicated a general personal development as result of volunteering among participants, e.g. learning sporting knowledge and the values’, ‘boosting confidence’ and other social skills. While ultimate goal of the both programmes was to encourage and enable people to being involved with future volunteering and sporting activities, and to play a more active part in society, evidence gathered from the Games Makers programme suggested that, building on the experience of the 2009 Leicester Special Olympic Games, there was a continuity of volunteering behaviour (in particular volunteering for disable people). However, there was a lack of evidence for predicting future volunteering behaviour for the Sport Makers programme participants.
## Table 8.14 CMO for the volunteering-legacy programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contexts</th>
<th>Mechanisms</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **The volunteers for the Olympic and Paralympic Games** | • LOCOG provided a series of training sessions;  
• ‘Games Maker’ as a personal identity was promoted heavily, providing with uniform, team badge, Games souvenir, a thanks letter from Prime Minister, etc.;  
• Volunteers were assigned to specific roles based on their personal skills and experience;  
• Leicestershire provided financial support to local volunteers;  
• Local Games Makers were invited to give a speech in schools;  
• Inspire Leicestershire organised celebration events and extra marketing promotion to raise awareness of, and interest in, volunteering. | • Gaining knowledge of the 2012 Games and the Olympic and Paralympic values;  
• The enjoyment and achievements benefits;  
• Personal development (e.g. customer service skills, knowledge of working with disables);  
• Bringing personal experience and stories back to the community and raise aspiration of volunteers;  
• Continuing volunteering for future mega events;  
• Using the Games to create a pool of volunteers. |
| **The sport volunteers for the Olympic-related programme** | • LRS worked with local authorities to deliver the training workshops and to deploy volunteering opportunities;  
• Inspire Leicestershire cooperatively worked together to promote the programme and to identify volunteering opportunities;  
• ‘London 2012’ branding seemed work relatively effectively on attracting participants particularly first-time volunteers;  
• Incentives (e.g. free t-shirt);  
• Linking with other local volunteering programmes (e.g. Medal Makers). | • Gaining knowledge of the Olympic and Paralympic values;  
• A relatively higher number of sign-up from non-volunteering experience group;  
• Personal development (e.g. boosting confidence, teamwork skills and other social skills);  
• Increasing local sport participation level;  
• Using the Games to create a pool of volunteers to promote and support increased participation. |
8.7 Conclusion

The 2012 Games provided an increase in the number of volunteering opportunities that built capacity within the voluntary sector for Leicestershire. In terms of the Sport Maker programme, although the evaluation was undertaken at an early stage, the key indicators and responses to the surveys suggested a good performance of Leicestershire in Year One. It may be too early to draw a conclusion as to whether or not Sport Maker had successfully created any London 2012 volunteering legacy. Nevertheless, the assumptions and logical trends underlying the analytic logic model for Sport Maker indicated there was a great possibility that the programme had made contributions towards embedding 2012 legacy planning into the work of CSPs across the country.

Overall, it was evident that the design of Sport Maker in terms of carefully targeting and recruiting potential volunteers was successful, as the motivation dimensions of Love of Sport and Olympics related scored highly. The results of the surveys were also positive, with over 94% of respondents enjoying the workshop, being inspired by the workshop, and stating an intention to become a volunteer in sport. The examination of the voluntary motivation factors revealed that information on volunteers’ motives was important and that practitioners can therefore make an effort to ensure satisfactory experiences for volunteers according to their different motivations; but it was also useful to help stakeholders’ policy decision-making regarding recruitment, training, and trying to sustain the volunteering base.

However, LRS had encountered a problem of getting Sport Makers to log volunteering hours. In regards to this challenge, the feedback from key stakeholders suggests that volunteers often finish volunteering work but feel reluctant to record it. Although it should be stressed that it is still in the comparatively early stages of the programme and more volunteering hours are expected, this particular challenge could possibly be explained as that, due to its nature, voluntary work seems to be ‘altruistic’ and ‘not seeking for any forms of ‘pay-back’. Those Sport Makers thus may perceive logging their voluntary work as a way of ‘showing off’. It thus might suggest a possible programme design failure. Certainly, further qualitative evidence was needed in order to explore constraints and reasons for lower logging hours.
With regard to the Games Maker programme evaluation, the frequently reported satisfaction from volunteering for the Games was related to the psychological gains and social factors, e.g. enjoyment, pride, and meeting new people and having a great time.

The flickering of a national spirit, the value of Games Makers towards community inclusion, and possible future volunteering legacy were also evident from the qualitative data analysis. In addition, the importance of the grant was recognised and appreciated by the interviewees. Some evidence also supported the assumption that volunteering for the 2009 Special Olympics had positively impacted on motivating and encouraging people to take up event volunteering work with the disabled.

The next chapter provides a summary of the lessons learned from the London 2012 Games in terms of policy making and activities delivering in Leicestershire.

This chapter aims to address the implications of the Leicestershire 2012 legacy programme in practice for the key stakeholders in the following two ways: firstly, in order to identify the uniqueness of the Leicestershire 2012 legacy programme, a review of the end of Games reports of each regions was conducted to establish a summary of the 2012 activities delivered at the regional level across the England. Secondly, as requested by the sponsors, a number of normative recommendations, observations, and emerged challenges, on the basis of the evidence analysis and key stakeholder interviews, were identified to inform policy and to support policy makers to build on the success of the Games by putting the lessons learned from leveraging the Games to the best possible effect in leveraging other major projects in the future.

9.1 2012 legacy programmes across the England

At the national level, there is a study of the impact and legacy of the London 2012 Games, i.e. a meta-evaluation of the London 2012 Games, commissioned by DCMS, that seeks to evaluate and synthesise the results of the evaluations of individual initiatives/programmes which are related to London 2012 Games\(^{68}\).

Activities at the regional level were largely organised and led by the Regional Development Agencies (RDAs) which were responsible for developing their own plans based on local needs and priorities. By reviewing the London 2012 strategies and the end of Games reports of each regions, and scanning through the RDAs’ websites, a summary of a range of planned activities, the length of each project, respectively evaluation action (if any), and whether or not, similar to Inspire Leicestershire, a specific sub-regional London 2012 programme existed in other sub-regions, is presented in the table below, which provides a summary and comparison of the 2012 activities delivered at the regional level across the England.

---

\(^{68}\) Related reports available to download at [http://www.culture.gov.uk/what_we_do/research_and_statistics/7605.aspx](http://www.culture.gov.uk/what_we_do/research_and_statistics/7605.aspx)
### Table 9.1 London 2012 activities at regional level and its progress

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regions</th>
<th>Olympic and Paralympic venues</th>
<th>Evaluation studies planned</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Project Length</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Sub-regional specific action for 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>South East</strong></td>
<td>3 venues (Rowing and Canoeing and Paralympic Rowing at Eton Dorney, Road Cycle and Time Trials in Surrey, and Paralympic Road Cycling at Brands Hatch)</td>
<td><strong>Triple Gold</strong> strategy (organised by the South East England Development Agency, and South East Partnership)</td>
<td>This regional strategy focused on four core areas: economic, social, sport and access (accessible region). The strategy was set to deliver an economic, social and sport legacy from the London 2012 Games for the region.</td>
<td>2006 – Sep 2012</td>
<td>Regional: The final report was published in June 2012. Sub regional: only annual report 2010-2011 is available</td>
<td>A West Sussex Coordinator for the 2012 Games (from 2005– March 2013) A website &amp; 4 training campuses Action Plan: <em>West Sussex–Ahead of the Game</em>, aiming to: Increase participation in sport and physical activity; to increase involvement in cultural activities; to enhance visitor economy; to enhance business and skills; to offer more opportunities for young people; to increase international links; to improve transport infrastructure; to enhance profile and image.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Accentuate</strong> (a Legacy Trust UK funded project)</td>
<td>A culture programme of 15 projects that required individual projects to have their own monitoring and evaluation plans in place.</td>
<td>Dec 2009 – End 2012</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>South West</strong></td>
<td>Sailing venues in Weymouth and Portland</td>
<td><strong>Team South West</strong> – ‘South West England Legacy Strategy for the 2012 Games’ (2007) (encompasses the South West England Board for the 2012 Games, the South West England Operations Groups for the 2012 Games, the County Working Groups and RELAYS)</td>
<td>It focused on 5 core themes: Business Development; Tourism and Regional Image; Sporting Opportunity; Cultural Celebration; Community Engagement. The key objectives included to communicate opportunities for engagement with London 2012 and promote regional successes; to provide a single point of contact for London 2012 in the region plus providing operational support and strategic coordination; to contribute towards a community legacy through engagement and partnership working with stakeholders.</td>
<td>early 2006 - Sep 2012</td>
<td>An end of the Games Report published in Oct 2012.</td>
<td>A Dorset 2012 Games Legacy Manager post (part-funded by Team South West) from 2007-2012. A website (embedded under the councils information web) &amp; sailing events The objectives were to: 1. Contribute to UK Resilience preparations by compiling a UK calendar of events for the South West region for the period 1 April 2012 – 30 September 2012; 2. Consider resolution of any conflicts revealed by the compilation of the UK Calendar with local partners and relevant authorities; 3. Monitor venue/city operations planning in Weymouth &amp; Portland and Dorset and provide assistance where required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of England</td>
<td>RELAYS (A Legacy Trust UK funded project)</td>
<td>Regional Educational Legacy in Arts and Youth Sport (RELAYS) was led by Universities South West and delivered through 11 of the region's universities as well as external project partners. The final report published on Jan 2013</td>
<td>2008-Dec 2012</td>
<td>A final evaluation report published in Jan 2013.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of England 2012 Games Impact Study (conducted by Grant Thornton, Torkildsen Barclay and the Christel DeHaan Tourism and Travel Research Institute)</td>
<td>The Power of Possibilities – regional strategy for 2012 (2008). This region was one of the few regions that undertook a full impact evaluation study ahead of the Games to provide an evidence base for its work. However with the removal of the Regional Development Agencies a body no longer exists to undertake a final evaluation to identify the resulting impact from the Games to compare with the estimations made in 2006.</td>
<td>The regional vision stated that: The East of England will rise to the challenge of the London 2012 Games by creating a sustainable legacy that extends far beyond the sporting landscape including: Economic development and regeneration; skills and employment; Education; Tourism; Culture; Health and wellbeing.</td>
<td>2005 – Sep 2012</td>
<td>An end of the Games Report published in June 2012.</td>
<td>An Essex Legacy Team (2006 - ?) A website Two Olympic venues No independent evaluation The Essex 2012 Legacy team is based at Essex County Council and is working to meet the following objectives: Increasing Physical Activity and Sports Participation levels (including closer alignment to local and national health initiatives); Pre Games Training Camps: leveraging Essex’s existing infrastructure; Delivering a successful Cultural Olympiad Extending London 2012 Games as a tool to impact on tourism in Essex; Maximising the Economic Impact of the 2012 Games in Essex; Promoting skills development in Essex’s businesses and workforce; Supporting Volunteers; Supporting Learning &amp; Development;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1 pre-training campus;
An independent evaluation conducted by Loughborough University
Inspire Leicestershire strategy and quarterly monitoring |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Igniting Ambition programme (a Legacy Trust UK funded project)</td>
<td>This programme was the Cultural Olympiad programme funded by Legacy Trust UK. It focused on supporting emerging talent and celebrating internationalism and cultural diversity.</td>
<td>2008-2012</td>
<td>An independent four phases of evaluation was conducted by Focus Consultants.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| West Midlands | One Olympic venue – Coventry football stadium | Prepare for 2012 – a West Midlands regional plan for London 2012(2009) | The West Midlands vision is to raise the profile of the region and deliver an Olympic moment for everyone in the West Midlands. The identified five central themes were: Business and skills; Culture; Sport and Health; Tourism and regional image; Volunteering. | N/A | End of the Games report is not accessible | A Coventry City Operations Manager for 2012 Games post, (2006 – May 2011)
A website
No evaluation report available
The Coventry and Warwickshire Partnership for the 2012 Games was a combination of private, public and voluntary organisations working together to maximise the opportunities around the London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games. The |
Partnership involved the key organisations across the sub-region and was established to ensure that Coventry & Warwickshire derives real benefits before, during and after the Games, by providing leadership and identifying tangible opportunities to contribute to making the 2012 Games a real success.

Focusing on maximising the opportunities around the key areas of Sport, Culture, Business, Tourism, Education and Pre-Games Training Camps.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>North East</th>
<th>Cultural Olympiad in West Midlands (a Legacy Trust UK funded project)</th>
<th>West Midlands cultural organisations led this project via the following programmes: London 2012 Festival, Artists Taking the Lead, Dancing for the Games, Community Games, Inspire, London 2012 Open Weekend.</th>
<th>2008-2012</th>
<th>An evaluation of the impact of the programme report was published in Nov 2012</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td>Play your part – a plan for London 2012 (2009)</td>
<td>This plan focused on three themes – participation, transformation and excellence – and comprised the following eight themes with associated ownership by the key partners on the Regional Management Board: Sport, Business, Tourism, Pre-Games Training Camps, Volunteering, Children and young people, Health and Culture.</td>
<td>2009-2012</td>
<td>End of the Games report is not accessible</td>
<td>Football related activities were led by Newcastle City Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td>Generation 2012 (a Legacy Trust UK funded project)</td>
<td>This was a £1.53 million Legacy Trust funded project that provided the opportunity for North East cultural organisations and young people to work together to develop high quality and aspirational projects which celebrate the 2012 Games.</td>
<td>2008-2012</td>
<td>A report was published in Aug 2011</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| North West | **One Olympic venue – Manchester Old Trafford football stadium** | **Be Inspired – the North West Legacy Framework for 2012 Games (2007 and updated in 2009)** | This regional framework focused on six areas: sport & physical activity; business; cultural Olympiad; tourism; major events; skills and volunteering:  
- The North West Steering Group for 2012 Games aimed to achieve the following objectives:  
  1. To stage an inspirational Olympic Games and Paralympic Games for the athletes, the Olympic Family and the viewing public.  
  2. To deliver the Olympic Park and all venues on time, within agreed budget and to specification, minimising the call on public funds and providing for a sustainable legacy.  
  3. To maximise the economic, social, health and environmental benefits the Games bring to the UK and all sections of the UK population.  
- No formal evaluation of the North West Legacy Programme as a whole. | Every sub-region all had their own sub-regional steering groups for the London 2012 Games which were chaired by the sub-regional representatives on the North West Steering Group.  
- An interim London 2012 Coordinator post was appointed at **Cheshire and Warrington** (2009-May 2010). The sub-regional Steering Group was established in 2007 and led to produce a legacy strategy ‘Embrace the Games’ (2008) (focusing on Cultural Olympiad, Sport and PA, visitor economy, Business opportunity). It has its own website. A case study of reviewing of legacy planning and strategy for London 2012 in Cheshire and Warrington was conducted by MMU (this study is not available).  
- **Lancashire** secured a part time resource through Lancashire County Council (2011);  
- **Great Manchester**: Stockport Council and Hyndburn Leisure employed full time posts to capitalise on opportunities of the Games; and Manchester City Council and Trafford Council also employed London 2012 Coordinators who had a major focus on the Olympic Football operations as well as legacy. |  |
| North West | **WE PLAY (a Legacy Trust UK funded project)** | | This was a £3.02 million investment from the Legacy Trust UK in cultural activities. It included the following four projects:  
- Abandon Normal Devices Festival;  
- Blaze;  
- Lakes Alive;  
- WE PLAY Expo | 2008-2012 | N/A | N/A |
| Yorkshire and Humber | No venue | **Yorkshire Gold** – a regional London 2012 plan (2009) | The Skills, Employability and Educations (SEE) for the 2012 Games Core group and Network was responsible for engaging and inspire Yorkshire and Humber people, focusing on Sport and PA; Business; Tourism; Community; and Culture. | 2007-2012 | Only an interim evaluation report, conducted by Skyblue Research, was published in Sep 2009. | N/A |
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The above matrix was intended to map out the legacy activity taking place across nine English regions, in order to firstly highlight the particular areas of legacy focus in each of the regions; secondly, to evaluate the uniqueness of the existence of Inspire Leicestershire in terms of the effects of leveraging the London 2012 impacts, in comparison with other regions.

As can be seen from Table 9.1, the East Midlands was one of only two regions (the other being the Yorkshire and Humberside Region) that did not have any London 2012 Olympics or Paralympic venues. The overall achievement of leveraging London 2012 benefits for the East Midlands, in particular for Leicestershire, was significant in terms of retaining top position within the region in some key performance indicators of different London 2012 programmes/initiatives (e.g. the highest number of total business contract wins; the highest percentage of schools which applied to Get Set; the highest number of participants who were retained in the Sportivate programme after the first year of the implementation of the programme).

The Leicestershire Legacy Programme was distinctive in its own right, in terms of its operational structure and the broadness of its activities. Although some other sub-regions had planned and delivered London 2012 activities, to various degrees, this proved to be either a single manager’s post, or team capacity in support of the running of the Olympic events. Indeed, Leicestershire’s uniqueness, as a non-hosting sub-region, came in the fact that, first of all, its London 2012 vision and strategy were planned at an early stage, together with establishing a small dedicated legacy team with human capacity and resources to commit to delivering 2012 related activities; secondly, KPIs were monitored and reported on a quarterly basis to the Leicestershire 2012 Steering Group, and in addition an external research study was commissioned for evaluating its overall impacts/legacies of the Games for Leicestershire.

9.2 The development of the policy progress of London 2012 and lessons learned

As addressed in the Chapter 1, the London 2012 Games hosting in the UK offered a significant opportunity, in the context of evaluation the impact and legacy of sporting mega events, for gathering empirical evidence and establishing lessons learned for planning and delivering future events.
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The Leicestershire 2012 Steering Group had a goal of maximising the benefits for Leicestershire arising from London hosting the 2012 Games. With the three years of the running of the steering group, while the uniqueness and the success of the legacy programme had been illustrated from a number of legacy areas as discussed above, there were several areas in relation to the policy making process and policy implementation that are worth highlighting. Thus the following discussion aims to identify emerging behaviour patterns of the key agencies within the steering group based on the interviews conducted with the key stakeholders.

a. Strategy design and building the operational group

An early plan to have a steering group for maximising the benefits of London 2012 Games for Leicestershire was forged right after the bid announcement. This incorporated a group of core people who were highly motivated and actively brought partners together, which attracted buy-in from key regional public agencies at an early stage. A clear vision and fundamental strategies were developed and shared with the funding partners. However, for a number of the objectives and remits within the policy structure developed by the Steering Group, it proved difficult to engage strand leaders because of the lack of consultation and the subsequent absence of consensus on key goals.

A small dedicated legacy team was established with human capacity and resources to commit to delivering 2012 related activities, developing ‘home-grown’ 2012 campaigns, e.g. My Games My Legacy. This capacity was unique to the sub-region within the region and within other non-hosting regions. This provided more legacy outcomes for the City and County.

b. Partnership working

It was recognised by the key stakeholders that London 2012 offered a great opportunity for practicing partnership working between relevant public and other sector organisations towards a common goal. Stakeholders also indicated that the improved partnership working helped to improve or establish relationships between those organisations.

During the legacy process, in particular just before the 2012 Games commenced, Leicestershire 2012 partnership collaboration within the Steering Group had been intensified, and programmes within some strands were given greater exposure generating significant
success (e.g. the Workplace Challenge, Sportivate, regional Inspire Mark programmes, Cultural Olympiad);

In addition, it was a common view among those consulted for this study that, through coordinating effort and partnership, the process of maximising London 2012 benefits had raised the profile of Leicestershire, the sub-region and the nation; and created a positive image of the county. This helped to move sport up the agenda in a period of economic recession.

However, partnership working proved to be challenging in a number of cases. For instance, at the early stage of the legacy process, several strand leaders expressed confusion as to the role they should play in the development of the Leicestershire 2012 Legacy activities. With existing capacity and funding resources, it was difficult to join up the work undertaken on a daily basis and the London 2012 new initiatives.

In addition, tension and conflicts between the strands and between various bodies (in terms of e.g. claiming kudos) resulted in lack of cooperation between key leaders or partners, and thus less effective use of local resources, generating fewer benefits from London 2012-related activities. The issue of disparity between the city and the county, in terms of the different degree of the engagement and commitment, was also identified in the interviews.

Nevertheless, the collaboration and partnership working built over time, and the established relationships may enhance the likelihood and effectiveness of future partnership work. The experience should help to position partners to benefit more effectively from future events

c. **Unpredictable changes in the political and economic context**

Since the general election in 2010, the change of government structure at the national and regional level challenged the delivery of legacy activities in particular for business activities. In addition, as the result of funding cuts and staff redundancies, key partners rearranged their priorities, and thus the importance of London 2012 activities was downgraded on their agenda, which perhaps explained the lack of commitment and contribution from some legacy strands (e.g. health and wellbeing, and volunteering).
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The Steering Group reacted to those changes by adjusting strategic priorities. While seven strands were initially identified, strategies and priorities were evolved during the delivery process, with the result that there was an increasing focus on those activities/themes which attracted greater commitment from interested partners, and/or which were more likely to generate the most benefits with the given resource. In addition, the funding for the overall Leicestershire 2012 programme was secured before the funding cut in the public sector, which minimised the risk of termination of the Inspire Leicestershire initiative. However, a certain degree of funding uncertainty still existed which caused significant concerns, particularly about employment among the operational practitioners.

**d. The influences of the Games**

There were three factors which emerged from the legacy process that were worth noting, as they reflected the fact that policy planning and decision making could be positively/negatively influenced by the nature and development of the event. Firstly, the success of the London 2012 Game positively stimulated the country: the excellent performance of Team GB and Games Makers had increased people’s enthusiasm about the Games, which provided a potential boost for sport and volunteering across the nation and sub-region. Thus, with the same kind and amount of inputs, the overall achieved impacts and legacy of the Games (in particular relating to intangible effects) might have exceeded original targets.

Secondly, at the beginning of the policy process, it was beyond sub-regional stakeholders’ knowledge to recognise that, there were a series of rules and conditions associated with the Olympic and Paralympic Games that would limit the opportunities for marketing and promotion activities. For instance, due to the strict London 2012 business related data and branding protection rules, Leicestershire local businesses could not highlight their success and to further encourage more businesses to take in part before the Games. Therefore, early research of the features of any future event itself would be necessary.

In addition, the sustainability of the legacy of the Games became an issue because of lack of funding, which directly influenced, e.g. the length of existence of Inspire Leicestershire, and thus it became difficult to keep a pool of talents which had been developed during the process. Thus, it is crucial for preparing appropriate funding during the legacy process if there are some long-term objectives need to be achieved.
e. Mechanisms for building up and spreading the legacy outcomes of the Games

During the delivery process, the value of having Inspire Leicestershire gradually became clearly evident, in particular in contributing to raising the profile of the sub-region, PR management, hosting landmark showcase events, providing high quality print and broadcast media coverage, facilitating communication and decision making among partners (in cases such as the Torch Relay Dress Rehearsal and celebration event, and the Games Maker Grant).

Having a group of dedicated champions with experience, knowledge of and commitment to particular areas of work relevant to the themes, proved to be critical in terms of providing strong leadership roles on supporting and encouraging other operational practitioners to deliver 2012 related activities, e.g. the success of the Get Set programme.

In addition, it was recognised as important among the key stakeholders to secure independent research to evaluate the impacts of the various elements of the project, in order to provide a potential evidence base for policy analysis relevant to the staging of future events. For pragmatic reasons the evaluation had to be completed shortly after the Games finished. However given there are still many legacy benefits and impacts which had not at that point yet surfaced, long-term legacy evaluation research is still needed.

Thus the above observations allow us to draw some conclusions about lessons learned from the Leicestershire 2012 Legacy experience.

**Lesson 1**: At an early stage of the creation of the Steering Group, a reduced number of strategic foci would have been likely to reduce the number of conflicts existing in relation to priorities across different strands. Thus fewer foci will allow greater concentration and be more likely to lead to tangible outcomes.

**Lesson 2**: Feedback from some stakeholders on the strategic document suggested that it was ambiguous, relatively irrelevant to stakeholders’ interests, and should have been more operational. It perhaps would have been preferable firstly to consult key operational leaders, to identify the key linkages between the nature of the event (in this case is London 2012 Olympics) and different agencies’ policy priorities. Key stakeholders should be fully engaged throughout the planning from an early stage, to make sure that a shared understanding of the possible potential benefits and actions between the department and delivery partners can be
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achieved. Such an approach would have been seen to be more likely to result in a detailed strategic document, with relevant operational targets and measurement indicators.

**Lesson 3:** The life cycle of Inspire Leicestershire took place across a particularly turbulent period in economic, political, and social term (recession, change of central government, London riots). The ability to revisit priorities in the strategy to reflect changing context would have been further facilitated if a mixed-scanning approach (Etzioni, 1967) to planning had been adopted, with strategic goals being revisited periodically and confirmed, amended or revised.

**Lesson 4:** There may be a danger that legacy gains will be lost unless the organisations or stakeholders involved continue to leverage the legacy that the Games had made. One of the means of communication may be adopted would be web-based information and forum resources promoted through email contact to e.g. individuals who had volunteered or participated in legacy initiatives. Spaces for telling ‘stories’ of the Games, ‘forums for participants’, and ‘information pages’ about future opportunities could be effective media.

**Lesson 5:** Making the most of the London 2012 Games for Leicestershire requires concrete legacy plans for long-term benefits. Improved working relationships between sub-regional and regional partners were created up to 2012. This should be capitalised upon as a basis for future projects. In order to use the unique experience and skills gained from the Olympics, to inform the development of the Leicestershire local authorities and key partners’ thinking regarding the legacy of the Games, it is important to set up detailed plans on, e.g. bidding for hosting of major showcase events, ensuring more volunteering opportunities to be identified to make a better use of the volunteering base.

**Lesson 6:** The success of maximising the benefits of London hosting the Games has raised the potential for sport, cultural and social prospects for Leicestershire. At the national level, in order to sustain the legacy of the Games, the government has been working on attracting over 70 international major sporting events (referred to as the ‘Gold Event Series’ strategy) to the UK. It means that sporting organisations and local authorities should be prepared and start to plan ahead for maximising the benefits (economic, sporting and social) of the UK staging the upcoming events, to continue the momentum generated by London 2012 at the sub-regional level. In addition, long-term benefits of the Games are worth evaluating to provide
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an evidence-base for policy analysis in the future event, and acting as a benchmark for other regions.

9.3 Conclusion

Although the analysis of the practical outcomes of the Leicestershire 2012 legacy programme was not a normal exercise for a PhD study, it was requested by the sponsors to identify the uniqueness of the programme, and to summarise any lessons learned for future events in the sub-region. In addition, it proved to be a useful practice in terms of directly informing policy provided by the independent researcher.
Chapter 10: Conclusion

The findings from the four case studies showed that the London 2012 Games had impacted on the changed outcomes (in terms of increasing sport participation among WCP participants, a number of changes and improvements in students’ attitudes and sporting behaviours through Get Set, and the possible future volunteering actions after the positive experience gained from Games Makers) for Leicestershire. In summary, the Games were likely to have contributed to these positive results in two ways: first, the Games provided an inspirational and motivational effect, which boosted people’s enthusiasm for e.g. sport and culture events participation; secondly, as a result of significant investment in the Games, a number of legacy programmes/initiatives were developed (e.g. Get Set, Games Makers), which have provided a range of opportunities for Leicestershire citizens to take part. However, it does not mean that by following the same pattern would generate similar outcomes in other sub-regions, regions, or the next Olympics, as we have emphasised throughout the thesis that different contexts produce different outcomes, for example, the motivational factor of the Games would perhaps weaken if the Team GB did not finishing third place in the medal table. Thus people’s enthusiasm on sport participation would probably not be brought up to a great deal.

This final chapter has two principal sections. In the first section, it considers the state of legacy both in terms of legacy development (at the national and sub-regional levels) and legacy research. The insights provided by the empirical data analysis in Chapters 6 – 8, and the review of the literature in relation to Olympic legacy evaluation in Chapter 4, help to guide the analysis in this respect. Here, a particular emphasis is given to evaluating the usefulness of the realist evaluation framework.

Analysis in the second section centres on the analysis of the contribution to knowledge, methodological limitations, and identifying potential future research. It also concerns, by referring to the theoretical and/or methodological insights set out in Chapter 3, how these insights have been incorporated into the analysis of the data.

It is worth recalling the five objectives of this research study here, before expanding the discussion in more depth:
[1] To conduct a systematic review of the literature (covering the period 1996-2011), in order to explore and establish an understanding of the concepts of ‘Olympic legacy’, evidenced legacy/impacts of hosting the Olympics in previous Games, and whether there is any difference between hosting region and non-hosting regions;

[2] By conducting either primary or secondary research of the selected legacy-programmes, to evaluate the extent to which the 2012 Games had impacts on the social legacy outcomes for Leicestershire (Only primary research on the legacy-programmes are presented in the thesis. Evaluation of other research on the legacy-programmes was included in the final report for the sponsors).

[3] To apply a realist analysis framework to identify underlying contexts (including political, economic, social and cultural contexts), and to understand the generative mechanisms and their relationships to outcomes, with a long-term aim to develop an explanation of the relationship between contexts, mechanisms, and outcomes on legacy;

[4] To produce an evidence base for policy analysis which provides a national exemplar of research into regional legacy outcomes from the 2012 Games;

[5] To identify the lessons learned about the maximisation of the legacy benefits of the 2012 Olympics for the non-hosting sub-region.

10.1 The impact/legacy of the London 2012 Games for Leicestershire

As identified in the systematic review (Chapter 4), although the term ‘legacy’ was first associated with the Olympics in 1956, the real emergence and development of legacy analysis for the Olympic context only really developed in the last decade. Until 2005, the London 2012 Games bid, which was in part explicitly based on the concept of a legacy for future generations of children and adults to choose sport as a way of life, had pushed legacy evaluation to the next level, in terms of embedding the notion of establishing a lasting legacy for the host country into the bid document, and recognition of the importance of legacy evaluation by the host government.

One year after the completion of the 2012 Games, at the House of Lords Select Committee on the legacy of the London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games, comments by key members of the bid team, i.e. Lord Coe (Chair of LOCOG), and David Luckes (author of the original London 2012 Games feasibility study and former Head of Sport Competition at LOCOG)
reinforced the importance of having promised legacy outcomes in the process of winning the bid.

_I think it (the legacy aspect) was one of many (important aspects in winning the bid). Legacy itself does not necessarily convince people to vote for you internationally. It has a strong domestic sell and it was a strong, I suppose, pitch, for want of a better phrase, domestically, to say, “This is something that will have tangible benefits for people on the ground in East London”._

**Q112: ...Should legacy be a far higher priority for the IFs and the IOC in determining their approach to hosting an Olympic Games?**

_I think it absolutely should.... Certainly the international federation I now work with, which is the International Hockey Federation, takes an approach that is legacy-driven._

David Luckes (House of Lords, 2013b)

An interesting point to emerge here is that the acknowledging of the legacy priority has become significant not only for the host country’s policy agenda but is also now seen as important in some International Federations and the IOC.

The significance of the Games’ _legacy development_ at the national level is reflected in the fact that the government placed responsibility for this under the Olympics Sub-committee of the Cabinet Office which is responsible for coordinating and assuring delivery of the longer term legacy after the Games. This intended legacy includes opportunities for business, tourism, and increased sport participation; the securing of elite funding up until Rio; and a £150m funding boost for school sport and PE, etc. In Leicestershire, a scheme called the _Leicestershire Legacy Fund_ was created after the completion of the Leicestershire 2012 legacy programme to support facility improvement projects in community sports clubs and voluntary organisations, which has been managed by LRS.

The _evaluation_ of the Games’ legacy was also developed during the period of the London 2012 Games, in terms of the scale of legacy evaluation and range of concerns. The literature on Olympic legacy analysis has already incorporated a wide range of foci, as identified in Chapter 4, and for example generally including tangible and intangible, positive and negative, elements etc. In the case of the London 2012 Games, not only has the national study of the Games’ impact and legacy provided the most comprehensive research on legacy evaluation focusing on sporting, economic, social outcomes and the East London effect; but also this sub-regional study of the Games’ legacy for Leicestershire has covered areas of impact such
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as children and young people, volunteering, culture, and sport. These two studies at national and regional level suggest a high degree of emphasis given on assessing intangible effects of the Games. Thus assessing intangible impact/legacy of the Olympics poses some methodological challenge we highlighted in Chapter 3 with regard to social intervention evaluations. Part of this dilemma centres on different outputs generated in different contexts and teasing out the real impact of the Games. This study has therefore sought to redress the position, identifying the causal mechanisms that produce the anticipated/unanticipated effects in relation to social impact evaluation.

To return to the research questions, the listed research objectives in Chapter 1 sought to answer the following two general research questions:

[1] What are the possible impacts of hosting the Olympic Games, in legacy terms, which would have on the hosting and non-hosting regions?

[2] To what extent had the 2012 Games impacted on the changed legacy outcomes (in relation to sport, children and young people, and volunteering) for Leicestershire? And why had those changes occurred?

The first question has been answered by the completion of the systematic review (see Chapter 4). In order to answer the second question, the major challenge was that of how to discover the structures and mechanisms that might explain observed regularities (Blaikie, 2010), which required creative imagination (Hempel, 1966) of what mechanisms might be responsible for this association and the context in which they operate. If we recall the explanatory model proposed by Pawson and Tilley (see Figure 10.1), the theoretical models created for each case study were based on their own logics. Taking the WCP case as an example, the logic underlying the context – mechanism – outcome triad is that a ‘regularity’ in this case the level of *sport participation*, has been affected by an input (the WCP Programme), which has produced the mechanism to promote a desired ‘outcome’ i.e, *increased sport participation*. The ‘mechanisms’ which have been enabled by the input may be described as *increased knowledge of the health benefits of participation*, and *provision of ease of access to exercise opportunities*. The ‘context’ within which these inputs and mechanisms are produced is that of the *Leicestershire 2012 legacy operational structure* which is in turn a product of the *UK hosting of the 2012 Games*. 
This model thus presents a clear view of how these concepts were connected theoretically. Rather than seeing them as a logical set of associations, they were seen as a combination of socially relevant influences. The evaluation of WCP was conducted to test this model and to identify the generated outcomes through descriptive statistics of who uses the programme and qualitative analysis (through in-depth interviews) of why, and to what effect, they used the programme. Similar logics were employed in evaluating the impacts of the other three case studies (see Chapter 7 and 8). Thus the objectives 2 and 3 have been addressed.

**Figure 10.1 Explanatory model**

![Explanatory model](Image)

*Source: Pawson and Tilley (1997: 72)*

**The application of the realist evaluation framework**

As stated in the earlier Chapter, this evaluation research concerned those legacy-programmes and actions that the government and local key stakeholders implemented by identifying ‘what worked’ and ‘how it worked’, and ‘for whom did it work’ during and after the London 2012 Games in Leicestershire. The application of the realist evaluation model in this thesis was significant in supporting the answering of the above questions, in the sense that, firstly, the model focused attention on underlying reality. As Pawson and Tilley (1997) argued because reality is stratified, and all social programmes involve the interplay of individual and institution, and of structure and agency, the application of the realist evaluation model should begin with an attempt to grasp the context of a programme. It therefore encourages the researcher to have a full understanding of the overall evaluation setting, in order to capture the way and in which the relationship between contexts, mechanisms, and the outcomes operated.
Chapter 10 Conclusion

Indeed, the existence of the fragmentation and difference in local subcultures may produce a range of incommensurable ‘conditions’, which render it impossible to make universal claims of ‘if we do X, it will trigger Y’ in any or all circumstances. In the case of the Leicestershire 2012 legacy programme, a common theme evident across all four legacy-programmes and which contributed to success was a clear policy remit of legacy thinking and planning set out by committed programme leaders. The Leicestershire 2012 Steering Group’s responsibility was to provide a framework that would ensure that partners could work together in order to maximise those benefits. Thus although the delivery of legacy activities remained the responsibility of programme operators, partnership arrangements between local authorities, sporting organisations, and other legacy-strands leaders were critical in leveraging and promoting programme development and effective coordination for the utilisation of resource. A further theme to emerge is the Inspire Leicestershire’s (continuing) involvement in delivery, and facilitation of communication. It is also worth noting that the nature of the Leicestershire context before London 2012 was already quite unique, given the leading role LRS had already played within the national County Sport Partnership framework (Henry, Downward, Harwood, & Robinson, 2008) and Loughborough University’s sport reputation. Thus by identifying the above contextual conditions, a more nuanced level of causal explanation can be drawn; and the implications for external validity of any claims to be made should be borne in mind.

Secondly, in order to ensure the quality of explanations of the findings, the realist evaluation model guided us to use a realist methodology. This implies that for claims to be made in relation to ‘scientific’ evaluation, a commitment to realism should be made. The following of a positivistic line and the employing of a mechanical experimental format as Pawson and Tilley (1997) warn is likely to result in disappointing findings. For this study, research thus began with what Pawson and Tilley term ‘a period of theory development’, derived from a systematic review of the literature on the subject in relation to Olympic legacy (from which key issues and areas of interests of the legacy evaluation were drawn out to assist empirical investigation), and preliminary qualitative investigation (in which key stakeholders were interviewed to make explicit the Leicestershire legacy programme contexts and mechanisms). This identifying of practitioners’ knowledge provided significant insights which were critical in providing explanations of assumptions made about causality.
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After identifying the legacy-programmes for evaluation, this theoretically informed approach was then used to support the design of research strategy and development of analytic logic models for each of the cases. The design then led to a further phase of conducting qualitative and/or quantitative work which attempted to tease out in more detail the participants’ reflections on how the mechanisms and contexts of the programmes had influenced them. Guided by the developed logic models, data on participants’ actual outcomes after participating in the programmes were then compared with the expected outcomes in order to identify evidence of real outcomes.

Thirdly, as suggested by Pawson and Tilley, the application of the realist evaluation should be conducted in a form of applied research – meaning that the ultimate goal of realist evaluation is to inform the thinking of policy makers, practitioners, programme participants and public. Thus findings about the legacy programme theory, summarised in Chapter 9, were provided in feedback to the policy makers who can devise new causal claims accordingly in the future, as outlined in objective 5.

10.2 Contribution to knowledge, methodological limitations and future research

Contribution to knowledge

This research study has contributed to knowledge in a number of ways. Firstly, the completed systematic review of legacy/impact evaluation of the Olympic Games has contributed to the existing literature, which provided a summary of current knowledge and issues in the Olympic legacy/impacts sector. Secondly, this study, using a case study approach to examine the impact of six legacy-programmes across five legacy-themes for Leicestershire, can be considered as a rare, and perhaps to date unique, comprehensive study assessing the impact/legacy of the Olympics for a non-hosting sub-region. As pointed out in Chapter 4 limited research has been undertaken in this respect in non-hosting regions. This logic of enquiry employed in capturing data can thus subsequently be applied to different contexts (e.g. other mega-sporting events) or different non-hosting regions.

This research study also contributed to knowledge by conducting a more evidence-based practice to inform policy in this area. It aimed to address the implications of the findings for key stakeholders in terms of future event partnership working. As highlighted in Chapter 9, a
summary of the lessons learned seems to provide helpful guidance for action in a range of policy contexts. While these cannot offer a recipe for success, and all aspects require further development, they do provide some grounds for optimism that practice can be made more ‘evidence aware’.

Finally, this research study has also contributed to theory. The utility of the realist evaluation approach has been presented throughout Chapter 6, 7, and 8 to illustrate how the results of the evaluations could be converged to establish CMO configurations in order to understand the uniqueness of the situations studied, which allowed the researcher to view the emergent outcomes in a realist perspective and to be aware of the differences in contexts and mechanisms. The application of both analytic logic models and additionality assessment also proved to be significant in these legacy evaluations. In particular, the analytic logic models were useful in helping to highlight not only causal relationships between inputs, throughputs, outputs and outcomes, but also provide the trajectory of long-term impacts and development. The assessment of additionality proved to be a not always straightforward process in these three legacy cases. However, the intention was to emphasise the importance of having a good understanding, judgement, and knowledge of the intervention by adopting the logic of enquiry underlying the four key elements of additionality in order to make the final claims.

Methodological limitations and future research

A number of limitations should be taken into consideration. Firstly, as already mentioned, the selection of the seven legacy-programmes as priorities for empirical data collection was made by the Director of Inspire Leicestershire. The research missed out on collecting evidence for other major legacy activities (e.g. the Torch Relay, or Sportivate), which were arguably more significant in terms of creating impact at the sub-regional level. Nevertheless, those selected cases were drawn from and therefore represented the range of themes which were the focus of attention of the Leicestershire 2012 legacy programme in relation to the London 2012 Games.

Secondly, this research project had to ‘serve two masters’ throughout its duration. There were two competing requirements placed on the research and the researcher, most notably those of: i) meeting the expectations of the funding bodies – Inspire Leicestershire, LRS, and regional CYP legacy programme; and ii) meeting the requirements for a PhD study - undertaking a theoretically informed evaluation of the impact/legacy of the Games for a non-hosting region.
Thus the challenge experienced by the researcher was to balance the pragmatic requirements of the funder and the need for theoretically informed analysis. While regular meetings with the funding body were held in order to prevent significant conflicts between these two requirements, there were occasions when the funding body was reluctant to accept findings or the way that findings were reported. This led to either the collection of further data to reinforce findings, or the providing of detailed explanations of the research framework and interpretation of the results. In addition, a certain degree of negotiation regarding the research strategy for data collection was required in order to control the validity and accuracy of the research, or to defend less popular methods (as it appeared that the funding sponsors had prejudices about what are regarded as appropriate methods for data collection and/or analysis, e.g. favouring in some instances of anecdotal data, and in others positivist assumptions).

A third challenge lay in getting direct evidence where required data was to be collected from children and young people (e.g. for the Get Set programme evaluation), and getting access to the national evaluation reports for the Sport Makers and Get Set programmes. In the case of Get Set evaluation, there were some pragmatic difficulties when sourcing the data from children and young people, e.g. time consuming, the difficulty of gaining permission from the parents or teachers, or the poor quality of the responses in relation to the Games’ impact from primary schools’ students. Thus while interviews were conducted with Head teachers and PE teachers in the case of primary schools, secondary school data collection consisted of one PE teacher interview and a group interview with students. In addition, while it was originally anticipated that a secondary analysis of the national studies for the programmes of Sport Makers and Get Set would be conducted to provide a top-down insight into the findings, it later proved to be impossible to gain access to all but the brief executive summary of the latter report (LOCOG declined to publish the full report, despite the fact that the government had spent a large sum of money on delivering and evaluating these programmes).

Other challenges associated with the research related to the constraints of time and resources, which limited the possibility of providing longitudinal evaluation for the Leicestershire 2012 programme. Thus, as the findings of this study indicate a significant gross impact of the Games on e.g. an increased sport participation through the WCP programme; a general improvement on student education attainment and school attendance through Get Set; and generated interests in future volunteering activities through Games Makers; the first area of
future research should perhaps be to follow up those participants to identify the Games’ impact at a later point in time, and thereby to explore the sustainability of those programmes.

The second area of future research should take into consideration a wider selection of the type and nature of the legacy-programmes giving particular attention to Paralympic related programmes, elite sport and cultural programmes. Thus a broader evaluation of the impact of the Games for Leicestershire may be provided.

The evidence from this study has also illustrated the uniqueness of the Leicestershire case in terms of its operational structure and the regional association with sporting excellence, which may well have had a bearing on leveraging the Games’ impact for Leicestershire. A further dimension to consider would thus be the inclusion of another sub-region within the region, or another non-hosting sub-region, for analytic comparison. Nevertheless we would argue that this study provides a sound basis for conceptualising and evaluating the additional legacy elements produced in such contexts, and thus provides a foundation for such future research.
Notes


[8] McCartney et al., 2010, Weed, 2006a, etc.
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