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Abstract

The unique potential of sport as a site for the delivery of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) has received increasing academic attention in recent years (e.g. Smith & Westerbeek, 2007). However, this literature has been said to have held “relatively static conceptualisations of CSR through sport” (Dowling, Robinson & Washington, 2013, p. 270), and it could similarly be argued that insufficient attention has been given to the broader social contexts in which it has been delivered. This study therefore aimed to understand more about sport - and the Olympic Games - as a site for the delivery of CSR, using the specific context of private sector sponsor-led CSR schemes based upon the sport and physical activity participation legacy of London 2012. Three separate stages of qualitative data collection were conducted. The first comprised a thematic analysis of macro level policy discourse produced by official Olympic ‘legacy actors’ in relation to the proclaimed sport and activity legacy of the Games. The second stage also used thematic analysis in order to establish how 20 sponsors rationalised their CSR activity around the Games and how six who organised programmes involving either sport or activity participation justified these. The third stage comprised a series of semi-structured interviews with representatives of three Olympic sponsors and three charity delivery partners who co-operated in the delivery of specific CSR schemes. Once data was organised into themes, data analysis was informed by a governmentality perspective in order to help understand the respective roles of public and private sector organisations in not just the delivery of CSR, but also in ‘governing’ society in the broadest sense of the term.

In the first stage of data collection and analysis, it was apparent that state policy around the sport and activity participation of London 2012 represented a social context of significant complexity for the delivery of CSR, as demonstrated by competing interpretations of sport and activity, their entanglement with intangible concepts such as ‘inspiration’ and the ultimate official abandonment of the aforementioned legacy targets in 2011. In the second stage, it was first established that sponsor rationales for CSR activity around the Games could be seen to demonstrate both the unique context of both sport and the Games for its delivery as well as the extent to which sponsors constructed themselves as legitimate ‘governors’ of society. Second, three significant themes were identified around sport and activity-based CSR activity; an emphasis upon ‘community development’, a greater focus upon intangible values such as ‘well-being’ and ‘enjoyment’ as opposed to health, and a range of different interpretations of Olympism that were presented in order to justify this. Finally, at the third stage, interviewees expressed that CSR had become both increasingly formalised and essential in (sport) sponsorship, and while the Olympic Games was constructed in as unproblematically a positive way as in the preceding stages, it was nevertheless claimed to have stimulated a range of partnerships.
between sponsors and other organisations such as charities in the delivery of sport and activity-based CSR initiatives.

**Key words:** Corporate Social Responsibility, sponsorship, sport participation, physical activity participation, health promotion, Olympic Games, Olympic legacies, London 2012, governmentality.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

One of the great legacies already from the Games has been the involvement of the private sector, the private sector that brings smart, creative people and extra and fresh money to the table, companies sticking their heads above the parapet, buying into the Singapore vision and then taking it on into a very practical landscape of encouraging more young people into sport is absolutely crucial, that is one of the strongest parts of this legacy (Coe, 2012).

This statement, aired in January 2012 by LOCOG chairman and Olympic gold medallist Lord Sebastian Coe, captures both the unprecedented role of Olympic sponsors in contributing to the legacy of London 2012 and the primacy of the sport participation legacy. The official sport and activity participation targets were published by the UK Government in 2008:

The first priority of the Games is to make the UK a world-leading sporting nation. We hope to see people becoming increasingly active, with a goal of seeing two million people more active by 2012 through focused investment in our sporting infrastructure and better support and information for people wanting to be active (DCMS, 2008, p. 3).

This target of two million included an ambition to encourage one million more people to take part in sport and another million more to take up physical activity by the year of the Games, and it is in these terms that the current document henceforth refers to sport and activity participation. Furthermore, the contribution of private sector Olympic sponsors – both domestic and international – towards these objectives can be understood as an example of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR), a concept that this has proved notoriously difficult for academics to define. In order to overcome the terminological confusion that exists here, this thesis follows Crane, McWilliams, Matten, Moon & Siegel’s (2008) clarification that:

A comprehensive overview of CSR has to accommodate such difference rather than eschew it in favour of a closely defined term. That said, we might at least suggest that at the core of these debates is the subject of the social obligations and impacts of corporations in society (Crane et al. 2008, p. 6).

On this basis, CSR is understood here as any corporate activity that could be seen as intended for the benefit of society – regardless of whether this is fulfilled or whether it is labelled as such. However, while CSR of this nature may have been accepted and implemented into practice in mainstream business, this process has taken longer in sport. Only within the last decade has academic discourse begun to focus on the need for research to focus upon the delivery of CSR in relation to sport (e.g. Babiak & Wolfe, 2013; Bradish & Cronin, 2009; Godfrey, 2009; Crow & Bradish, 2002). This may take the form of social initiatives organised by sports organisations, leagues, events governing bodies or by particular athletes (Walters, 2009; Babiak & Wolfe, 2006). Beyond this, it may also be delivered by non-sporting bodies (Carey, Misener & Mason, 2011) such as national or transnational organisations and,
as is the focus here, corporate sponsors of major events (Séguin, Parent & O'Reilly, 2010). In this growing body of literature on CSR and sport, one topic that has received significant attention has been the issue of whether – or how far – certain characteristics of sport serve to render it a particularly beneficial vehicle through which CSR can be delivered (Smith & Westerbeek, 2007). It is within this perceived “institutional aura of moral goodness” (Godfrey, 2009, p. 712), that the Olympic Games retains a special status – both in terms of its magnitude and its published desire to leave a positive legacy for the nations in which it takes place (IOC, 2013). This can be seen to pose the Olympic Games as a unique context for the delivery of CSR programmes and initiatives, something which has become especially apparent following the IOC’s formal addition of legacy to the Olympic Charter in 2002. Given that London was the first Summer Olympic host city to be selected following this amendment, the London 2012 Games can therefore be seen as a particularly significant moment in the development of CSR in relation to sport. However, this event – and the CSR activity around it – did not take place in a cultural vacuum. Just as Dowling, Robinson and Washington (2013) have asserted that academic literature on CSR and sport had hitherto held “relatively static conceptualisations of CSR through sport” (2013, p. 270), it can similarly be argued that insufficient consideration has been given to the broader social environments in which sport-related CSR has been delivered. In order to address this, the current research seeks to understand more about the delivery of CSR within the specific social context of the 2012 Summer Olympic Games in London.

On this note, it is worth clarifying that the study can best be understood as being primarily concerned with CSR – and therefore using both sport and the Olympic Games as a specific context in which to analyse this. In terms of its intended contribution to knowledge, the primary field in which this is intended is that of sport and CSR, although it should be acknowledged that the complex social nature of sport – and especially the Olympic Games – mean that findings can reasonably be expected to extend beyond CSR alone into related fields such as sport sponsorship, Olympic (and mega event) legacies and the sociology of sport. The following section sets out the specific aims and objectives of the research.

1.1 Aims and Objectives
The overall aim of this study was to understand more about sport - and the Olympic Games - as a site for the delivery of CSR, using the specific social context of private sector sponsor-led CSR schemes based upon the promotion of sport and physical activity participation legacy at London 2012. Within this overarching aim were three specific objectives:
- To understand more about the proclaimed sport and activity participation legacy of London 2012 as a social context for the delivery of CSR by exploring how this was discursively constructed by organisations responsible for its development and delivery.

- To establish how CSR activity around the London 2012 Olympic legacy was justified and rationalised by private sector sponsors, and to investigate how programmes involving sport and activity participation were promoted.

- To understand more about the dynamics of how sponsor-led CSR activity was organised in relation to the roles of other organisations and how individuals involved in this process articulated both the wider role of business in society and the London 2012 Olympics as a particular context.

In order to approach these aims, data collection was separated into three distinct but related stages, which are presented in three respective findings chapters. An overview of the structure of the entire document is provided next.

1.2 Thesis Structure
Chapter 1 provides an introduction to the study, describing the background to the research, the study's aims and objectives and presenting an overview of the structure of the thesis. Chapter 2 presents the theoretical framework used for the study. The purpose of this is to justify the theoretical approach used in terms its suitability for this study and to illustrate how it is deployed here. Chapter 3 comprises a review of relevant literature upon topics significant to this thesis: CSR (in both sport and mainstream business), Olympism, Olympic legacies and the sport and physical activity participation legacy of London 2012. Chapter 4 presents the methodological approach taken for the research. This includes an explanation of the project’s philosophical background, a review of the data collection and analysis techniques used and a specific account of how these were deployed in this particular study. Chapter 5 represents the first of three analysis and discussion chapters, and focuses upon the discourse of state or ‘legacy actor’ organisations around the sporting legacy of London 2012 from 2003 to 2012. Chapter 6 provides an analysis of discourse produced by sponsors of London 2012, including first an analysis of how sponsors articulated CSR in general and second a review of six sponsors who focussed explicitly upon the promotion of sport, physical activity or health. Chapter 7 is the final analytical section and presents the findings of interviews with representatives of seven organisations who were directly involved in the development and delivery of CSR activity around sport, physical activity and health promotion. Chapter 8 presents the conclusions of this study along with its contributions to theoretical and empirical knowledge, its limitations and some suggestions for future research in this field.
Chapter 2: Theoretical Framework

2.1 Chapter Introduction
The purpose of this chapter is to outline and justify the theoretical basis of the study. Specifically, this involves examining social theory that can potentially inform the project and articulating the specific theoretical position taken in the research. As the overall aim of the project is to understand more about sport - and the Olympic Games - as a site for the delivery of CSR, the emphasis here is placed upon theory that can be related to CSR in terms of how this can be understood as one manifestation of the role of the private sector in wider society. This chapter is therefore structured as follows. First, a rationale for the separation of data collection into macro and meso levels is provided. Second, an overview of the social theory of Michel Foucault is presented, which is followed by a discussion of his work on power in comparison to those of other social and managerial theorists. Third, and finally, the Foucauldian concept of governmentality - the main theoretical lens used in this research – is discussed in terms of its development from Foucault’s (1994) first articulations onwards as well as how it is interpreted and deployed in the current research.

2.2 Macro, Meso and Micro Theorising
Before discussing the specific theoretical perspectives that inform the study as a whole, it is worth addressing the assumption that social life can be organised into macro and meso levels, as this was the basis for the organisation of data collection and analysis in the current research. To elaborate, these two levels are typically articulated in relation to a third level – the micro level – which although not drawn upon in the present work can still be regarded as a product of the same logic through which the macro and meso levels would be conceived. Notably used in economics, the fundamental premise of this approach is that social life can be understood from a range of different perspectives, of which the macro and micro levels represent the broadest and most individualised respectively, and has been acknowledged in sociological literature as a potentially useful way to approach social research (e.g. Johnson, 2008; Turner and Boyns, 2006). In order to illustrate how this framework is applied here, it is first worth establishing how the macro and meso levels are understood in relation to the focus of the current study.

For Houlihan, Bloyce & Smith (2009), macro level work (or ‘grand theory’) in the field of sport “seeks to provide an interpretation of the social world” (p. 3). The emphasis here is therefore upon the analysis of social structures of entire populations at a national or international scale. In line with this, the meso level is then described as being “where the aim is to better understand the processes of sport policymaking and explain policy stability and change” (p. 4). While acknowledging the inherent difficulty of attempting to reconcile the complexity of social life with the arbitrarily defined nature of these two
levels, the current research will broadly follow these understandings of what they represent. The macro level will therefore be used to refer to national level policy (produced by both public and private sectors) while the meso level will be taken to refer to the processes by which these policies are designed and developed. However, it should not be assumed that macro or meso level theorising are unproblematic. For example, Houlihan et al. (2009) highlight some limitations in the application of both macro and meso theories in the field of sport policy:

Part of the decline in macro-level theorising of the policy process is a welcome corrective to the over-simplification of complex social processes that frequently accompanied analysis, the inflated generalisations that were generated and the too easy dismissal of counter-factual cases, but part is also a reflection of a retreat in much social science to an atomistic ontology which centres the individual rather than class, community, ethnicity, gender or nation.

Theory is also under-utilised at the meso-level where the aim is to better understand the processes of sport policymaking and explain policy stability and change. This lacuna in the analysis of sport policy exists despite the rich variety of meso-level analytical frameworks available and the current vigorous academic debate between the proponents of the competing frameworks (Houlihan et al., 2009, p. 3-4).

Two important issues arise from these quotations respectively. The first concerns the limitations of macro level work which ‘over-simplifies’ the social processes upon which it focuses, of which in the present research, it is intended that the combination of macro and meso level work offers one way to overcome this. Secondly, it can be seen that there is also a risk of failing to maximise the use of social theory at the meso level. However, at a broader level the more important consideration here relates to the way this statement demonstrates the relationship between the chosen level of analysis and the utility of social theory. Given this, there is a need for research to appreciate the suitability of theory to its chosen level of analysis – although this is a need that brings further complexity to the design of research. The current research therefore draws upon Desjeux’s (1996) scales of observation as a framework for justifying the use of particular theories at certain levels of society.

2.3 Scales of Observation
The philosophical difficulty of selecting a theoretical framework for any form of social research should not be overlooked. Put simply, to decide upon a given theorist is to assert that this represents the best possible way of approaching the subject at hand. Such an assertion is arguably impossible to justify, given both the impracticality of gaining a satisfactory understanding of every available theorist and the impossibility of proving the supremacy of one above all others. Although it may be possible to compromise to some extent by drawing upon multiple theorists, the basic problem would remain. While not claiming to offer a perfectly conclusive solution, Desjeux’s (1996) discussion of the scales of
observation represents one way of managing some of the theoretical difficulties that accompany the selection of a particular approach.

For Desjeux (1996), “what is presented as conflict between schools of thought is more often based on a difference of scale of observation” (1996, p. 45) and his advocacy of the scales of observation represents a critique of the idea of “catching at once all data coming from all scales” (p. 45). In other words, different sociological theories can simply be more suited to analysis at different scales (or ‘levels’) of social life. Following this, Desjeux (1996) proposes three independent scales: the macro-social, the micro-social and the micro-individual:

Our hypothesis is that we unconsciously interpret social realities in the context of a main pattern of interpretation – called a theory, which more or less belongs to a school – which matches our main preferred scale of observation. And little by little we forget the link between our scale of observation and its influence on our “theory”, leading us to think that our theory is universal, if not the best theory!

I think that researchers, myself included, confuse what is personally important (our personal subjectivity; our meaning of life), with what is important to us as researchers (our preferred scale of observation and our main pattern of interpreting social facts). But these two issues, our awareness of our implicit scale and the confusion between scale of observation and our subjectivity, are difficult to act upon because of the influence of our disciplines on our personal identities and our careers. This is why there are conflicts (Desjeux, 1996, p. 47).

The overriding message is that scholars may be reluctant to acknowledge the relationship between their perspective and the level of society to which it is best suited. In a sense, this is not surprising. For example, a researcher who is primarily concerned with issues at the macro-social level is most likely to settle upon a theoretical perspective that is best deployed at a similar level – consciously or not. For Desjeux, such theoretical decisions would be better justified in relation to some acknowledgement of the subjectivities noted above. But how can a scale be defined? While Desjeux’s primary example uses the different levels of society, he acknowledges that other methods of division are possible. For example, the macro and micro levels can be conceived of in terms of history. While a macro perspective here would focus upon events over a longer period of time, a micro perspective would be more concerned with historical events on a daily basis. Desjeux also notes that different academic fields have embraced the concept differently, but the most important point is that this offers a way of better justifying the theory chosen for a given research study.

Of course, this is not to suggest that what Desjeux proposes is unproblematic. For example, even if one splits social theories into different levels, there will still be several that are broadly concerned with the same scale of observation. For example, Desjeux cites Jauss, Meyer Shapiro, Bourdieu, Durkheim and Marx as being best understood as macro-sociological theorists, which means that the confused macro
level researcher will face the same dilemma. One way of overcoming this – and broadly following the sentiments expressed by Desjeux – would be to seek to differentiate between macro-sociological theories in a similar fashion. For example, some may be better applied to the state, some to the private sector and so on. It would therefore be possible to assert that while theories should be acknowledged in terms of their social scale of observation, there is also a case for making similar distinctions between those at the same scale – albeit using different criteria.

How can these scales of observation be applied to the current research? As the remainder of this chapter discusses, this research draws primarily upon a Foucauldian governmentality perspective at the macro and meso levels. Indeed, the fact that governmentality is better understood as a perspective or lens than a practical toolkit arguably renders it better for analysis at higher levels of society. Furthermore, it is unlikely that Foucault (1994/1974) would object to a single aspect of his work being selected and used in this fashion:

I would like my books to be a kind of tool-box which others can rummage through to find a tool which they can use however they wish in their own area... I don't write for an audience, I write for users, not readers (Foucault, 1994/1974, p. 523-4).

The pragmatism expressed by Foucault here and the theoretical clarity provided by Desjeux's (1996) articulation of the scales of observation represent a logical basis for this study’s use of governmentality at the macro and meso levels of society. However, in order to understand how this is implemented here it is first worth considering Foucault’s thought on a broader epistemological level as well as his understanding of power and how this may be compared to other theoretical alternatives.

2.4 Foucault: An Overview
This section provides an overview of the development of Foucault’s social thought. The purpose of this is to locate the specific concepts used in the present study in relation to the overall context of his work and the epistemological stance(s) that characterise it. Indeed, any account of Foucault’s work requires some degree of simplification because of its complex and wide-ranging nature, and Hamilton (1985) explains how his focus upon interrogating established power structures has the effect of rendering him more difficult to deploy in conventional fashion:

Foucault has always been a difficult writer to approach, not because his language is convoluted or his concepts elusive, but because of the anti-disciplinary structure of his work. His ideas do not map onto the conventional disciplinary structures – partly as a result of his interest in how those disciplinary modes of discourse were themselves created as systems of power relations. As a result Foucault’s work has been an inviting source of concepts and ideas for sociologists, but one whose implications have been difficult to integrate (Hamilton, 1985, p. 9).
A commitment to the critique of ostensibly natural social structures could be seen to recur throughout Foucault’s work, although this is not to say that his approach did not develop over time. For example, Andrews (1993) has argued for a need to differentiate between the earlier and later phases of his work:

It would be remiss to think of Foucault’s work as being a coherent constancy. Instinctively the conceptualizing within his early work differed markedly from that within his latter, more developed projects. The most dynamic aspect of Foucault’s intellectual development was his changing epistemic understanding. Indeed, his increasingly complex and ambivalent attitude toward knowledge provided the basis for three distinct phases of scholarly output (Andrews, 1993, p. 153).

So for Andrews, Foucault’s ‘epistemic understanding’ evolved so significantly that that later stages of his career should be carefully distinguished from his earlier work. However, a contrasting perspective is taken by Negri (2006), who argues that:

I am not sure that we can distinguish three Foucaults, nor even two, because prior to the publication of Dits et Ecrits and of the courses at the College de France, there was a tendency not to really take the very last Foucault into consideration. In effect, it seems to me that the three themes on which Foucault’s attention focused are perfectly continuous and coherent – coherent in the sense that they form a unitary and continuous theoretical production (Negri, 2006, p. 76).

It would doubtless be possible to assess the respective cases of Andrews (1993) and Negri (2006) at arduous length. However, the more significant point here is that such variance of opinion characterises many discussions of Foucault – be they concerned with his political, sociological or philosophical convictions or otherwise. To wade into any of these abstract debates here would be unnecessary, but to acknowledge them is essential. This is because all of these can be traced to the incoherent and diverse nature of Foucault’s work – and this should not be forgotten during any attempt to deploy specific aspects of his work in the present research.

2.4.1 Foucault: A Chronology

Foucault’s first two major works were entitled *Madness & Civilization: A history of insanity in the age of reason* (1973) (published in French in 1961 as *Histoire de la folie à l’âge classique*) and *The Birth of the Clinic: An archaeology of medical perception* (published in French in 1963 as *Naissance de la Clinique: une archéologie du regard médical*). These works focused on the specific fields of psychiatry and medicine, although they can be seen to analyse these respective fields in a similar fashion. Indeed, Foucault’s approach in both works involves an examination of the history of each profession in which particular concern is given to the ways that certain ideas and types of knowledge develop, mutate and come to be accepted over time. Markula and Pringle (2006) note Foucault’s appreciation of how “history was not progressive or continuous but the result of accidents, violence, disputes and clashes of
will” (2006, p. 12), and this perspective is readily apparent in both of these works. Overall, although the specific topics addressed in either *Madness & Civilisation* or *The Birth of the Clinic* are not germane to the focus of the current research, the approach essayed in both demonstrates how the early stages of Foucault’s career can reasonably be characterised by a critical and interpretive approach to knowledge.

Following these publications about specific sectors of society, Foucault’s next two major works can be seen to be broader in focus. First, *The Order of Things: An archaeology of the human sciences* (1970) (published in French in 1966 as *Les Mots et les Choses: Une archéologie des sciences humaines*) represented a wider engagement with the human sciences, in which Foucault used an analysis of economics, philosophy and biology to demonstrate how each field saw knowledge shaped and reshaped by dominant discourses and ways of thinking. This represents the first clear expression of his ‘archaeological’ method – an approach to knowledge that was to be more formally articulated in *The Archaeology of Knowledge* (1972) (published in French in 1969 as *L’archéologie du savoir*), in which Foucault stated that:

> In short, the history of thought, of knowledge, of philosophy, of literature seems to be seeking, and discovering, more and more discontinuities, whereas history itself appears to be abandoning the irruption of events in favour of stable structures (Foucault, 1972, p. 6).

This approach to the ‘history of thought’ can be seen to reflect the way that Foucault’s archaeological method is primarily concerned with establishing how such ‘discontinuities’ develop over time, a perspective that contrasts sharply with what he calls history’s emphasis upon ‘stable structures’. On a broader level, this statement – and the archaeological approach it relates to – can be seen to further demonstrate Foucault’s unconventional and anti-foundational position. Foucault’s next major work was entitled *Discipline and Punish: The birth of the prison* (1977) (published in French in 1975 as *Surveiller et Punir: Naissance de la prison*), and focused upon how all citizens in contemporary society were subject to the exercise of ‘disciplinary power’. For Markula and Pringle (2006), this increased focus on power meant that Foucault offered an increasingly attractive theoretical framework for studies of power in wider society:

> Foucault’s broadened conceptualisation of power, for example, allowed understanding of the political significance of popular cultural activities such as sport, fitness and leisure practices. In addition it provided a framework for interrogating the workings of power in specific locations and in a manner that did not reductively focus on laws, class, gender, the economic base or state apparatus (Markula & Pringle, 2006, p. 16).

Foucault’s conceptualisation of power will be discussed in more depth later. However, perhaps the most important point to be made about *Discipline and Punish* here is that it can be seen to have heralded the beginning of Foucault’s deployment in social studies of sport (Rail & Harvey, 1995). In line with
Andrews’ (1993) identification of distinct phases within Foucault’s career, a similar observation can be made in relation to sport. Put simply, the use of Foucault in studies of sport (or indeed any field) could be reasonably confined to specific aspects of his work. This is indicative of a need for the judicious selection of particular concepts or tools – as opposed to using Foucault (or indeed any theorist) to frame research in a more dogmatic fashion. The publication of the first volume of *The History of Sexuality* (1978a) (published in French in 1976 as *Histoire de la sexualité*) provides further evidence of this, as the approach to power articulated within it can be seen to differ from that set out in *Discipline and Punish*. *The History of Sexuality* represented Foucault’s last major intellectual project, and was one that was never completed. Overall, the work can be seen as an attempt to examine the ways that “sex was put into discourse” (Foucault, 1978a, p. 11). Most importantly for the current research, *The History of Sexuality* saw Foucault’s first articulations of concepts such as biopolitics and governmentality. With these concepts his focus was now upon the ways that populations could be ‘governed’ from the level of the state to the level of the individual. As mentioned earlier, it would be possible to debate the division of Foucault’s work at great length, but the more important point to be made here is that such debates are secondary to the need to select only the most pertinent theoretical tools from an academic career that covers numerous subjects over several decades.

This timeline serves to illustrate the difficulty that awaits the scholar who attempts to embrace Foucault’s work as a whole. Given the constraints of the current research, this would be impractical at best and impossible at worst. However, it is worth considering what this review of his career says about his deeper epistemological stance. Indeed, Foucault (1988) reflected that:

> What I have studied are the three traditional problems: (1) What are the relations we have to truth through scientific knowledge, to these ‘truth games’ which are so important in civilization and in which we are both subject and object? (2) What are the relationships we have to others through those strange strategies and power relationships? And (3) what are the relationships between truth, power and self? I would like to finish all this with a question: What could be more classic than these questions and more systematic than the evolution through questions one, two and three and back to the first? I am just at this point (Foucault, 1988, p. 15).

Although Foucault was notoriously reluctant to associate himself with particular schools of thought or clearly defined philosophical positions, the three problems listed here provide some insight into his underlying epistemological stance. His focus is predominantly upon the study of ‘relations’ – be they around power, truth or any other aspect of social life - and this can be broadly reconciled with anti-foundational or relativistic epistemological perspectives. With this basis established, this discussion will now turn to Foucault’s conceptualisation of power and how this relates to those of other selected theorists.
2.5 Power: Foucault and Other Perspectives

2.5.1 Foucault: Relational Power
Although characteristically nuanced and enigmatic, Foucault's conceptualisation of power is best understood as focusing primarily upon the 'relations of power' or 'relational power'. Given this, these terms will be used here to refer to his overarching definition(s) of the term before moving to an examination of other specific concepts that can be associated with his work on power. Foucault was reluctant to define power explicitly, and instead favoured a depiction of what it was not:

One needs to be nominalistic, no doubt: power is not an institution, and not a structure, neither is it a certain strength we are endowed with; it is the name that one attributes to a complex strategical situation in a particular society (Foucault, 1978a, p. 93).

It can be seen that for Foucault, power is intangible and immeasurable. The idea of “a complex strategical situation in a particular society” is vague at best – and this is not unintentional. The use of such a definition appears to be geared towards creating the impression that power should never be ascribed to one actor over another. Indeed, O'Farrell (2005) describes how Foucault extends this logic to discussions of the state and its role in society:

All these relations of power at different levels work together and against each other in constantly shifting combinations. The State is merely a particular, and ultimately precarious, configuration of these multiple power relations. It is not a ‘thing’ or a universal essence.

Power is not simply about saying no and oppressing individuals, social classes or natural instincts. Instead, argues Foucault, power is productive. By this he means that it generates particular types of knowledge and cultural order (O'Farrell, 2005, p. 100).

There are two aspects of these claims that should be examined. The first is the notion that the state is ‘ultimately precarious’ – or as Foucault himself puts it - only able to “operate on the basis of other, already existing power relations” (Foucault, 1980, p. 122). This appears to be an unusual way to describe governments in modern society. For example, if a government representative (such as a police officer) tells a citizen to behave in a certain way, the citizen’s response would usually belie this notion of the state as ‘precarious’ and dependent upon other power relations. However, such an example relates more to the micro or meso levels of society, and if one considers the statement's applicability at the macro level, the idea of precariousness is easier to comprehend and observe in practice. Examples such as this give the impression that Foucault's conceptualisation of ‘relational power’ is better understood as an abstract theoretical lens that can be better applied at broader levels of society, as opposed to micro level scenarios such as that in which the aforementioned police officer finds himself. The second important aspect of what O'Farrell's (2005) account concerns the idea that
power is somehow ‘productive’. Indeed, rather than considering power as inherently positive or negative, Foucault sees it as more of a capacity that can be used in any number of possible ways.

Although Foucault’s construction of relational power may be abstract, a number of its subsidiary concepts serve to demonstrate it more clearly. For example, Foucault’s (1977) development of ‘disciplinary power’ attempts to account for the ways in which:

How one may have a hold over others’ bodies, not only so that they may do what one wishes, but so that they may operate as one wishes, with the techniques, the speed and the efficiency that one determines. Thus discipline produces subjected and practised bodies, ‘docile’ bodies (Foucault, 1977, p. 137-8).

In *Discipline and Punish*, Foucault draws upon Jeremy Bentham’s panopticon to illustrate the dynamics of disciplinary power more clearly. To simplify, the panopticon depicts a prison structure in which all inmates can be monitored from one central vantage point. Each prisoner is therefore aware that they could be under surveillance at any moment – whether this is actually the case or not. In theory, behaviour must therefore be modified in the knowledge that someone may be watching at any time. Foucault then extends this metaphor to wider society in general; with the basic idea being that people’s fear of this panoptic scrutiny ultimately brings about a desired form of behaviour. The workings of panopticism in modern society are elaborated upon by Markula & Pringle (2006), for whom “the increase in personal freedom that occurred within the shift from the brutality of sovereign power to the development of the disciplinary society has subsequently generated considerable costs for modern citizens” (p. 44). In other words, the panopticon can be seen as a way of explaining how governments (or other ‘powerful’ entities) can influence behaviour without having to engage with the individual directly.

This idea that governments – or other state organisations – can shape the everyday behaviour can be seen to foreshadow Foucault’s later work- most notably presented in *The History of Sexuality*. However, his emphasis upon discipline was soon to give way to a concern for the ways in which governments can seek to influence more biological components of power:

If discipline was developed first historically, techniques of managing the life and death of populations were not far behind. Populations in this instance are not just large groups of people but are collections of living organisms with birth and death rates, different demographics and various states of health. Foucault describes the technologies used to manage populations as ‘biopolitics’ or ‘biopower’ (O’Farrell, 2005, p. 105).
Biopower can therefore be seen to describe the regulation of demographic phenomena such as public health, birth rates and epidemiology. The introduction of biopower/biopolitics in *The History of Sexuality* was also symptomatic of the wider shift in the development of Foucault's view of power that took place in his later career. Indeed, his focus was now upon examining the more subtle techniques and tactics used throughout society to influence individual behaviour. While biopower can be seen to account for how this was achieved in relation to the physical health of populations, the related concept of governmentality can be understood as an attempt to theorise about the ways in which macro level discourses and ideologies are transmitted to other levels of society.

### 2.5.2 Lukes: Three-Dimensional Power

Lukes’ (2005) theory of Three-Dimensional Power provides a particularly illuminating point of comparison with Foucault because it represents both a popular contemporary alternative to Foucault’s conceptualisation of power and one that has been contrasted with it explicitly. It is therefore intended that setting Lukes’s work against that of Foucault here will enable a better understanding of the strengths and limitations of the latter.

For Lukes (2005), power can be separated into One, Two and Three-Dimensional Power. The premise of this is that each added dimension enables a more sophisticated level of understanding, usually by virtue of some increased capacity to consider the influence of latent or hidden factors upon the exercise of power. Accordingly, Lukes presents the Three-Dimensional view of power as offering a “deeper and more satisfying analysis” (2005, p. 16) than either the One or Two-Dimensional perspectives. Before exploring his advocacy of Three-Dimensional Power further, it is first necessary to establish what is represented by his references to these theories of One and Two-Dimensional Power.

To begin with, One-Dimensional Power – which Lukes frequently equates to a ‘pluralist’ view of power – is perhaps the simplest to explain. The central tenet of One-Dimensional Power is that of a focus on “the study of concrete, observable behaviour” (p. 17). Given this, a researcher working from this perspective will primarily concern themselves with visible manifestations of power, such as the capacity of one actor to cause another to do something that they would not otherwise do. The main assumption involved here therefore concerns how the actor who prevails in processes such as decision-making can be understood as the one who possesses power. In summary, Lukes states that:

This first, one-dimensional, view of power involves a focus on behaviour in the making of decisions on issues over which there is an observable conflict (subjective) interests, seen as express policy preferences, revealed by political participation (2005, p. 19).
In other words, for Lukes the first dimension is concerned solely with those aspects of power that can be seen. Following on from this, the main difference between the One and Two-Dimensional views is that the latter enables a consideration of potential and covert issues as well as ‘non-decision-making’ in addition to that of actual/overt issues and decision-making alone. However, for Lukes it is limited in three regards. First, it is too committed to behaviourism. Second, it suffers from its “association of power with actual, observable conflict” (p. 26). Third, it is limited by “its insistence that nondecision-making power only exists where there are grievances which are denied entry into the political process in the form of issues” (p. 28). In Lukes’s own words, it can be summarised as thus:

The Two-Dimensional view of power involves a qualified critique of the behavioural focus of the first view and it allows for consideration of the ways in which decisions are prevented from being taken on potential issues over which there is an observable conflict of (subjective) interests, seen as embodied in express policy preferences and sub-political grievances (Lukes, 2005, p. 24-5).

In this discussion of One and Two-Dimensional power, Lukes makes repeated references to the fact that their limitations are largely attributable to their overly ‘behaviouristic’ nature. In other words, they do not give sufficient consideration to ‘real’ interests or ‘latent’ conflicts. His advocacy of the Three-Dimensional view is therefore based primarily on the attention it gives to these ‘invisible’ components of decision-making processes. In summary, Lukes describes how:

The Three-Dimensional view of power involves a thoroughgoing critique of the behavioural focus of the first two views as too individualistic and allows for consideration of the many ways in which potential issues are kept out of politics, whether through the operation of social forces and institutional practices or through individuals’ decisions (Lukes, 2005, p. 28).

Overall, it can be seen that Lukes’s presentation of the Three-Dimensional view as ‘more satisfying’ than either of the others is chiefly attributable to its consideration of invisible factors and ‘interests’. Indeed, this consideration of hidden factors is cited by Dowding (2006), who in arguing for the conceptualisation of power set out by Lukes, states that:

Lukes wants to be able to identify and criticise values that lead dominated people to acquiesce and even celebrate their own domination. At the same time he does not want to fall into the Foucaultian trap where all social relationships are seen in the same relativistic light and where all – dominated and dominant alike – are subject to the same power of structural relations and so all subject to the same moral opprobrium (Dowding, 2006, p. 136).

Indeed, this criticism of Foucault’s conceptualisation of power is echoed by Lukes (2005) himself:

Foucault’s first way of interpreting the key idea central to his view of power – that power is ‘productive’ through the social construction of subjects, rendering the governed governable – made no sense (Lukes, 2005, p. 98).
These criticisms are both resonant with the limitations of Foucault's conceptualisation of power expressed in the previous section. The principal line of argument is that the approach of Lukes is preferable to that of Foucault because of the greater consideration it affords to the influence of ‘interests’ in decision making processes. Indeed, both quotations appear to suggest that Foucault's perspective is ultimately fanciful and unrealistic. However, this could possibly be attributed to a difference in scale of observation (Desjeux, 1996). Whereas Lukes’s work refers more to the practical aspects of decision making and the exercise of power, Foucault’s is better suited at a more abstract level. Perhaps the best response to this criticism would be to suggest that while Lukes’s approach would be more effective at lower scales of observation, Foucault’s thought could be seen as better deployed at higher levels of society. Indeed, immediately after making this criticism, Lukes acknowledges that:

I do not think it altogether fanciful to suggest that Foucault's writings thereby themselves exhibit an interesting kind of power: the power of seduction. In Foucault’s case – and there are others in the history of the human sciences – this has been a singularly productive power, generating a remarkable quantity of important and interesting empirical work that, arguably, constitutes what Imre Lakatos might have called a successful and progressive research programme (Lukes, 2005, p. 98).

Although this might be construed as some kind of backhanded compliment, the fact that Lukes acknowledges the success with which Foucault's ideas have been deployed is important. Indeed, the previous point about the ideal scale of society for the application of either theorist may be significant here, as the fact that Foucault’s work has retained a ‘seductive’ capacity to inspire important research shows how it cannot be dismissed. However, perhaps the most important implication of this debate for the researcher who wishes to draw upon Foucault is that his work is better treated in an abstract sense – and not deployed in the more practical fashion that Dowding’s (2006) advocacy of Lukes seems to be premised upon.

2.5.3 Crozier & Friedberg: The Actor and the System
While Lukes’ (2005) conceptualisation of power represents a sociological alternative to that of Foucault, it is also worth considering how it has been approached in managerial literature. The issue of power in and between organisations is particularly significant here as the Olympic sponsors analysed in the current study can be better understood as the results of various power relationships between different (public, private, sport and charity) bodies rather than static, uniform entities. In relation to this, one useful perspective is set out in Crozier and Friedberg’s (1980) Actors and Systems: The politics of collective action; which was born out of frustration with contemporary American theories about
organisational sociology and thus attempted to offer an alternative approach from a French perspective. The text is introduced as follows:

For us, organizations and organized systems have enough autonomy to make it impossible to understand their functioning either from a deterministic standpoint or as an extrapolation from primary group interaction. Our research strategy therefore consists, first of all, in using individual behavioural data (Crozier & Friedberg, 1980, p. 2).

It is therefore immediately apparent that Crozier and Friedberg's construction of power is based upon a dissatisfaction with the more quantitative and behaviouristic theories that had gained popularity among English speaking organisational theorists. This can be seen to resonate with Lukes' (2005) advocacy of Three-Dimensional Power, as both approaches are significantly motivated by a desire to overcome the limitations of more simplistic, behaviourist-driven theories that are unable to capture the complexities of social life. However, it should be acknowledged that as Crozier and Friedberg's concern is for actors in 'organizations', their approach should be seen to differ markedly from the more sociological and political foci of Foucault and Lukes examined above. Crozier and Friedberg's approach has also been utilised by Olaya and Ruess (2004), who have described it as follows:

A strategic actor (being an individual, group or any other collective entity) with his own interests interacting with other actors - also acting strategically; a concrete system formed by the interacting actors; the game as a mechanism of integration between actor and system where each actor has his own interests, but also the interest to keep a concrete system of action alive; Power as the capacity of action which is the unbalanced exchange of possibilities of action and which has four sources (i.e. mastery of specific expert knowledge, the control of information and communication resources, and organizational rules) (Olaya & Ruess, 2004, p. 3).

In other words, within an organisation, power is exercised by different actors who participate in 'games' to determine this. Further detail on this conceptualisation is provided by Courpasson (2000):

The major stake for people in organizations is to control uncertainty, and uncertainty is a source of power and an opportunity for hidden struggles. Any person in a system can exploit uncertainties and create rules in his/her own interests; so each individual may 'have' power. For this game to be possible, there has to be a 'liberal organization' where all individuals are able to negotiate their positions in a relatively 'free market' of rules and power resources. In this situation, people can be defined as actors, who are capable of playing with the existing rules of the organization, of taking risks and of making decisions. For Crozier and Friedberg, the issue is to deal with ineluctable constraints, and the solution is a sort of compromise between action and constraint (Courpasson, 2000, p. 144-145).

This account captures how for Crozier and Friedberg, individual actors in organisations have the capacity to manipulate situations to serve specific interests as opposed to existing within a dominant concentration of power. In relation to the two perspectives on power addressed in this discussion already, it can be seen that Crozier and Friedberg's (1980) acknowledgement of the role of individual
agency is consistent with Lukes’ (2005) Three-Dimensional view of power in that it provides a more practical means of addressing the ways that macro level discourses are interpreted, negotiated and resisted by actors at lower scales of observation. However, while combining two or more of these three theories in the present research may offer a more comprehensive understanding of the exercise of power in the study as a whole, the practical demands of using multiple theories in the analysis stage would be difficult to manage within the temporal constraints of the project. Given the macro level utility noted above, this research therefore draws primarily upon a Foucauldian conceptualisation of power, and the specific nature of this will be outlined next.

2.6 Governmentality
With this outline of Foucault’s approach to power and how it can be compared to other theories now established, this final section of the chapter will focus upon Foucault’s governmentality as the specific theoretical concept that will be used to frame this study. This section will first address how governmentality was first developed by Foucault before considering some of the subsequent debates around it and clarifying how it is deployed in the present research.

2.6.1 Overview
Governmentality is perhaps best understood as representing a theoretical bridge between Foucault’s earlier work on the technologies of the self and the technologies of the state:

Why should one want to study this insubstantial and vague domain covered by a notion as problematic and artificial as that of “governmentality?” My immediate answer will be, of course, in order to tackle the problem of the state and population (Foucault, 1978b, p. 109).

The fact that Foucault himself describes the theory as “insubstantial and vague” betrays its abstract nature. Indeed, because of this there is a potential danger of seeking to apply it too literally. Rather than embracing every intimate detail about Foucault’s true meaning of the concept, it is more easily understood if one steps back and places a greater emphasis upon considering the concept’s overall orientation. In other words, governmentality is better understood as a lens through with to view social life than a set of practical directions for its analysis. However, despite acknowledging it as a “vague domain”, Foucault also provided a more comprehensive three-part definition:

1. The ensemble formed by the institutions, procedures, analyses, and reflections, the calculations and tactics that allow the exercise of this very specific albeit complex form of power, which has as its target population, as its principal form of knowledge political economy, and as its essential technical means apparatuses of security (Foucault, 1994, p. 219-220).

In other words, governmentality can be applied to every aspect of power in every possible context. Furthermore, it should be noted that the term should not be automatically assumed to refer to a state
government in the form that is common today — although this is one possible application. Rather, governmentality refers to ‘governing’ more as an act or a form of behaviour as opposed to something exclusive to governmental organisations. This means that it can be observed in any situation in which power is being exercised — explicitly or not. The second part of Foucault’s definition expands upon the broad-ranging nature of the concept:

2. The tendency that, over a long period and throughout the West, has steadily led toward the pre-eminence over all other forms (sovereignty, discipline, and so on) of this type of power—which may be termed “government” — resulting, on the one hand, in the formation of a whole series of specific governmental apparatuses, and, on the other, in the development of a whole complex of knowledges [savoirs] (Foucault, 1994, p. 219-220).

The emphasis here is upon how governmentality has become increasingly pertinent as a result of social change in the Western world. In his first articulations of the concept, Foucault noted that a shift from feudalism — where the sovereign could dominate - to ‘colonial states’ where factors such as population growth placed more emphasis upon the ‘art of governing’ — a topic on which a number of treatises were published. For example, Foucault cites the contrast between the understanding of government set out in Machiavelli’s *The Prince* and ‘anti-Machiavellian’ literature such as La Perriere’s *La Mothe Le Vayer*. The significant distinction here is that while *The Prince* was “essentially a treatise about the Prince’s ability to keep his principality” (1994, p. 203), La Perriere recognised the importance of governing everything from a household to a convent. The ‘art of governing’ therefore ‘explodes into a set of diverse questions’, which are broadly equivalent to those laid out by Foucault in his definition(s) of governmentality here. Furthermore, the logical extension of governmentality’s relationship with specific social contexts can be seen in the popularity of governmentality analyses among scholars concerned with neoliberalism, as the focus here is typically upon how the individual can be ‘governed’ in an ostensibly freer society. The third and final part of Foucault’s definition reveals more about the nature of the term:

3. The process or, rather, the result of the process through which the state of justice of the Middle Ages transformed into the administrative state during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries and gradually becomes “governmentalized” (Foucault, 1994, p. 219-220).

The word ‘process’ is important here. Governmentality does not represent a static theory but rather an acceptance that power relations are subject to change over time. Just as today’s political landscape could be seen to be continually evolving, the deployment of governmentality in social analyses must do likewise. In line with the broad and flexible nature of the concept, Rose, O’Malley and Valverde (2006) associate governmentality-based work with the following perspective:
From such a perspective, it becomes apparent that each formulation of an art of governing embodies, explicitly or implicitly, an answer to the following questions: Who or what is to be governed? Why should they be governed? How should they be governed? To what ends should they be governed? Thus, the governed are, variously, members of a flock to be nurtured or culled; juridical subjects whose conduct is to be limited by law, individuals to be disciplined, or, indeed, people to be freed.

An analysis of governmentalities then, is one that seeks to identify these different styles of thought, their conditions of formation the principles and knowledges that they borrow from and generate, the practices that they consist of, how they are carried out, their contestations and alliances with other arts of governing (Rose et al., 2006, p. 83-4).

Rose et al.’s reference to “styles of thought” and “conditions of formation” can be broadly linked to the present research. Given that the focus here will be upon analysing discourse from both Olympic ‘legacy actors’ and private sector sponsors, there is a need to establish the extent to which their interpretations of themes such as the Olympic legacy are similar or different. Rather than subscribing to an arbitrary divide between ‘public’ and ‘private’ institutions – and the assumptions that typically follow, a governmentality perspective can provide a more sophisticated understanding of the roles of each contributing to the legacy of London 2012.

Furthermore, such an all-encompassing definition resonates with Foucault’s earlier description of governmentality as “insubstantial and vague”, it is worth clarifying how it will be operationalized in the current study. The above notion of “conditions of formation” is crucial here. Put simply, a governmentality perspective can be used to demonstrate how apparently ‘natural’ or ‘typical’ phenomena are socially constructed, and therefore comprised of a webbed mass of interactions that take place throughout society. For example, consider O’Malley’s (1996) analysis of prudentialism and regimes of insurance. Rose et al. (2006) describe how this showed that central to these was “the inculcation of a prudent and calculative relation to the future in those who are its subjects” (p. 95). In other words, while the idea of prudency and risk minimisation might be conceived of as naturally occurring, the application of a governmentality perspective can help demonstrate how they are instead based upon a complex network of common assumptions.

Governmentality’s emphasis upon the abstract nature of power is also evident in the way it conceives of the relationships between different levels of society. Foucault (1994) terms these ‘continuities’, and describes how their establishment must be achieved:

In the art of government the task is to establish a continuity, in both an upward and a downward direction. Upward continuity means that a person who wishes to govern the state well must first learn how to govern himself, his goods and his patrimony, after which he will be successful in governing the state. On the other hand, we also have a downward continuity in the sense that,
when a state is well run, the head of the family will know how to look after his family, his goods, and his patrimony, which means that individuals will, in turn, behave as they should. This downward line, which transmits to individual behaviour and the running of the family the same principles as the good government of the state, is just at this time beginning to be called “police” (Foucault, 1994, p. 206-207).

It is worth noting that what Foucault describes here as the state and the family could be equated with the macro and micro levels as they have been defined in this chapter, although while this describes how such continuities between levels might be understood, it does not show how they might be approximated for analytical purposes. However, one possible example of this could be found in relation to Spivakovsky’s (2006) articulation of continuity:

Through the different mechanisms and technologies (economy) used at every social level (government – government institutions – non-government institutions – family- individual) a continuity can occur between the individual and the government. Moreover such continuity should be both upward in direction, where the individual manages themselves in such a way that they positively affect all that surrounds them, leading to a prosperous state; and also downward in direction, where the state manages itself in such a way that it allows new ways of being for the individual to consider for their own self-management, which are in line with both the state’s and the individual’s interests. Thus an arrangement of things can take place which allows the individual to choose, or become capable of taking on new and improving forms of being, identity, and ways of life (Spivakovsky, 2006, p. 4).

Spivakovsky’s (2006) account demonstrates how the notion of continuity could be used to highlight the multidirectional nature of power, as the implication is that the individual and the state can influence each other in similar measure. Furthermore, the particular idea that an individual’s self-management can affect the prosperity of the state could be extended to the issue of resistance, despite this not being mentioned here. However, a possible limitation here is that continuity is only presented here as functioning in linear fashion. For example, while it can be seen here to account for the relationship between the actions of the state and those of the individual, it is more difficult to conceive of how it could do likewise for that between the state and other macro level entities such as the corporation. With this initial outline of governmentality having addressed its fundamental theoretical basis, the focus of the next sections will be upon how this can be applied more specifically in the practical context of the current research.

2.6.2 Good and Evil? Governmentality and Neoliberalism

The previous section demonstrated governmentality’s all-encompassing nature using Foucault’s initial articulations as a starting point. However, it is also important to consider how it has been interpreted and applied in subsequent work by other scholars. For example, Dean’s (1999) approach to the term is consistent with that of Foucault:
Government is any more or less calculated and rational activity, undertaken by a multiplicity of authorities and agencies, employing a variety of techniques and forms of knowledge, that seek to shape conduct by working through the desires, aspirations, interests and beliefs of various actors, for definite but shifting ends and with a diverse set of relatively unpredictable consequences, effects and outcomes (Dean, 1999, p. 18).

The significance of this definition lies in how Dean simply refers to governing as including ‘any more or less calculated and rational activity’. This is important because – in line with Foucault - it demonstrates how governing represents a behaviour that should not be automatically classified as positive or negative. However, not all accounts of governmentality reflect this. For example, Chatterjee (2008) states that “the activities of governmentality affect the very conditions of livelihood and social existence of the groups they target” (2008, p. 61), which – whether intentionally or not – demonstrates how governmentality may be interpreted more as a more manipulative effort to shape individual conduct, with the term ‘target’ implying that this effort is negatively motivated. In a similar vein, Hamann (2009) asserts that:

The central aim of neoliberal governmentality is the strategic production of social conditions conducive to the constitution of Homo economicus, a specific form of subjectivity with historical roots in traditional liberalism. However, whereas liberalism posits “economic man” as a “man of exchange”, neoliberalism strives to ensure that individuals are compelled to assume market-based values in all of their judgments and practices in order to amass sufficient quantities of “human capital” and thereby become “entrepreneurs of themselves” (Hamann, 2009, p. 38).

Contrary to the definition of Dean (1999), the suggestion here is that governmentality represents more of a controlling mechanism through which governing actors may seek to shape the conduct of the individual. This is particularly significant given the terms association with neoliberalism, which gives the impression of tying the concept to a particular form of political logic. Indeed, the specific notion of a ‘neoliberal governmentality’ has been addressed in fields as diverse as education (Davies & Bansel, 2007), immigration (Hiemstra, 2010), food politics (Guthman, 2008) and the environment (Fletcher, 2010). Further evidence of this construction of governmentality can be found in the position of Bondi (2005), for whom:

As a form of governmentality, neoliberalism works by installing a concept of the human subject as an autonomous, individualised, self-directing, decision-making agent at the heart of policymaking. In so far as this vision of the human subject is recognised and assimilated, people are recruited into neoliberal forms of governmentality, even if they also, simultaneously, seek to resist some of its effects (Bondi, 2005, p. 499).

By characterising governmentality in such a deterministic fashion, there is a danger of straying too far from the all-embracing nature of the term as first advocated by Foucault. Although Bondi (2005) only cites neoliberalism as one form of governmentality, the broader tendency to link the two terms may
contribute to a characterisation of the term that is excessively dystopian and manipulative, especially given the way that neoliberalism has been “increasingly used in a pejorative sense as dismissive shorthand by critics” (Heynen, McCarthy, Prudham and Robbins, 2007, p. 3). This pejorative sense is largely attributable to the way that neoliberalism has become said to have “expanded globally to reshape everyday values and to govern conduct in diverse fields, including popular culture and sport” (Dubal, 2010, p. 124). In terms of the present discussion, the tendency to articulate governmentality in terms of neoliberalism could ultimately result in it becoming associated with the negative perceptions that can now be seen to characterise the former.

This is not to say that governmentality should not be combined with neoliberal analyses, or indeed any of the social issues that may be associated with it. Rather, it can be argued that governmentality should not be regarded as an inherently positive or negative process, but instead a perspective that can analyse both with equal utility – in line with the broader understanding of the term set out by Dean (1999). Indeed, the need to step away from regarding the act of neoliberal governing in an exclusively negative light is highlighted by Ferguson (2009), for whom:

If we can go beyond seeing in “neoliberalism” an evil essence or an automatic unity, and instead learn to see a field of specific governmental techniques, we may be surprised to find that some of them can be repurposed, and put to work in the service of political projects very different from those usually associated with that word. If so, we may find that the cabinet of governmental arts available to us is a bit less bare than first appeared, and that some rather useful little mechanisms may be nearer to hand than we thought (Ferguson, 2009, p. 183).

The position of the current research is largely consistent with that set out by Ferguson. This means that governmentality will not be deployed in the pejorative sense associated with neoliberalism here, but rather in an attempt to understand the conditions of formulation that contribute to particular modes of governing in relation to specific contexts. In order to demonstrate this more clearly, the discussion will now turn to the relationships between governmentality and the more tangible topics with which this research is concerned.

2.6.3 Governmentality and Responsibility: The Public and Private Sectors
The previous section asserted that governmentality should not be automatically regarded as inherently positive or negative, on the basis that Foucault’s original articulation was broader and more flexible than such a fixed position could be associated with. It is upon the same grounds that this section approaches its applicability to state and corporate organisations. Before addressing this specifically, it is worth acknowledging the implications of Rose et al.’s (2006) claim that:
Instead of seeing any single body—such as the state—as responsible for managing the conduct of citizens, this perspective recognizes that a whole variety of authorities govern in different sites, in relation to different objectives (Rose et al., 2006, p. 85).

Although terminological confusion may mean otherwise, governmentality should therefore not be seen as the exclusive preserve of explicitly named government organisations but rather as a form of behaviour that is performed by any entity that engages in the process of governing. However, the social complexity of modern governmental structures further complicates this issue. For example, McNay (1994) shows how the influence of the state has developed over time:

Historically, the modern state has adapted and strengthened itself through the adoption of multifarious techniques of government which are not necessarily immanent in the state of deployed in an intentional fashion. This is to say that although strategies of government may result in the efficient management of the population, there is not necessarily a causal link between these strategies and a centralized state power (McNay, 1994, p. 118).

In other words, given that the modern state governs in a less explicitly top-down fashion than those which have preceded it in previous years or centuries, the exercise of its power is more difficult to define or delimit, although this complexity would be possible to apply to other macro level entities in similar fashion. However, as the focus of the current study is upon both the activity of both public and private sector organisations, there is a need to clarify how these can be approached in terms of governmentality. The central debate here concerns the extent to which corporations can be construed to be ‘governing’ – in line with the position of Rose et al. (2006) related above. For Stenson (2005), the significance of the state should not be understated:

Even if the state is not a monolithic, unitary collective actor, at least in the advanced liberal democracies, where state, public sectors can account for between 30 to 50 percent of GDP, it is implausible to reduce state organizations, with huge command over resources, to the status of equivalent nodes in the market for security. Sovereign practices operate in the name of and with the resources of central state authority and law. This is so even where elements of sovereign power, for example, electronic surveillance of offenders, are sub-contracted to commercial corporations (Stenson, 2005, p. 273).

In this line of argument, the state’s significance is elevated above that of the private sector on the basis that it ultimately has greater responsibility for the exercise of ‘sovereign practices’. Indeed, Dean (1999) provides more detail on the influence of the state upon everyday life:

‘Fundamental experiences’ of life and death, of health and suffering, of desires and needs, of individual and collective identity, of toil and labour, have become matters for sophisticated regimes of government and complex forms of knowledge and expertise, and that all this is linked to the exercise of the sovereign power of the state (Dean, 1999, p. 115).
Indeed, it is difficult to dispute that state organisations can be understood to hold a much greater level of macro level influence upon society than any other. However, at this juncture it is worth considering Vallentin and Murillo’s (2011) assertion that “governmentality analyses have so far not been overly concerned with business and the corporate sphere”, on the basis that these have primarily focused upon “the political idiom and to societal matters in ways that do not necessarily exclude business but which certainly do not award it a focal role” (2011, p. 6). In accordance with this, it is worth noting how Roy (1997) outlines that the modern corporation should increasingly be regarded in comparable fashion to state organisations:

The corporation, that most ‘modern’ of economic organizations, thus is the continuation of a pre-modern system. Its legally binding by-laws are a delegation of state sovereignty, a vestige of its public origins. Why the business corporation was able to escape the sword of liberalizing egalitarianism is something that needs to be explained (Roy, 1997, p. 46).

Even if one acknowledges that the state’s influence over society remains greater than that of the corporation, the sentiments of Roy (1997) are understandable, and the corporation’s influence should not be disregarded. This can be reconciled with the view of Rose et al. (2006) acknowledged above, and it is on this basis that this study approaches the role and responsibility of the corporation in public life should be regarded in similar terms to that of the state. Following Boden (2005), CSR can be seen as a stark example of how these are exercised:

Corporate social responsibility and corporate governance regimes are not neutral processes but aspects of ‘governmentality’ and offer a technique, analytics, by which such processes can be explicated (Boden, 2005, p. 373).

While Boden’s (2005) depiction of CSR as part of a broader construction of ‘governmentality’ contradicts the position set out in the previous section, the argument that it should be seen as a form of governing and is therefore a worthwhile site for analysis is possible to square with the position set out here. Put simply, just as governmentality should not be regarded as positive or negative, it should not be automatically assumed to be exclusive to the state as opposed to any other macro level organisation – of which the private sector corporation is a prominent example.

2.6.4 Governmentality and Public Health
One example of the respective influences of the state and the corporation on society lies in the field of public health, where both public and private sector entities can play significant roles in both the promotion of health and the delivery of healthcare. McNay (1994) outlines how this might be approached from a governmentality perspective:
In the juridical theory of sovereignty, a radical discontinuity is established and constantly redefined between the legitimate power of the prince and other 'illegitimate' forms of power. In contrast, a continuity is maintained between the different forms of power that compose the arts of government (McNay, 1994, p. 116).

The notion of 'legitimate' and 'illegitimate' power can be applied to the roles of the public and private sectors in relatively straightforward fashion. For an organisation to be afforded responsibility for the delivery of health there must be a recognition that it is capable of doing so proficiently. According to a governmentality perspective, this recognition would ultimately be contingent upon certain contextually-based ‘conditions of formulation’, and its analysis would involve the identification of certain techniques, procedures, regulations and laws that permit it to function (Burchell, 1998). However, despite this possible application to health, it has been asserted that Foucault's theory in general does not help to inform work on health policy:

Foucault's work is probably of very little direct use to health policy. He offers no positive conceptions as to how health might be regulated, only historical studies relating to how systems of knowledge concerning the health of populations came to be linked to styles of power and procedures of state (Osborne, 1997, p. 173).

On a practical level, Osborne's concerns are difficult to deny when one considers the primarily abstract nature of Foucault’s work. However, Osborne's (1997) elaboration on this point gives more insight into how the Foucauldian scholar might approach an analysis of health:

Governments can at best provide the conditions – a medical staffing of the population, a hospital system, procedures of public health, sanitary infrastructures, social security, employment legislation, etc. – that put different sectors of the population on a more or less equal footing with regard to chances for health; and they can pay professionals to attempt to cure (where possible) diseases after they have occurred. But they cannot guarantee health as such (Osborne, 1997, p. 179).

This is consistent with both Foucault’s original articulations of governmentality, and also with his wider approach to power. This is because in a modern liberal democracy it is simply impossible for a governing organisation to ‘force’ health upon a population. Given this, the measures Osborne (1997) highlights represent the greatest extent to which health can be encouraged, but illustrate how it cannot be guaranteed. This difficulty of ‘guaranteeing’ health is consistent with the notions of ‘steering’ (Vallentin and Murillo, 2011) and of ‘nudging’ individuals towards healthy behaviours (Vallgårda, 2012), and is a concern that must be negotiated by all actors involved in the promotion of health. It should also be noted that the broad-ranging nature of ‘health’ as a concept further complicates this issue. For example, Petersen (1997) lists a number of other spheres of society that also interact with the promotion of health:
Contemporary health promotion encompasses such areas as community development, personal skills development, the control of advertising ‘unhealthy’ and dangerous products, the regulation of urban space, intervention in workplaces and the monitoring and periodic screening of sub-populations (Petersen, 1997, p. 195).

The most significant of the terms listed here is ‘community development’, which is common to both public and private sector discourse around the promotion of health. In terms of both governmentality in general and CSR in particular, the notion of ‘community’ can be seen as important in how it represents one way of articulating attempts to translate macro level policies into the micro level context of specific (local) groups of people.

2.6.5 Governmentality in Research on Sport and Health

Beyond these more abstract wider discussions of governmentality’s applicability, it is also worth acknowledging how it has been used in social research on sport. In a fashion that is largely consistent with Foucault’s anti-foundational epistemological stance, this has varied in relation to both context and interpretation. For example, governmentality has been applied in relation to drug use in sport (Burke & Hallinan, 2008), national sporting organisations (Green & Houlihan, 2006), obesity (Readdy & Ebbeck, 2012), coach education (Piggott, 2012) and disability sport (Wickman, 2011).

Indeed, governmentality has proved a popular framework for the analysis of ‘risk’. More recently, Giulianotti (2009) has shown how this can apply in a sporting context:

For example, police forces classify specific sport events or tournaments as “high-risk” and different policing strategies are implemented for different categories of spectators who are classified according to particular “risk” characteristics (e.g., most likely to cause disturbances, most likely to be drawn into disturbances) (2009, p. 543).

The example of the “high risk” sport event can be used to further illustrate the comprehensive nature of governmentality. Firstly, while a sporting event may be given this status by certain authorities, an anti-foundational perspective would see this as being socially constructed and premised upon a range of assumptions relating to sport and society. Secondly, and in relation to Foucault’s “technologies of the self”, the “high risk” event will be perceived by individual fans or spectators according to the dominant types of knowledge that would be associated with such a fixture. It can therefore be seen that a governmentality perspective represents a powerful lens through which to problematize and to examine social phenomena that would be typically accepted as natural or common sense. The concept of risk has also been used in research on obesity. For example, McDermott (2007) used a governmental perspective in her analysis of ‘risk’ in relation to children, physical inactivity and obesity. In her conclusion, McDermott writes that “risk discourses are a strategy, a rationale, and a technique deployed
to govern a population” (2007, p. 317). In this particular study, such a strategy includes practices such as epidemiology, ‘expert’ knowledge and education. While the specifics of these are not important here, it is important to acknowledge how when combined, these practices contribute to a discourse of fear about the long term risks of childhood inactivity that is observable at macro level and internalised at the level of the individual, or the ‘self’.

Governmentality was also used by Piggin, Jackson & Lewis (2009) in the context of sport and recreation policy-making. In this instance, the use of governmentality was linked to its capacity to help in attempting to establish “how certain governing ideas within sport and recreation policy are formulated in order to obtain various results, from encouraging citizens to become more active, to promoting ideas about the value of elite sporting success” (2009, p. 89). Piggin et al. concluded that the use of a governmentality perspective provides “insight into the ‘art of government’” and “the management of populations”, along with the ultimate effects of “policy rhetoric” (2009, p. 99). This is consistent with the tenor of this discussion as a whole, as it captures the way that governmentality is understood here as a perspective or a lens through which attempts to manage populations can be better understood.

2.6.6 Deployment of Governmentality in the Current Research

Building upon the overall theoretical understanding of governmentality that has been outlined in the preceding sections, the framework within which it will be applied to the current research will now be set out. Following Miller and Rose (1990) and Rose and Miller (1992), Vallentin and Murillo (2011) advocate approaching governmentality using three distinct levels: rationalities, programmes and technologies. Here these will be defined first following Miller and Rose (1990) and Rose and Miller (1992) and subsequently clarified in relation to Vallentin and Murillo (2011) given the specific focus of this paper upon CSR.

Firstly, a political or governmental rationality refers to the overarching formation of a particular way of thinking:

> It is possible to specify and differentiate political rationalities in terms of the relatively systematic discursive matrices within which government is articulated.

> [For example] Before one can seek to manage a domain such as an economy it is first necessary to conceptualize a set of processes and relations as an economy which is amenable to management (Miller & Rose, 1990, p. 5-6).

Furthermore, Rose and Miller (1992) describe how a rationality can be understood to have moral, epistemological and idiomatic forms – which ultimately shape how it is perceived, understood and
articulated in mainstream discourse. Vallentin and Murillo (2011) explicate how the overarching nature of rationalities means that several can influence CSR:

In the eyes of government, CSR does not constitute a particular rationality in and by itself. Rather, it tends to be incorporated into existing policy areas and to be viewed through the lenses of already established governmental rationalities (Vallentin and Murillo, 2011, p. 10).

In accordance with Miller and Rose (1990), existing rationalities that could inform CSR include those relating to economics, society and the environment. However, the focus of the present research also involves others such as sport and health, which further demonstrates the complexity of the term. Following this, a governmental ‘programme’ can be used to represent the translation of a broader rationality into particular policy content. For Miller and Rose (1990), these are socially constructed:

Programmes of government are idealized schema for the ordering of social and economic life. As such they are not simply ‘applied’ through techniques such as national planning and accounting. Programmes constitute a space within which the objectives of government are elaborated, and where plans to implement them are dreamed up (Miller & Rose, 1990, p. 14).

A governmental programme can therefore be best understood as taking the form of a particular policy or initiative. For Rose and Miller (1992), “government is a problematizing activity” in that it “poses the obligations of rulers in terms of the problems they seek to address” (1992, p. 181) – which means that governmental programmes can thus be constructed as attempts to rectify these. This is consistent with Vallentin and Murillo’s (2011) description of how programmes represent attempts of government to “define a governable space and thus to render visible – and approachable – the space over which government is to be exercised” (2011, p. 14). In other words, before a programme can be justified there must be a broader recognition of its importance – which can in turn be linked to overarching rationalities that relate to it. In the present study, the two most prominent tangible examples of governmental programmes are government policy documents and sponsor-led CSR initiatives.

Finally, a governmental ‘technology’ describes the specific techniques through which a programme is delivered:

Government is a domain of strategies, techniques and procedures through which different forces seek to render programmes operable, and by means of which a multitude of connections are established between the aspirations of authorities and the activities of individuals and groups. These heterogeneous mechanisms we term technologies of government. It is through technologies that political rationalities and the programmes of government that articulate them become capable of deployment (Rose & Miller, 1992, p. 183).

As Vallentin and Murillo (2011) describe, technologies of government “mark the point of realization for governmental programmes” (2011, p. 15). Examples of these in the context of the present study could include techniques such as official Olympic legacy targets and sport and activity participation statistics.
The association of these more tangible technologies with programmes and wider rationalities can therefore be seen as a useful way to conceptualise the relationship between the explicit manifestations and the more abstract underlying beliefs and ideologies of governmental activity. In terms of the present study’s interest in both public and private sector discourse, approaching the activity of each as governmental programmes therefore enables them to be better linked to overarching rationalities which ultimately inform both at a broader level.

While this framework of rationalities, programmes and technologies represents a clear way of translating the abstract theoretical notion of governmentality into a more practical approach to use in the current research, it is also worth justifying this approach in relation to the suggestion that studies in governmentality may be regarded - to some extent - as descriptive (Dean, 2007; Rose et al., 2006). For example, it has been claimed that what these “describe is not governing as such, but our thinking and imagination about governing” (Waage & Benediktsson, 2010, p.5). Indeed, this can be related to this chapter’s earlier discussion of Foucault’s thought in comparison to that of Lukes (2005) and Crozier and Friedberg (1980), in which it was suggested that, in comparison to Foucault-driven work, each of these represent more practical means of addressing the ways that macro level discourses are interpreted, negotiated and resisted by actors at lower scales of observation. This observation could similarly be applied to the framework set out in the present section, as its emphasis is primarily upon identifying different modes and techniques of governance as opposed to explaining how they are interpreted and understood by specific actors at a local level or - to use Desjeux’s (1996) terms, a lower scale of observation. However, while drawing upon these additional theories may contribute to a stronger explanatory framework overall, the practical constraints of this project preclude this. Given that the overarching aim of this research is to understand more about sport - and the Olympic Games - as a site for the delivery of CSR using the specific social context of CSR delivery at London 2012, the framework outlined above is therefore most suitable by virtue of its capacity to understand CSR schemes within the broader social context of the Games as a whole.

2.7 Chapter Conclusion
This chapter has sought to outline and justify the theoretical framework of this research in terms of the broader social theory that has shaped this and the specific way in which it is deployed here. First, the distinction between macro, meso and micro level theorising was explored (Desjeux, 1996) in order to establish the basis for the organisation of data collection in this study. Second, given the suitability of Foucault’s (1994;1978b) governmentality to the topic of the research, an overview of Foucault’s thought was provided – and then set against the alternative theories of Lukes (2005) and Crozier and Friedberg (1980) – in order to illustrate certain points of contrast with that of Foucault. Third, the concept of
governmentality was reviewed in terms of both its original development and its more recent application to fields relevant to the present research, such as the role of government, public health promotion and sport—before an account of governmentality’s deployment in the current research was set out. Using Desjeux’s (1996) scales of observation, this project’s selection of a governmentality perspective can be better justified, although it should be acknowledged that this can also be used to explain the respective suitability of this particular approach for both the macro and meso levels. Also, situating governmentality within Foucault’s work as a whole helps in both understanding the concept’s intellectual origins as well as the extent to which it has been deployed by subsequent authors. Finally, the use of governmental rationalities, programmes and technologies in accordance with Rose and Miller (1990) in general and Vallentin and Murillo (2011) in the specific context of CSR can be seen to provide a clear framework in which to understand a concept that has been described as a “vague domain” (Foucault, 1978b, p. 109) but which has been shown to be particularly applicable to the study at hand.

In terms of the overall thesis, the purpose of this chapter was to build upon the aims and objectives set out in Chapter 1 by setting out the theoretical basis from which these would be approached. With this theoretical basis established, the next chapter addresses the primary concept analysed in the research—CSR—as well as the specific social context which the London 2012 Olympic Games represented for CSR’s delivery.
Chapter 3: CSR and The Olympic Games as a Context for its Delivery

Given that this study can best be understood as being primarily concerned with CSR – and therefore using both sport and the Olympic Games as a specific context in which to analyse this, the purpose of this chapter is to address the concept of CSR before clarifying how CSR is understood in this study as a whole, and to explore the Olympic Games as the context in which it is analysed here. In order to do this, literature pertaining to CSR in relation to mainstream business, public health, community development, sport and the Olympic Games is reviewed. The chapter contains four main sections. The first of these seeks to define and review CSR as a concept in relation of mainstream business. The second then narrows its focus to the relationship between CSR and public health. After this, the third section examines and reviews the relationships between CSR and sport. Finally, the fourth of these chief sections focuses upon the London 2012 Olympic Games as a specific context for the delivery of CSR. Following this, a summary of the chapter’s and implications for the research as a whole is presented.

3.1 CSR in Mainstream Business

3.1.1 CSR: Definition and Clarification
CSR has proved notoriously difficult for academics to define. McWilliams, Siegel and Wright (2006) describe how no clear consensus on a definition exists while Carroll (1999) describes an “impressive history” of how attempts to establish one have evolved over time (p. 268). This difficulty of definition can be attributed to the social complexity of the term. Crane et al. (2008) highlight a number of questions around CSR that must be answered by anyone looking to provide a convincing definition, including those of the fundamental purpose of the business and the contribution it should make to society. These authors acknowledge that the status of CSR has been compromised by a range of other labels that concern similar ideas, including “corporate citizenship, sustainable business, corporate responsibility and corporate social performance” (2008, p. 4). Not surprisingly, each of these labels can be reasonably argued to be as unclear as that of CSR. Indeed, it could even be said that – particularly in qualitative research - a precise definition of CSR is impossible. Instead of seeking to defy this, research on CSR should be more concerned with establishing its position in relation to the central debates around it – which extend far beyond the limits of the business context itself. Indeed, Crane et al. (2008) summarise some of the most important debates around CSR:

For a subject that has been studied for so long, it is unusual to discover that researchers still do not share a common definition or set of core principles, that they still argue about what it means to be socially responsible, or even whether firms should have social responsibilities in the first place. Empirical researchers have been similarly unable to answer the one question that has
dominated CSR research probably more than any other over the past 30 years, whether CSR is good for business or not (Crane et al., 2008, p. 4).

Two important questions follow from this. First, it can be observed that debate around CSR can vary in scope considerably. At its narrowest extreme, it can be limited to questions of CSR’s worth and delivery in individual businesses – such as whether it can improve aspects of a company and how this can be achieved. However, one looking from a broader vantage point can see that these specific questions can be held to be symptomatic of the wider social and political status of CSR. Here, one is more likely to view CSR as a general way of thinking about the responsibilities of business in social life as opposed to as a specific technique that can be used to address more everyday needs. Second, the idea that researchers continue to disagree about ‘what it means to be socially responsible’ is also important. Any attempt to debate either what social responsibility is or whether it should be expected of business in the first place will be premised upon a range of political, cultural and economic assumptions. With the extent of the social complexity around CSR now apparent, one can more easily sympathise with those scholars noted above who have struggled at such length to define it. Furthermore, for a piece of qualitative research like the current study, subscribing to any rigid definition of CSR would be unfaithful to both its epistemological and theoretical foundations.

But if any attempt by the qualitative researcher to define CSR is inherently futile, then how is the term understood in the current research? To be succinct, this is done in the broadest possible sense, and is in accordance with Crane et al.’s (2008) assertion that:

A comprehensive overview of CSR has to accommodate such difference rather than eschew it in favour of a closely defined term. That said, we might at least suggest that at the core of these debates is the subject of the social obligations and impacts of corporations in society (Crane et al., 2008, p. 6).

In line with this, CSR is understood in this research as any corporate activity that could be seen as intended for the benefit of society – regardless of whether this is fulfilled or whether it is labelled as such. Indeed, the problem with using too narrow a stance of CSR to analyse the activities of Olympic sponsors is aptly illustrated by the fact that many of the ‘socially responsible’ initiatives being run in conjunction with London 2012 have been organised not by CSR departments but by sponsorship teams. Although this point may appear pedantic, the fact that different facets of certain businesses are involved in the delivery of ‘socially responsible’ activity serves to demonstrate how CSR is best regarded here as a way of thinking (or behaving) as opposed to a more specifically demarcated aspect of business life.
3.1.2 Origins of (Corporate) Social Responsibility
The values and principles that underpin CSR have been advocated since antiquity. However, the modern business usage of the term stems from the influence and application of Christian principles to developing businesses from the 19th Century onwards. Most notably, philanthropy was first encouraged in business after it became clear that the private sector was more able to support the poor in comparison to what were then comparatively rudimentary public institutions. Heald (1970) outlines how these principles - along with other factors - compelled business to consider its relationship with society:

Philanthropy and fraternity were ideals doubly commended to nineteenth-century Americans. Both the humanitarianism of the Enlightenment and the precepts of Christianity reminded men on their mutual ties and obligations. The Industrial Revolution brought changes which challenged men to apply these values in new social contexts, but it failed to destroy the sources which fed them. Indeed, the conditions it created opened new perspectives on the relationship between economic growth and social welfare. It stimulated efforts to achieve deeper understanding of the nature of social relations, and it provoked many attempts to reform and strengthen them (Heald, 1970, p. 1).

Heald’s account shows how the increasingly changing nature of working life meant that business leaders were faced with new questions about their role in society. On a similar note, Wren (2005) describes how the later part of the nineteenth century saw the first significant criticism of business – or what in the context of CSR could be understood as corporate ‘irresponsibility’.

Virtuous conduct seldom makes news. Historians and journalists are awed by the extraordinary and more frequently than not over-stress it to the detriment of those quiet, sturdy, responsible people who, unheralded, are the true protective builders. Criticism of business leaders and their practices began to appear primarily in the latter third of the nineteenth century (Wren, 2005 p. 92).

The criticism of which Wren speaks was aimed at noted businessmen such as Cornelius Vanderbilt and Daniel Drew, who were both likened to criminal ‘robber barons’ for their involvement in malpractices such as bribery, stock manipulation and ‘watering stock’. While the accuracy of these particular claims would be better examined elsewhere, their chief implication for the current study is that such criticism of business can be linked to its growing prominence in society – and the fact that any illicit behaviour would therefore have a much stronger effect on the population as a whole. However, although Wren (2005) may be right to downplay the seductive appeal of ‘virtuous conduct’ to academics, it can be seen that the sincerity of social responsibility in these early years of business is subject to debate. For example, Carroll shows how it may be difficult to differentiate between business and societal motives:

In examining the mid-to-late 1800s, it is apparent that emerging businesses were especially concerned with employees and how to make them more productive workers. Then, and now, it is sometimes difficult to differentiate what organizations are doing for business reasons, i.e. making the workers more productive, and what the organizations are doing for social reasons,
i.e. helping to fulfil their needs and make them better and more contributing members of society (Carroll, 2008, p. 21).

Indeed, Carroll’s words here can be seen to foreshadow much of the debates around CSR to follow – and specifically, the question of whether it is born out of some heartfelt social concern or the more calculating pursuit of profit. Going further than Carroll, Heald (1970) shows how this particular question can be linked to the wider social and political context of the 19th century in which business developed:

Businessmen, to be sure, had special reasons for desiring stable and healthy social conditions. To show that they were not guided by self-interest alone is not to suggest that they were, at the opposite extreme, paragons of sympathy and understanding. When labor was in great demand, as was often true in America, it was practical good sense to show the workers some consideration. Where the masses were empowered with the right to vote, their circumstances and mood might be a matter of serious concern to even the staunchest conservative. From the outset, self-interest combined with idealism to foster sensitivity to social conditions of the part of the business community (Heald, 1970, p. 2).

Regardless of where one stands on the continuum of possible attitudes to business, the way that Heald (1970) links this debate to wider social developments such as suffrage and demand for labour shows how the concept of social responsibility – and today’s CSR – are best suited to the kind of theoretical stance that was articulated here in the previous section. Despite this, it should be noted that the current discussion has only focussed on the earliest equivalents of modern day CSR programmes. As Carroll (2008) describes, the early 20th century saw the growth of business reach a point where “large corporations began to dominate the economy and many of these firms had the power of governments” and that this “raised up a corporate ruling class with almost limitless power” (p. 23). However, as this author notes, this was soon undermined by the onset of the Great Depression, which “ushered in the next period of business and society relationships” (p. 23). With this in mind, the focus of the discussion will now turn to the ways in which these relationships were debated and ultimately formalised in the 20th century.

Indeed, by the 20th century, industrialisation had fundamentally changed working life. Earlier arguments about responsibility and philanthropy gave way to a wider recognition of the need for social responsibility, although debate regarding the fairest extent of this persists to this day. These debates about CSR typically involve two opposing views, and the respective positions of Adolphe Berle (1931) and Merrick Dodd (1932) in the 1930s can be seen as the earliest clear example of this. For Berle (1931), the primary concern for any corporation should be the “ratable benefit of all the shareholders as their interest appears” (p.1049), a view that has led to his portrayal as the first to oppose CSR on the basis that it simply reduces a corporation’s capacity to maximise shareholder wealth. In contrast, Dodd
(1932) is represented as an early champion of CSR. However, Bratton & Wachter (2008) show how this dichotomy is perhaps too simplistic:

The Berle-Dodd debate of 1932 is easily (and frequently) misread. When modern scholars read the texts out of context, Berle appears to be the supporter of modern shareholder primacy, which is a position he did hold, but only prior to his political metamorphosis and only in the strict confines of corporate law. Dodd, on the other hand, is interpreted in modern terms as a supporter of CSR. In fact, neither was supporting either position. Both were speaking to the politics of their day, defending different visions of the emerging corporatist state, Berle’s on the left and Dodd’s on the right. Berle thus ended up as the putative great-grandfather of shareholder primacy by happenstance, and, ironically, only because Dodd’s attack placed him in that position. By the time of the debate with Dodd, Early Berle was history. Berle, now Middle Berle, saw no principal role for shareholder primacy in his political economy (Bratton & Watchter, 2008, p. 134-5).

These words raise two important points. First, both Berle and Dodd’s views are both said to have been significantly shaped by the “politics of their day”. While this is hard to deny, it should also be observed that the same caveat could apply to views of CSR from any period and that the current study must therefore acknowledge that CSR at the London 2012 will be closely linked to the political and economic circumstances in which the event takes place. Second, the fact that for Bratton and Watcher (2008), both Berle and Dodd have been misinterpreted as standard-bearers for the polemic extremes of the CSR debate show how important this tension is. Were it not for the complexity noted by Heald (1970), one would almost be tempted to argue that the majority of discussion around this debate could be simplified to a stand-off between those who are in favour of CSR—citing the responsibility of business to society—and those who oppose it—citing the responsibility of business to create wealth. More broadly, these perspectives can be squared with left-wing and right-wing economic convictions respectively.

3.1.3 The 1950s and the 1960s
Although this underlying moral debate had been going on for decades—or even centuries—the more tangible origins of CSR in its modern sense can be traced to the 1950s. The 1950s and 1960s are described by Carroll (2008) as representing the period in which CSR was introduced into business discourse, but could be summarised as “more ‘talk’ than ‘action’” (p. 26). In other words, this was the period in which academics and businesspeople first recognised the need for debate around the social responsibilities of business, but did not translate this into any identifiable business programs or practices—aside from some isolated instances of philanthropy or charitable giving. On a terminological level, it can also be noted that these decades also saw the term ‘social responsibility’ evolve into that of
‘corporate social responsibility’ – which can primarily be attributed to the continuing growth of the modern corporation.

Among the earliest notable advocates of CSR was Howard Bowen, who provided a broad definition of the term:

It [CSR] refers to the obligations of businessmen to pursue those policies, to make those decisions, or to follow those lines of action which are desirable in terms of the objectives and values of society (Bowen, 1953, p. 6).

Perhaps the most striking aspect of this definition in relation to the current discussion is the fact that CSR is understood not as a set of specific practices but more as a general approach to business that is contingent upon a range of wider social factors. Indeed, although later work may have developed these ideas with more instructive recommendations for businesses, the fact that Bowen (1953) links business conduct to wider society demonstrates an awareness of the significant status of the business – or the corporation – in wider society. Bowen’s definition of CSR was consistent with the increasing amount of literature upon business’s role in society at that time (e.g. Eels, 1956). However, while the 1950s may be seen as the decade in which today’s CSR was born – the only significant effect of this upon practitioners was in terms of the adjustment required by these new debates about the social impact and responsibility of business.

Indeed, as Griseri and Seppala (2010) state, CSR “emerged as an area of general concern for companies only in the 1960s” (p. 6). These authors describe how this happened as corporations were placed under increasing scrutiny for the impact of their operations, something that had previously been the responsibility of “society as a whole” (p. 6), as well as for controversial issues such as the support of authoritarian regimes. Companies were also increasingly required to be sensitive to a growing public awareness of issues such as environmental sustainability and social issues such as gender discrimination. The fact that Griseri and Seppala speak of CSR in terms of ‘concern’ rather serves to support the notion that the 1950s are best seen as a period in which awareness of it had increased. Clearly, the fact that CSR could now represent a legitimate ‘concern’ for the corporation demonstrates the practical significance of how this awareness had grown.

This heightened consciousness of CSR demanded a more formalised definition, and one prominent attempt to establish one was made by Davis (1960), who stated that CSR represented:

Businessmen’s decisions and actions taken for reasons at least partially beyond the firm’s direct economic or technical interest (Davis, 1960, p. 70).
This particular definition can be seen to foreshadow much of the later speculation about the possibility of a ‘business case’ for CSR (put simply, the idea that socially responsible conduct may be profitable). Davis’s (1960) definition appears to dismiss this, as it limits CSR to business activity that is ostensibly beyond this. Alternatively, Walton’s (1967) definition of CSR emphasises the relations between society and the business/corporation:

In short, the new concept of social responsibility recognizes the intimacy of relationships between the corporation and society and realizes that such relationships must be kept in mind by top managers as the corporation and the related groups pursue their respective goals (Walton, 1967, p. 18).

These two examples demonstrate how different ideas about the responsibilities of business influenced attempts to define CSR in the 1960s. However, it can be seen that among the most prominent of these was that which concerned the altruistic extent of CSR, as well as that which concerned the ‘relationship’ between the business and society in general. It is also apparent that the 1950s and 1960s represented only the embryonic discussions of these debates, and that no formal definitions could have been said to have been developed over this time. However this lack of any clear definition or theoretical framework for the application of CSR laid bare the need for a more formalised approach – something that began to take shape in the 1970s and 1980s.

3.1.4 The 1970s and the 1980s
If the 1950s and 1960s can be best characterised as the years in which CSR entered the consciousness of mainstream business and began to be defined, debated and defended, the following two decades should be seen as the period in which approaches to the topic were more developed both theoretically and practically. Indeed, by the end of 1970s the theoretical case for it had been exemplified by Archie Carroll while that against it was notably advocated by Milton Friedman.

Carroll’s (1979) model identified four aspects of social responsibility. At the base is ‘economic responsibility’, which refers to the need for a company to be profitable. Above this is ‘legal responsibility’, as all business activity is constrained by law. Next is ‘ethical responsibility’, which is more ambiguous than legal. However, companies must still be sensitive to this because – as Griseri and Seppala (2010) state – “ethical expectations can be seen to underpin and predict the emergence of new laws and regulations” (p. 10). Finally, the fourth level – and the peak of Carroll’s pyramid is ‘philanthropic responsibility’. This refers to discretionary business activity that goes beyond obligation or expectation. The four levels should be seen as discrete rather than consecutive, as the different types of responsibility may compromise one another. For example, consider a company who have a relationship with a repressive political regime. While this may be financially profitable, it would be likely
to draw criticism on ethical grounds. Conversely, the relationship would cause profit to suffer – or in Carroll’s terms, economic responsibilities to be unfulfilled. Carroll’s model can therefore be seen as a helpful illustration of the balancing act that is required of managers who must satisfy both economic and social criteria.

At the time of the publication of Carroll’s model, one of the most influential critics of CSR was Milton Friedman:

In a free-enterprise, private-property system, a corporate executive is an employee of the owners of the business. He has direct responsibility to his employers. That responsibility is to conduct the business in accordance with their desires, which generally will be to make as much money as possible while conforming to their basic rules of the society, both those embodied in law and those embodied in ethical custom. Of course, in some cases his employers may have a different objective. A group of persons might establish a corporation for an eleemosynary purpose--for example, a hospital or a school. The manager of such a corporation will not have money profit as his objectives but the rendering of certain services (Friedman, 1970, p. 13).

Before addressing Friedman’s specific claim here, it is worth acknowledging his influence over not just management theory but also economic policy. As an advisor to Ronald Reagan during his tenure as president of the United States, Friedman must be recognised as a significant contributor to the neoliberal economic policy that characterised Western politics in the 1980s. The impact of his economic thought is hard to dismiss. In terms of CSR, Friedman argues businesses should simply focus upon maximising shareholder wealth. While the social responsibility programmes of corporations today suggest this approach is now outdated, some academic support remains. For example, Jenson (2003) argues that profit (a single objective function) ensures that managers remain focused on the most efficient allocation of economic resources. From this perspective, the sincerity behind CSR is ultimately insufficient to justify its negative effects on ‘wealth’ and therefore social well-being in general.

Thus far, this discussion may have emphasised the two opposing views of CSR too strongly. Other perspectives exist. The idea that shareholder wealth should be prioritised above all social concern fails to consider the argument that corporate responsibility may be profitable in itself. Perhaps the earliest significant manifestation of this perspective was Johnson’s (1971) advocacy of ‘conventional wisdom’, in which he stated that:

A socially responsible firm is one whose managerial staff balances a multiplicity of interests. Instead of striving only for larger profits for its stockholders, a responsible enterprise also takes into account employees, suppliers, dealers, local communities, and the nation (p. 50).

In other words, Johnson’s position is that a firm that concerns itself solely with the profit of its shareholders may suffer from the lack of consideration for its wider environment that this could entail. In
order to alleviate this, the business should therefore appreciate the extent to which its wider reputation can affect its profitability – which would in turn leave the same stakeholders worse off. However, it should be noted that the ideas expounded here by Johnson would not be fully developed (in theoretical terms) until the 1980s.

Indeed, Carroll (2008) describes how the 1980s saw the earlier interest in defining and clarifying what CSR represented give way to “research on CSR and a splintering of writings on alternative or complementary concepts and themes” (p. 34). If one considers the principles set out in Johnson’s ‘conventional wisdom’ above, it can be seen that the development of Freeman’s (1984) stakeholder theory and the notion of a ‘business case’ for CSR can be seen as logical extension of them. For Freeman, firms must pay attention to stakeholders to survive, and if stakeholders are not well managed then strategy becomes hard to implement and business suffers accordingly. However, Freeman’s theory has been criticised for its lack of clarity, with some arguing that it is difficult to determine precisely what constitutes a stakeholder – and why managers should attend to them (Mitchell, Agle & Wood, 1997). For some groups, everyone is a stakeholder because all can be affected by business activity, while others take a narrower view. It has also been argued that the stakeholder theory is not even a theory (Donaldson & Preston, 1995; Phillips, Freeman & Wicks, 2003), primarily because it does not offer managers any way of resolving the trade-offs demanded and challenges posed by such a number of different stakeholders.

Tuzzolino and Armandi’s (1981) attempt to develop Carroll’s pyramid alongside Maslow’s (1943) hierarchy of needs can be seen as one example of how the 1980s bore witness to numerous attempts to expand or elaborate upon the work on CSR that had gone before. For these authors, the business organisation was comparable to the individual (as depicted by Maslow) in that each has a hierarchy of criteria (or ‘needs’) that need to be satisfied or fulfilled. This hierarchy was ultimately presented as a means by which to assess the extent to which socially responsible practices had been successful or not. However, for the present discussion, less important than the particular merits and limitations of this theorisation is the way that it demonstrates how CSR scholars in the 1980s had begun to follow a more practical approach.

Towards the end of the 1980s, the focus of academic work on CSR turned to concepts such as Corporate Social Performance (Wood, 1991), which assesses CSR alongside Corporate Social Responsiveness. Central to Wood’s model of Corporate Social Performance is the conviction that while CSR may be well intended, it may not have the desired practical effect. Wood therefore sought a way to evaluate the impact of these corporate actions upon both certain stakeholders and wider society. The
very premise of this model would be dismissed by scholars such as Entine (2003), for whom Corporate Social Performance is too abstract a concept to generate any useful data for. Indeed, the question of ‘impact’ is important in relation to the project at hand, as the corporate (and also government-led) discourses and initiatives linked to 2012 may ultimately not have any significant effect upon their targeted populations – however altruistic the motives behind them may be.

3.1.5 The 1990s and the 2000s
It is arguable that the 1970s and the 1980s represented the years in which academic work on CSR evolved most significantly. Whilst acknowledging that the present discussion has somewhat arbitrarily divided this process into twenty-year segments, it could similarly be contended work on CSR from the 1990s and 2000s to the present day does not feature the same extent of invention or innovation. For example, Carroll (2008) generalises that “very few unique contributions to the concept of CSR occurred in the 1990s” – and this description could reasonably be extended to the work of the early 21st century that has followed this. However, it should be acknowledged that the passage of time may render this statement less defendable in decades to come.

One dimension of CSR scholarship that has grown in recent years is that of its application and analysis in countries outside the USA – where most of the key debates addressed here can be seen to have originated (e.g. Bratton & Watchter, 2008; Friedman, 1970; Heald, 1970). This is exemplified by the work of Moon (2005), who used the evolution of CSR in the United Kingdom as an example of its development in Europe – or more specifically, the European Union (EU). Moon links the growth and development of CSR in the UK to the wider context of British society – using the economic difficulties of the later 1970s as one example of this. Again, the most important implication of this work for the current study lies in the way that Moon (2005) links the development of CSR in the UK to wider social factors. Overall, it could be reasonably argued that this observation can be applied to every phase of CSR’s academic development, and is also consistent with the epistemological stance set out at the beginning of this chapter.

3.1.6 Concluding Thoughts: CSR in Mainstream Business
Perhaps the overriding theme of this discussion is that CSR – in both the academic and practical sense of the term – has been continually shaped and reshaped by the wider social contexts in which it has been promoted, debated, accepted and developed. However, to say that CSR is simply affected by society in such a passive fashion is to do an injustice do the different aspects of this. The subjectivity of CSR is evident in different ways, although three in particular are apparent here. The first, and broadest, is that which concerns how important social and cultural events can stimulate interest in CSR – for example, historical events such as the Great Depression or the corporate scandals of the 1980s may
require business to reconsider its relationship with society. Second, closely related to this first aspect is the effect that these events can have on public perception. The crucial distinction here is that there is a difference between a company pursuing CSR because of negative media coverage and a company who do so because of a more internal perception that such change is required. Third, complexity is also evident at an academic level – where attempts to define CSR as a concept have continually suffered from a lack of consistency. For example, one definition may set out the voluntary or involuntary nature of CSR while another concerns itself with the broader relationship between business and society. As far as the present study is concerned, CSR is understood in its broadest and most complex sense, albeit with the caveat that the limitations of this particular piece of research would make a comprehensive analysis of the social factors that have shaped the delivery of CSR at London 2012 unrealistic.

3.2 CSR in Local Communities and Public Health
The previous section sought to provide an account of how CSR has developed over time - with particular emphasis upon how it has been dealt with by academics. However, it did not place any great emphasis upon the particular aspects of public life that CSR schemes have either been targeted at or influenced in any way. In order to address this, the purpose of this section is to offer an account of CSR initiatives in relation to community and to public health-based initiatives, as these are the two aspects of CSR that will be examined most significantly in the current study as a whole. Although community development and public health are ostensibly discrete fields of CSR, two things are common to both. First, both are examples of ‘external’ CSR; in that each consist primarily of a corporation attempting to bring about some degree of social benefit for the wider public – as opposed to restricting their focus to the internal operation of the business. Second, both relate to the notion of responsibility, and whether this should be held by the individual or by the corporation. As the previous section shows, some academics would argue that business should have no responsibility for the welfare of anything beyond its own profit, whereas others would accept that corporations have a responsibility to contribute to the wellbeing of the communities in which they operate.

3.2.1 CSR and Community-Based Initiatives
It should be acknowledged that the concept of a community is unclear at best and almost impossible to define at worst. For clarification, the present discussion considers ‘community’-based initiatives in terms of those corporate-led social programmes that focus on addressing social goals in specific local communities. The need for business to attend to these objectives is set out by Marshall (1993), for whom:

> In practical terms it can therefore be claimed that a successful business exists to serve the community as a whole. The better it serves the community, the more it will flourish. The
adoption of an ethical standpoint in society will best advance the self-interest of the individual firm. Those with a more high-minded view of ethics will claim that service of the community is really the primary aim of business, and the accumulation of profit is simply a measurement of how successful a firm is in serving the community (Marshall, 1993, p. 8).

Marshall’s depiction of the ‘high-minded’ understanding of ethics here can be seen to represent the logical extension of the conviction that business has a responsibility to take the needs of the wider community into consideration. Although it may be difficult find individual businesspeople who would agree wholeheartedly with the view that the first aim of business is community service, the fact that such a perspective exists does serve to demonstrate how the responsibility of the private sector continues to be understood.

Griseri and Seppala (2010) differentiate between community CSR programmes in more and less economically developed countries. On one hand, those in less developed states may fulfil a more apparent need to help the nation develop towards industrialisation, while on the other it can be seen that:

Some companies have important community programmes in industrialized countries as well. These programmes range from training and education of young people in disadvantaged communities to the support of social movements on a national scale (Griseri & Seppala, 2010, p. 383).

In terms of the current study, it can be seen that initiatives in developed countries are not limited to disadvantaged communities (however these are defined) and instead can be seen to promote socially desirable behaviour across the UK as a whole. For example, Lloyds TSB’s National School Sport Week and EDF Energy’s The Pod initiatives could both be construed as community initiatives in that both feature a clear attempt by a business to encourage young people to behave in a particular way or to do so in the future. However, it should be acknowledged that these kinds of community initiatives have been criticised as being driven more by self-promotion than pure altruism alone:

Community programmes have been criticized for being attempts to build corporate reputation while ignoring larger problems relating to corporate operations. Programmes have been viewed in a negative light particularly when companies have been seen to present information about them in response to other concerns (Griseri & Seppala, 2010, p. 384).

Two common features of debate around CSR are evident in this criticism alone. The first is that of the difference between internal and external CSR initiatives, where the argument would hold that a company may attempt to use the delivery of a particular initiative in public in an attempt to mask undesirable behaviour that is taking place within its internal operation. Second, the notion that community programmes should be seen as cynical attempts to earn favourable publicity can be seen to resonate with the debate around the possibility of a ‘business case’ for CSR.
A pertinent and illustrative example of a community-focused CSR initiative here is IBM’s contribution to education. Moore (2011) describes how although this began in the 1990s in the form of funding alone, it later developed as the organisation decided to use its core business expertise in Information Technology to make a more direct contribution to student learning in this subject area. Furthermore, IBM then started to suggest ways of using IT to improve aspects of the school day such as timetabling and parental involvement. As far as IBM’s reasoning for this kind of contribution is concerned, Moore states that:

In addition to serving the direct and immediate needs of the business, we have also gone beyond this and played a role in developing skills that serve not just our long-term needs, but address generalized requirements that will help with national skills agendas (2011, p. 90).

IBM’s delivery of CSR in this example resonates with the discussion of mainstream CSR in the previous section. First, there is an acknowledgement that over time, simply providing funding alone was perceived to be insufficient, which meant that the business felt the need to ‘go beyond’ this basic form of CSR by offering their practical expertise as well. Second, the fact that Moore (2011) acknowledges the reputational and long term benefit to IBM serves to blur the boundary between altruism and self-interest as suggested by Grisi Seppala (2010) above. Third, and most significantly, this example shows how community-focused programmes are an example of CSR delivery that has received growing attention in recent years, with the implication of this being that the onus upon business to take a more proactive stance towards benefitting wider society is increasing.

3.2.2 CSR and Health
The concept of public health is another that has increasingly featured in debates about the role of business in public life. Given the number of different topics that could fit under the label of ‘public health’, it is first necessary to clarify how this is being approached here. At the macro level, discourse around health can be closely linked to the idea of responsibility – and particularly in terms of the extent to which this should be distributed between the individual and the corporation. This often features in debates about the influence of companies that are best known for profiting from the sale of ‘unhealthy’ products upon the health of the individuals who consume them – something which is particularly notable in the fast food, soft drink and tobacco industries. In a paper addressing the CSR strategies of the latter two, Dorfman, Cheyne, Friedman, Wadud & Gottlieb (2012) note that:

By highlighting the importance of consumers making healthy choices instead of the companies’ roles in creating an unhealthy environment, soda company and tobacco industry CSR campaigns emphasize personal, instead of corporate, responsibility (Dorfman et al., 2012, p. 3)
In other words, companies that may stand accused of contributing to such an ‘unhealthy’ environment may defend themselves on the basis that decisions to consume their products are taken by responsible individuals. To accept this argument is to place responsibility for behaviour primarily with the individual, a perspective that is broadly congruent with a more right-wing or neoliberal social or political outlook. However, as the current discussion has examined thus far, this kind of stance must be seen to be largely at odds with the academic consensus that business instead has a significant responsibility to affect public life for the better. If this position is as flawed as the strict neoliberal would argue, then the credit for initiatives such as that of IBM described above must be awarded to the individuals who have taken part and benefitted as opposed to the corporation. If one is to make partisan claims about the responsibility of the corporation when individuals are influenced negatively, then logic would dictate that the role of the corporation should be similarly dismissed when the effect on the public is more positive.

However, this view of the corporation should not be applied across society, and is explicitly contradicted by the health-based activities of certain organisations. For example, the work of Holmqvist (2009) shows how business can act in the interest of health promotion. Here, the author shows how employers can use the terms ‘social responsibility’ and ‘health promotion’ to label the advancement of workplace health initiatives. Further, this author also states that:

> By clothing an activity as “socially responsible”, organizations may accomplish an essential task in a very sublime and efficient way: that of controlling its environment in terms of desired and appropriate human behaviors. Health promotion may be a particularly important mechanism of corporate social control since this practice targets the very foundation of a human's “personal condition” – sickness or health; disability or fitness (2009, p.68).

Although it should be noted that this particular article only concerns CSR and health promotion in internal terms, the points made by this author here can be applied more generally. Most importantly, the fact that activities which are ostensibly socially motivated can be used to disguise more cynical attempts to control the behaviour of individuals points to a need to carefully consider the motives behind any CSR scheme that claims to be aimed at promoting health – either within a specific organisation or in wider society in general.

### 3.2.3 Section Summary and Implications for the Study

This discussion of the application of CSR to the more specific contexts of community-focused initiatives and health promotion has sought to demonstrate how the debates covered in the previous section can be identified in and around the delivery of contemporary CSR. Of these, perhaps the most apparent was that which concerns the motives that may lurk behind any form of CSR. This is similarly evident in both community and health-focused CSR, as in both it can be seen that companies have been accused of using CSR as a subtle way of building their reputation – sometimes even in response to scandals.
that have had the opposite effect beforehand. The other overriding feature of both manifestations of CSR examined here is that of responsibility, as in both community and health-driven initiatives, the respective obligations of both the business and the individual can be debated considerably.

3.3 CSR and Sport

3.3.1 Background

I think sport is the hidden social worker in all our communities….It can reach places that very few things can. I know that from my Haringey athletics days, when people I trained with were brought up in and around the Broadwater Farm Estate (Coe, cited in McEvoy, 2010, para. 22).

This perspective, voiced by former Olympic athlete and LOCOG chair Lord Coe typifies a popular assumption about sport and its role in society – and one that can be considered in association with London 2012 given the prominence and influence of Coe’s role. Indeed, such beliefs about sport are also evident in CSR scholarship. For example, consider Smith and Westerbeek’s (2007) glowing appraisal of its potential to help business fulfil its duties to society:

Sport possesses the power to captivate and unite individuals within communities and create environments for contributing to social capital. Equally, the corporate world can mobilise much-needed resources to be deployed through sport to meet its social responsibilities. When the two come together in the form of sport corporate social responsibility, it can be pervasive, youth-friendly, health-oriented, socially interactive, environmentally aware, culturally liberating and fun. Corporate managers and sport managers alike can enhance the economic prospects of their organisations and maximise the social benefits that they deliver to society by better harnessing the power of sport to deliver on social and community objectives (Smith & Westerbeek, 2007, p.10).

The fact that this positive view of sport’s social potential is so widely accepted in both public and academic discourse should not be ignored. However, several of Smith and Westerbeek’s (2007) claims can be questioned. For example, while the positive features listed above may well be evident in sport to some degree, it is difficult to see how they can be held to render it unique. Furthermore, these authors do not acknowledge that the ‘social benefits’ that sport can provide should be set against those aspects of it that are less desirable. For example, it has been argued that sport can reinforce forms of social discrimination such as sexism and racism (Anderson, 2010), and the claim that sport provides a straightforward way to improve ‘physical fitness’ must be questioned given the risk of physical injury that it brings (Messner, 1992). Also, while some participants may develop ‘vital social skills’ from sport, it would be wrong to apply this to everyone – such as schoolchildren with little interest in sport who are still required to take part (Anderson, 2010). On a broader level, it has been observed – such as by Marxist thinkers – that what is presented as sport’s capacity to encourage enterprise and teamwork is
instead a way of justifying the capitalist logic upon which it is based (e.g. Rigauer, 1983), and this position continues to inform contemporary perspectives such as Cultural Studies (e.g. Andrews, 2009). Beyond these criticisms of participation in sport, significant problems with spectatorship in sport have also been identified. A notorious example of this in the United Kingdom is football hooliganism, which has attracted significant academic interest (e.g. Poulton, 2008, Dunning, 1999, Hall, 1978). Although a comprehensive analysis of these issues is beyond the scope of this discussion, they can be taken together to represent a counterpoint to the set of unproblematic assumptions noted above (Smith & Westerbeek, 2007). Indeed, these assumptions can be seen to underpin much of the rhetoric that accompanies the CSR initiatives found in sport and at London 2012 in particular. For example, it would be difficult to highlight the event as a great opportunity to tackle obesity (DCMS, 2008) were it not for the perception that sport and exercise participation is of absolute benefit to health. This represents a contrast with ‘mainstream’ or non-sporting CSR, which is unable to draw upon – or exploit – such pervasive ideals and beliefs.

The belief that sport can play a positive role in social development is also evident in the Sport for Development and Peace (SDP) movement. Indeed, while attempts to exploit sport for social progress can be traced across centuries, today’s manifestation of sport has been argued to have distinct implications for development due to the number of agencies and organisations involved, its appeal to youth volunteering and the formal financial support it enjoys from national and international sport and non-sport organisations (Kidd, 2008). The beliefs that underpin this are typified by the United Nations (UN), who state that:

Sport has historically played an important role in all societies, be it in the form of competitive sport, physical activity or play. But one may wonder: what does sport have to do with the United Nations? In fact, sport presents a natural partnership for the United Nations (UN) system: sport and play are human rights that must be respected and enforced worldwide; sport has been increasingly recognized and used as a low-cost and high-impact tool in humanitarian, development and peace-building efforts, not only by the UN system but also by non-governmental organizations (NGOs), governments, development agencies, sports federations, armed forces and the media. Sport can no longer be considered a luxury within any society but is rather an important investment in the present and future, particularly in developing countries (UN, 2013, para. 1).

Rather than subscribing to narrower definitions of “institutionalized competitive activities” involving “physical exertion” and “complex physical skills” (Coakley, 2007, p. 6), sport is recognised here as encompassing the related realms of physical activity and play. This is important in relation to the current project, as the CSR schemes examined here include examples of each of these as well as competitive sport. However, as with the broader academic literature around sport’s role in society examined above,
notes of caution can also be detected in work on SDP. For example, Darnell’s (2010) research into the perspectives of young Canadians involved in SDP programmes warned that their “commitment to an ethic of responsible choices and personal emancipation often overrode analyses of the broader political economy and relations of dominance that contribute to the inequality to which SDP programs attend” (p. 70), which in turn necessitates the design of “counter-hegemonic approaches” with the capacity to counter “the relations of dominance that would produce the need for development in the first place” (p. 71).

In terms of the delivery of SDP, Giulianotti (2011) identifies four domains of social policy; neo-liberalism, strategic developmentalism, developmental interventionism and social justice. In terms of the present research, that of neo-liberalism is of particular significance, as this encompasses those development initiatives that are delivered by transnational corporations in the form of CSR initiatives. For Giulianotti (2011), a neo-liberal view “imagines individual choice-making individual consumers being serviced by TNCs across borderless markets” although the author acknowledges that in the practical reality is complicated by how “many public services are reconfigured within public-private partnerships or the ‘for-profit’ sector” (p. 763). Within the scope of neo-liberal-driven CSR, Giulianotti (2011) distinguishes between three categories: those driven by a need to respond to campaigns against “exploitative production techniques” (p. 764), those delivered in cooperation with ‘community’ organisations and those organised alongside national governmental and intergovernmental organisations. This account of neo-liberal CSR helps to illustrate the complexity of the Olympic Games as a site for the current research, given the way that Olympic sponsors may deliver CSR initiatives both nationally and internationally and in cooperation with charity, government and inter-governmental organisations under the auspices of both the OCOG and the IOC. In order to help overcome the potential issues of manageability this may pose, the focus of the current research is therefore restricted to CSR activity that was delivered within the United Kingdom and Ireland.

Overall, these analyses of sport’s potential for social development and the way this is evident in the context of the SDP movement provide a more informed perspective from which the analysis of sport and CSR can take place. It is upon this basis that the focus of this discussion will now turn to the ways these debates have been approached in the sport management literature. For example, Morrow (2012) argues that there is a lack of sound empirical evidence to support the range of claims that can be made about sport:

Sport is often portrayed unproblematically as something people believe is inherently good. It is frequently presented as a means of alleviating a variety of social problems and of improving
individuals and communities and in diverting young people from crime and anti-social behaviour; as well as contributing to international development in areas including empowerment, health awareness, peace building and conflict prevention or resolution. However, the evidence available to back up some of the claims made for sport and hence for the impact of some of the community, social and development initiatives remains weak (Morrow, 2012, p. 104-5).

This statement demonstrates the relationship between deeper philosophical debate around sport’s moral foundations and its use in community-based social initiatives. However, it is worth noting that while this ‘inherent good’ may represent a useful catalyst for positive social activity (such as in the form of CSR), it has also been argued that CSR can see this “value and altruistic nature of sport” be exploited by corporations in order “to fulfil their own goals” (Carey et al., 2011, p. 259), as opposed to representing part of a wider process. This is consistent with Anagnostopoulos’s (2011) call for CSR run by football clubs to be “serious, consistent and solid” (p. 17) and to be clearly distinguished from public relations campaigns. Indeed, the suggestion that CSR represents a strategic attempt to compensate for perceived reputational failings is similarly evident in the mainstream business literature. For example, it has been argued that CSR represents a form of ‘window dressing’ for CEOs in controversial sectors of industry that can be used in order to protect reputations (Barnea and Rubin, 2010), as is described by Cai, Jo and Pan (2011) as the use of CSR in a “distrustful attempt to legitimise questionable business and deceive stakeholders” (p. 467). Indeed, while this research does not seek to address the issue of the underlying motives behind CSR, this perception that it may be manipulated for ulterior purposes should not be disregarded. This debate is particularly important in relation to the previous discussion of sport, as the high level of public engagement in sport can be seen to suggest it to be particularly vulnerable to being exploited by the type of CSR activity described above. In order to build upon this discussion of the underpinning attitudes and assumptions that shape how sport is perceived as a site for the delivery of CSR, the discussion will now turn to address the ways that research on CSR in sport have developed over time.

3.3.2 Research on CSR in Sport
Although CSR scholarship has lauded sport’s unique capacity for positive social development (Smith and Westerbeek, 2007; Walters, 2009), it has also identified certain limitations. For example, while Levermore (2010) cites its global popular appeal and facility for the creation of partnerships between different organisations as important benefits, he also acknowledges that it may also exacerbate existing inequalities such as that between the global north and south. Furthermore, in the context of Scottish football, Hamil & Morrow (2011) argue that while the “community presence and social significance” of football clubs represent advantages over mainstream business in the delivery of CSR, the success of this delivery is contingent upon both the attitudes of relevant executives and stakeholders and
overcoming the challenge of implementing CSR in “response to wider social agendas” (p. 165) – a warning that illustrates the importance of the broader environmental context in which it is delivered. On a narrower level, the debate around sport’s suitability for CSR must also consider more endogenous positive and negative factors, of which Godfrey (2009) highlights a number before suggesting a possible compromise:

Sport, through organizations such as the International Olympic Committee, has created a mystique and institutional aura of moral goodness. Sport, through corrupt athletes, coaches, officials, and administrators, has also created a mystique and institutional aura that defines victory, at any price, as the ultimate moral end. I hope that the discourse concerning CSR in sport helps find a middle ground: a set of institutional norms and practices that moderates the abusive elements of competition while stopping short of deifying athletes, athletic achievement, or sport in general (Godfrey, 2009, p. 712).

Although CSR’s use in sport has traditionally received limited academic attention, this has begun to change in recent years (e.g. Babiak & Wolfe, 2013; Bradish & Cronin, 2009; Godfrey, 2009; Crow & Bradish, 2002). Indeed, it is possible to organise the broad field of sport and CSR in different ways. For example, Babiak and Wolfe (2006) differentiate between CSR as delivered by sports leagues, by sport organisations and in relation to significant events such as the Super Bowl and the Olympic Games, while Walters (2009) distinguishes between CSR organised by individual athletes, sport organisations, sports leagues, governing bodies and particular sports events. On a different note, Carey et al. (2011) identify a difference between CSR delivered by both sport and non-sport organisations while it has also been observed that it can be implemented via sport such as in the activity of corporate sponsors around particular events (Séguin et al., 2010). It can therefore be seen that while CSR and sport may be understood as one general field, there are significant differences between the specific forms it can take. However, in line with the classifications noted here, it can be seen that the chief means of organising research around sport and CSR concern the particular format this follows (e.g. a league, an individual athlete or a major event) and the nature of the organisation delivering CSR (e.g. a sports team or organisation or a non-sport body such as a corporate sponsor or a charitable organisation). Given that the focus of the present research is upon private sector sponsors at the Olympic Games, those forms of sport CSR based around major events and delivered by non-sport organisations therefore merit the greatest consideration here.

Where the delivery of CSR by private sector, non-sport organisations is concerned, a degree of inconsistency must be acknowledged. For example, Lagae (2005) states that “any definition [of sponsorship] should distinguish commercial sponsorship from corporate philanthropy” (p. 35), whereas Ferrand, Torrigiani and Camps I Povill (2007) define sponsorship as follows:
Sponsorship is based on an exchange process between two parties. The exchange is a process that consists of obtaining something from someone in return for something else (2007, p. 2).

...Social marketing is the application of marketing concepts and tools to programmes designed to influence the voluntary behaviour of target audiences where the primary objective is to improve the welfare of the target audiences of which they are a part (Ferrand et al., 2007, p. 24).

Indeed, some perspectives of CSR may advocate a definition that would be very close to this description of social marketing – with the caveat that others would reject the presence of any kind of ‘marketing’ in a true example of CSR. However, regardless of one’s position on this debate, the above definitions show how the distinctions between the different terms should not be seen as discrete. This ambiguity is particularly significant in the present study, as CSR programmes around London 2012 may be officially described as sponsorship activities or activations. It is therefore worth clarifying that for the purposes of this discussion and the project as a whole, all sponsorship activity that can be seen as consistent with the basic tenets of CSR will be considered as such – in line with the definition of Crane et al. (2008) set out at the beginning of this chapter.

Academic work on the delivery of CSR by sport organisations and events can be divided into two broad categories; one focused on sport in the United States (e.g.; Inoue, Kent & Lee, 2011; Sheth & Babiak, 2010; Babiak & Wolfe, 2006) and another concerned with that primarily in Europe, which has chiefly focused upon football (e.g. Athanasapolou, Douvis, & Kyriakis, 2011, Breitbarth, Hovemann & Walzel, 2011; Hamil & Morrow, 2011; Dolles & Soderman, 2010; Breitbarth & Harris, 2008). However, certain aspects of these studies can be seen to have important implications for the present study. For example, Sheth and Babiak (2010) aimed to understand more about the attitudes of professional sport executives towards CSR and the levels of priority in which it is held, and established that factors influencing CSR practice included philanthropy, community concerns, ethical concerns and partnerships. In terms of the effects of CSR upon communities, these authors noted that future research should explore how these are affected when sports teams either arrive in or depart from a particular area. When considered from a broader vantage point, this suggestion can be seen as a product of the American sporting and economic environment in which the research was conducted – and the set of cultural values this encompasses. It would therefore follow that any research upon CSR must give sufficient consideration to the broader national, philosophical or cultural context in which it is carried out. In a similar vein, Breitbarth and Harris (2008) suggest that research on CSR should take the form of “explorative, in-depth studies into the complexity and dynamic of organizations and their stakeholder environment” and that football should seek to “embrace CSR as an opportunity-driven rather than problem-driven concept” (p. 201). Both of these recommendations are significant in relation to the present study, as the former
again demonstrates the importance of context in relation to CSR while the latter can be applied to the Olympic Games in that it represents an ‘opportunity’ for CSR delivery of great magnitude. Indeed, this is one regard in which major events could be differentiated from season or league-based sport, and must therefore be given special consideration in the present study. Another trend in research on CSR has been a focus upon ‘measurement’, such as in terms of the relationship between CSR delivery and corporate financial performance (Inoue, Kent and Lee, 2011), the attitudes of consumers towards CSR (Walker and Kent, 2009) and the construction of an overall CSR Performance Scorecard, based upon political, ethical and economic dimensions (Breitbarth, Hovemann and Walzel, 2011). More pertinently, Wind-Cowie and Wood (2012) worked in conjunction with Coca-Cola’s London 2012 sponsorship team in order to develop an “easy-to-use metric to help them [sponsors] understand the positive social impacts they have”, on the basis that traditional social value measures “do not fit the bill” (p. 17). These attempts to quantify or measure different aspects of CSR’s delivery or perception can be seen as symptomatic of the relatively scarce attention it has received in the sport management literature. Furthermore, Wind-Cowie and Wood’s (2012) focus upon the social value of sponsorship again illustrates how CSR may occasionally become intertwined with sponsorship in practice.

The most relevant studies of CSR to the current project concern that which has been delivered in association with major sporting events. As noted above, this may be initiated by either the event’s organisers or sport organisations themselves, or externally driven by corporate sponsors or charitable organisations. In terms of the specific major events covered, those that have received the most attention have been – as might reasonably be expected - the FIFA World Cup, of which research has focused upon areas such as the perceptions of CSR schemes (Walker, Kaplanidou, Gibson, Thapa, Geldenhuys & Coetzee, 2012) and the implementation of long term environmental visions (Dolles & Soderman, 2010), and the Olympic Games, in areas such as partnerships between corporations and sports organisations (Dowling, Robinson & Washington, 2013), CSR focus at the bidding stage (Carey, Mason & Misener, 2011), consumer perceptions of CSR (Walker, Heere, Parent & Drane, 2010) and perceptions of community development schemes (Misener & Mason, 2009). Although these events are comparable in their global scale and quadrennial nature, Walker et al. (2012) note that the FIFA World Cup’s structure and qualification system mean that a key distinction from the Olympic Games is the fact that uncertainty around precisely which nations will participate until the year before the event sets it apart from the Games - where any IOC member may attend. Although it would be possible to identify a much more extensive range of respective similarities and differences, the intention here is to demonstrate that work upon the two events should be seen in relation to the contexts in which they are held.
Although not an event of the same magnitude, Séguin et al.’s (2010) research upon the 2005 FINA World Aquatic Championships contains significant implications for the present study. This study sought to examine the factors which contributed to the corporate support that was given to the event, and these were found to include the positioning of the event as a social cause, the leadership characteristics of the organising committee, the perceived cost of not being involved, corporate peer pressure and certain contextual limitations. In conclusion, these authors state that:

The unique situational factors associated with the event, while difficult to predict or control, proved to be important in the sponsorship outcomes. As a result, organising committee members and city leaders must have a good understanding of the external environment, as any situational factor could become an obstacle and hinder their attempts to achieve corporate support (Séguin et al., 2010, p. 217).

While this differs from the present study in that its focus is more upon the attraction of corporate support than the delivery of CSR programmes, this conclusion again demonstrates the importance of external contextual factors in shaping the nature of sponsorship at a given event, as well as the role played by actors such as event organising committees. In terms of the Olympic Games specifically, Carey et al. (2011) aimed to investigate the extent to which social responsibility was emphasised in discourse produced at the bidding stage. These authors conclude with reference to both the status of CSR within an Olympic bid and the extent to which corporate organisations may attempt to exploit this for their own benefit:

An attempt should be made to determine if CSR and social development is actually an integral part of the overall bid process or is it merely driven by corporations who are attempting to utilize the value and altruistic nature of sport to fulfil their own goals (Carey et al., 2011, p. 259).

This statement addresses two debates that have been addressed in the current discussion. Firstly, the speculation around the role of corporations could be understood in line with the way corporate activity may be perceived in an inherently negative fashion (see Chapter 2). Secondly, the acknowledgement of sport’s ‘value and altruistic’ nature resonates with the earlier discussion of sport as a basis for CSR activity – in line with scholars such as Smith and Westerbeek (2007) and Morrow (2012). However, beyond this it can also be seen that the range of questions raised in Carey et al.’s statement alone demonstrate the complex range of issues that must be seen in association with the delivery of CSR activity by private sector sponsors at an event that enjoys the public engagement held by the Olympic Games (Henry, 2011).

Perhaps the closest published research to the present study is Dowling et al.’s (2013) work upon how CSR was leveraged through partnerships between corporate and sport organisations - which were brokered by the British Olympic Association – in the lead up to the London 2012. This research is
significant in that it considers the delivery of CSR around a major event in relation to how this was mediated by a third party. In terms of the unique characteristics of the Olympic Games as a site for the delivery of CSR, Dowling et al. (2013) write that its cyclical nature means that sport is “inherently more attractive in the lead up” period, and that these events can therefore be associated with specific “windows of opportunity” (p. 288) for the delivery of CSR. Furthermore, these authors also make the broader point that previous work on CSR had thereto “held relatively static conceptualisations of CSR through sport” (p. 270) on the basis that:

> Whilst we do not disagree that sport has the potential to enhance through its ubiquitous appeal or even that sport has limitations as a vehicle for change, we argue that initiative timing, context and organisational objective alignment in CSR through sport should be paramount deliberations, and not peripheral afterthoughts. Such deliberations have been subject to examination elsewhere within the sport management literature, but so far have been omitted from the CSR and sport literature (2013, p. 270).

In other words, research on CSR and sport could benefit from a greater sensitivity to the specific manifestation of sport in question as well as the broader social environment in which it is delivered. This is particularly apparent in relation to a major event such as the Olympic Games, and associated concepts such as legacy and Olympism. In order to examine this further, the focus of the present discussion will therefore turn to how the Olympic Games – and London 2012 – can be better understood as a context for the delivery of CSR – in line with the way that CSR is the concept with which this study is primarily concerned.

### 3.4 The London 2012 Olympic Games as a Context for CSR

The purpose of this section is to explore specific context for CSR represented by the London 2012 Olympic Games. In order to do this, the broader contemporary political landscape of the UK is addressed first, before the discussion turns to two specific features of the Olympic Games: Olympism and legacy. Finally, the fourth section addresses the sport and activity participation legacy as the specific context for CSR activity that is the focus of this research.

#### 3.4.1 The UK as a Context for CSR

Given that this study recognises the importance of considering CSR at London 2012 in relation to the wider environment in which it is delivered, it is worth considering the political context of the by the United Kingdom in the years leading up to the Games. Perhaps the chief concern here relates to how the role of business in society is perceived, as discussed previously in relation to the contrasting approaches to CSR set out by Archie Carroll and Milton Friedman in the 1970s. While a comprehensive discussion of the relationship between British politics and business is beyond the scope of the current
discussion, it is worth tracing the current political situation to the 1980s, in which Conservative Prime
Minister Margaret Thatcher’s emphasis upon “free markets, low tax, a small state, independence,
individuality, self-determination”(Saatchi, cited in White, 2013, para. 2) was both typical of a wider
global phase of ‘neoliberal’ government and the basis for what could subsequently be characterised as
‘Thatcherism’. Indeed, the enduring influence of Thatcher(ism) upon British politics is demonstrated by
Kerr, Byrne and Foster’s (2011) assertions that the three subsequent Prime Ministers – John Major,
Tony Blair and Gordon Brown – have all been set against Thatcher to some extent, and that “there is
no doubt that Thatcherism has, does and will continue to frame much of the contemporary political
imaginary and debate” (2011, p. 197). While the positive or negative nature of Thatcher’s legacy
remains fiercely debated (Flanders, 2013), its primary implication for the current research lies in the
ways in has shaped debates around responsibility in public life.

Following a hung parliament in the 2010 General Election, a Conservative-led coalition replaced the
Labour government that had held office since 1997. The Coalition emphasised responsibility as distant
from the government, and a flagship policy in this regard was the Big Society - as articulated by Prime
Minister David Cameron in 2011:

To me, there’s one word at the heart of all this, and that is responsibility. We need people to
take more responsibility. We need people to act more responsibly, because if you take any
problem in our country and you just think: ‘Well, what can the government do to sort it out?’,
that is only ever going to be half of the answer...

So, what this is all about is giving people more power and control to improve their lives and
their communities. That, in a nutshell, is what it is all about (Cameron, 2011b, para. 4-5).

Described by Kerr, Byrne and Foster (2011) as a ‘recycled Thatcherite slogan in inverted form’ (p. 198),
the Big Society typified an approach to government that emphasised individual responsibility ahead of
government involvement – as also demonstrated by the cutbacks in welfare provision (e.g. Grice,
2010).In terms of the role of business, Cameron has also emphasised the increasing importance of
CSR in comparison to the ‘moral worth’ of the state:

The snobbery that says business has no inherent moral worth like the state does, that it isn’t
really to be trusted, that it should stay out of social concerns.

When this movement began, some of it was quite superficial. You did get companies practising
a kind of moral off-setting – allowing irresponsible things to happen day after day then once a
year making a big pay-out to charity to ease their conscience.

But over the past decade or two corporate responsibility has changed utterly. Today it’s about
integrating your values deeply into the soul of your business (Cameron, cited in Plummer, 2012,
paras. 4 & 6-7).
Although the positions of Cameron and the Coalition government towards responsibility may draw comparison with those advocated by Margaret Thatcher and other neoliberalism-driven governments of the 1980s in terms of their view of the state’s role in society, it can be seen that this should also be considered in relation to a growing recognition and acceptance of business’s obligation to contribute towards social concerns, as articulated by Cameron above. Indeed, this position is similarly evident in relation to the Coalition’s support for business intervention in health, as demonstrated in the Public Health Responsibility Deal of 2011:

The strength of the Deal lies in the diversity of organisations that it brings together – public sector, commercial, non-governmental, and academic – to determine things business can do to accelerate the progress towards public health goals. In a context like this, we shouldn’t be scared to use the reach of businesses to achieve mutually beneficial aims. Put simply, commercial organisations can reach individuals in ways that other organisations, Government included, cannot (Lansley, cited in DH, 2011, p. 2).

This is both consistent with the sentiments expressed by Cameron relating to CSR and illustrative of the way that this extends to the active role of businesses in promoting health. This emphasis upon reduced role of government (in this case as compared to business) can also be seen to be consistent with the 2010 debate around the future of School Sport Partnerships offered further insight into the Coalition’s approach to spending on encouraging participation. In this instance, new Education Secretary Michael Gove was reported to want to abandon the School Sport Partnership system (introduced under the previous Labour government) on the basis that it had failed to increase participation and was overly bureaucratic (Helm, 2010), although it should be noted that, in a subsequent U-turn, Gove ultimately abandoned these plans (Campbell, 2010). Nevertheless, Gove’s initial approach to government funding for school sport can be seen to fit with the Coalition government’s wider commitment to reducing the role of the state in public life – as demonstrated here in relation to communities, health and business.

Although perhaps more readily apparent in the present Coalition than the previous Labour government, the current government’s efforts to lessen the contribution of the state to society can be seen to have their origins in the neoliberal approach to governing most associated – in the UK context – with Margaret Thatcher and the 1980s. In terms of the present research, the overall picture presented here suggests that by the year 2012, the UK represented a context in which the contribution of business towards social objectives was welcomed by a government that had publicly sought to play a reduced role in public life – as demonstrated most clearly here in the sentiments expressed by David Cameron. With this broader background established, this chapter will now turn to address some specific features of the Olympic Games that must also be considered by businesses looking to deliver CSR initiatives around the event.
3.4.2 Olympism

If sport – upon the basis of its proclaimed social and moral values - is assumed to represent a unique context for the delivery of CSR, then the Olympic Games can be understood in similar terms. However, the fact that the Games possess an accompanying philosophy – Olympism – sets the Games apart from other competitive sport in terms of the extent to which it proclaims such a strong desire to bring about benefits beyond sport. Olympism is explained by the IOC (2013a) in the Olympic Charter:

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.

The goal of Olympism is to place sport at the service of the harmonious development of humankind, with a view to promoting a peaceful society concerned with the preservation of human dignity.

... The practice of sport is a human right. Every individual must have the possibility of practising sport, without discrimination of any kind and in the Olympic spirit, which requires mutual understanding with a spirit of friendship, solidarity and fair play (IOC, 2013a, p. 11).

The values espoused here resonate with those attributed to sport as discussed in the previous section. In a similar fashion, the peace-making capacity of the Olympic Games has also been recognised by the UN. For example, on the eve of the 2008 Summer Olympics in Beijing, UN Secretary General Ban Ki-Moon stated that:

The true excellence of the Games rests in their ability to unite humanity around universal aspirations: equality, fair play, sportsmanship, tolerance and, above all, peace. These values represent the driving force of the Olympic Movement, which employs the potential of sports to promote a culture of peace, prosperity and human dignity (UN, 2008, para. 1-2).

This portrayal of the Olympic Movement demonstrates how Olympism could be understood as an offshoot of the broader positive perception of sport as a whole that was addressed in the previous section. Indeed, Spaaij (2012) describes how the modern Olympic Games were founded not for sporting competition alone but as part of a greater effort to use sport as a vehicle to encourage “international understanding and peace” (p. 763). Although this view of the Games continues to be held by significant actors on the global stage – such as the UN – it should be acknowledged that it is not universal. For Hoberman (2011):

A more persuasive argument on behalf of international sport’s peace-promoting effect would demonstrate a cause and effect relationship between Olympiads and the absence or reduction of armed conflict. The fatal defect of this argument is the fact that the Olympic century that began in 1896 turned out to be the bloodiest in human history. Given the appeal of the idea that sports can serve as a useful form of social engineering, it is not surprising that a few
serious thinkers, either ignorant or dismissive of the historical record, have argued on behalf of sport's peace-promoting effects (Hoberman, 2011, p. 19).

While the suggestion of this particular argument that a dyadic relationship between the Games and worldwide levels of bloodshed exists is ridiculous, the belief that the peaceful rhetoric of the Games – in association with that of sport - represents no more than a deceptive veneer must be taken seriously. For example, Malfas, Theodoraki and Houlihan’s (2004) assertion that the IOC has succeeded in “maintaining the illusion” that “the sport world is unequivocally supportive of the Olympic venture” despite negative impacts that have been evident in malpractices or boycotts (p. 218), along with Darnell’s (2012) recognition that Olympism can be both resisted and reshaped by local communities demonstrate the complexity of any attempt to accurately establish the sincerity of the IOC and Olympism’s lauded emphasis upon peace and progress.

In the present study this complexity is understood as impossible to overcome, and it is therefore argued that – as with CSR – Olympism is ultimately the product of a range of social constructions. Accordingly, it has been suggested that Olympism should not be understood as a uniform body of thought. For DaCosta (2006), “there never was a fixed Olympic philosophy” (p.158) while Chatziefstathiou (2011) acknowledges that time has shown Olympism to be “inherently contradictory” (p. 334), and shows how this ‘contradiction’ has manifested itself throughout history, with one example being the conflict between Olympism’s emphasis on ‘sport for all’ and the forms of social exclusion that have grown out of racial and gender discrimination and Victorian amateurism. It can therefore be seen that from its birth, Olympism’s development has not been linear but has been continually reshaped and influenced by wider social factors. Given this, it is worth noting Parry’s (2006) claim that “there will be differing conceptions of Olympism, which will interpret the general concept in such a way as to bring it to real life in a particular context” (2006, p. 191). Although various charges of theoretical or practical fallibility – such as that delivered by Hoberman (2011) - could be levelled at Olympism and the Olympic movement in general, Parry’s (2006) words represent an apt summary of how any potential to bring about social change depends upon how it is translated into a particular social context.

Indeed, this process of translation is manifest in the design and delivery of Olympic legacy visions. For Kay (2012), the commitment of the Games to social change is “captured in the notion of ‘legacy’”, which is in turn based upon a “powerful advocacy” (p. 899) of sport’s capacity to bring this about. On this basis, it follows that the current study’s aim to understand more about the Games as a site for the delivery of CSR requires both an appreciation of how the theory of Olympism is interpreted and of how this is applied in the form of specific legacy programmes. In terms of the former, this discussion of Olympism has demonstrated clear parallels with CSR, in that while both are premised upon ideals of
social development and progress, their abstract nature leads both to be understood and constructed in a variety of ways. In terms of the latter, the current discussion will now turn to address how legacy is understood within the current study as a whole.

3.4.3 Olympic Legacies

As a sporting mega-event, a particularly significant aspect of the Olympic Games is the long term effect that it has upon its host cities. Indeed, this is one of several characteristics of sporting mega-events highlighted by Malfas et al. (2004) in their definition:

A mega-event can be viewed in two main respects: first, with regard to its internal characteristics—that is, primarily its duration and its scale (i.e. number of participants and spectators, number of individual sessions, and levels of organisational complexity); and second, in respect of its external characteristics, which mainly take account of its media and tourism attractiveness, and its impact on the host city (2004, p. 210).

These authors highlight four types of mega-event impacts: socio-economic, socio-cultural, physical and political. While the range and complexity of issues entailed within these four categories would be impossible to address here, an associated concept that merits particular attention here is that of sustainability. Acknowledged by LOCOG (2009) as a “relatively new concept in the events sector” (p.9), sustainability is addressed specifically in the IOC’s Agenda 21 (IOC, 1999), which according to Theodoraki (2007) “aims to encourage members of the movement to play an active part in the sustainable development of the planet” (2007, p. 104). Furthermore, Fussey, Coaffee, Armstrong & Hobbs (2011) note that:

For more recent Games of the new millennium, the IOC has laid the requirement on organizing committees to adopt more environmentally and socially responsible approaches to planning, which in turn has influenced how commentators view and evaluate the regenerative legacy of the Olympics (2011, p. 29).

This quotation demonstrates the close relationship between sustainability and Olympic legacy. However, while sustainability can be understood as a broader conviction that could be applied to a number of sporting mega-events, the present study will focus more specifically upon the concept of Olympic legacy as the specific context with which the CSR activity to be analysed was delivered.

Much in line with the earlier introduction of Agenda 21, 2002, saw the Olympic Charter amended to include the statement that one of the IOC’s official roles is “to promote a positive legacy from the Olympic Games to the host cities and host countries” (IOC, 2013a, p. 17). Within this overarching concept of legacy, the IOC (2013b) has identified five thematic categories: cultural/social/political, environmental, economic, urban and sporting legacies and impacts. Legacies and impacts are defined as thus:
The term ‘impact’ is commonly used to describe the effects of a policy, programme or project on ecosystems, society in general and/or the economic system. ‘Impacts’ are more often regarded as implying an adverse effect or a damaging or destructive result.

In contrast, the term ‘legacy’ is more often used when presenting positive effects. ‘Legacy’ also tends to be used in association with those effects that are of longer duration (IOC, 2013b, p. 4).

While the distinction between impact and legacy is presented here may be simplistic, this discussion will approach legacy as representing the long term effects of the Games – whether desirable or not. Indeed, as with the previous discussions of CSR and Olympism, a range of competing interpretations are again apparent. To begin with, Cashman (1999) states that:

Almost every Olympic city, since the Games were revived in 1896, has some form of legacy, whether it be in the form of buildings, monuments, art galleries and museums, repositories, archives, stamps, souvenirs, memorabilia, plaques or even street names. Then there are the local Olympic champions, who are living reminders of a city’s and country’s Olympic experience. There are also oral memories and stories of the Games that are treasured by individual citizens. More mundane legacy includes debts (and occasional profits) for a city and its anniversaries of the Games, which are, in part, attempts to recapture some of the magic of the Olympic moment and to place the Olympics in the history of the city (Cashman, 1999, p. 183).

While Cashman provides a comprehensive list of potential legacies, it should be noted that those he names are mostly physical, with the exception of the memories of the event held by individuals. However, Leopkey and Parent (2012a) describe how although the notion of long term benefit can be seen in association with the modern Games from Coubertin’s revival onwards, these have “evolved from general benefits and impacts of the Games to sustainable long-term legacies, which have been strategically planned from the time of the bid” (p. 938) and represent an important aspect of the process of selecting a host city. It is also important to note that these authors link the concept of legacy to the overall strength of a Candidate City’s bid. In other words, staging a successful and proficiently managed event is insufficient, as there is now a wider consensus that the (public) cost of hosting the event obliges OCOGs to ensure that it brings about appreciable permanent benefits for the host nation.

However, while it is apparent that the scope and formality of potential Olympic legacies has increased over time, these legacies have also been argued to be increasingly the products of discursive construction (MacAloon, 2008). This can be reconciled with the perspective of Agha, Fairley and Gibson (2011), for whom the fact that an COG disbands within two years of the event gives rise to “a series of broad legacy claims” (p. 126) that are further complicated by the multitude of different organisations involved in the delivery of the Games (Chappelet & Kübler-Mabbott, 2008). In light of this, Horton and Zakus (2010) have argued that the IOC should take a more active role in the implementation of legacy programmes. Much in a similar vein, Gratton and Preuss (2008) note that a satisfying definition of ‘event legacy’ does not exist, with the IOC’s not being broad enough to allow the
evaluation of effects upon improvements to local sport facilities or the assessment of the event’s impact on different sub-national regions or entities, as well as its failure to consider the influence of the Games upon more intangible variables such as urban revival, tourism, and public welfare, and fails to differentiate between positive and negative legacy effects. In order to overcome this, Gratton and Preuss (2008) present a ‘legacy cube’ (Figure 3.1) of which the three dimensions of a legacy are its planned or unplanned nature, its positive or negative effects and whether it is tangible or intangible.

Figure 3.1: Olympic Legacy Cube (Gratton & Preuss, 2008, p. 1924).

The different dimensions of this legacy cube can therefore be seen to offer a more comprehensive way of approaching legacy than would be possible following the IOC’s official definitions alone, although it should be noted that notions of positive and negative legacies must be seen as subjective and dependent upon the perspective from which these are being assessed – for example, perceptions of a given legacy effect could quite reasonably be expected to differ in the opinions of event organisers, governments, sponsors and the general public. Furthermore, Gratton and Preuss (2008) also note the difficulty of measuring these effects:

It remains the case that the scientific evidence needed to evaluate the economic importance of the legacy of hosting major sports events, such as the Olympic Games, simply does not exist. This situation will not be resolved by the IOC’s new Olympic Games Global Impact (OGGI) project, although this will substantially improve the evidence base. The problem is that it will take 15-20 years to measure the true legacy of an event such as the Olympic Games and the OGGI project finishes 2 years after the event has been held. So far, nobody has been prepared to commit the research resources required to carry out a scientific study of net legacy benefits.
There is also the political position that host governments may not welcome a truly scientific assessment of the true legacy benefits of hosting the Olympic Games (Gratton & Preuss, 2008, p. 1933).

These problems of measurement, along with the different possible understandings discussed above, have important implications for the present study. Firstly, this research will broadly follow both MacAlloon’s (2008) account of how legacy can be discursively constructed and Gratton and Preuss’s (2008) ‘legacy cube’ in terms of the comprehensive account of the term it provides. The intention here is not to seek to ‘prove’ or ‘disprove’ the positions set out here but rather to draw upon each in order to better understand the social complexities of legacy as they arise. Secondly, the statement of Gratton and Preuss (2008) that legacy requires at least 15 years to measure can be taken to show how this would be impossible in the practical context of this study alone. Indeed, even the two year period used by the OGGI would be excessive in this regard. On a broader level, this subjective consideration of legacy can be seen to be consistent with the ways in which both CSR and Olympism have been articulated in this chapter previously. With this understanding established, the particular aspect of legacy in relation to London 2012 emphasised in this research will be that concerning mass participation in sport and physical activity. The discussion will therefore now seek to address the key issues and debates around this.

3.4.4 The Sport and Activity Participation Legacy of London 2012

According to Weed (2013), the legacy visions of the London 2012 bid team represented an attempt to distinguish London “from both previous editions of the Games and from its bid competitors” (p. 87) on the basis of their proclaimed benefits for both the host city and country as well as the Olympic Movement and young people worldwide - to an extent that no previous Games had pursued so ambitiously or explicitly before. Within this overall legacy strategy, this author describes a potential increase in national sport participation as "first among equals' in the minds of the IOC, LOCOG, the government and the UK media" (Weed, 2013, p. 95), an increase linked to a government-level belief in the capacity of the event to inspire the UK population to become involved in sport. This is consistent with the Commission for a Sustainable London 2012’s (2011) assertion that London 2012 represented “the first major sporting event to have broad and ambitious commitments to healthy living and inclusion” (p. 4), as developed by the bid team and detailed in the official Candidate File, where it was stated that this commitment would ultimately lead to a “fitter society and reduced health inequalities” (p. 4). Indeed, the specific targets upon which this rhetoric was based were published by the UK Government in 2008:

Inspiring young people through sport: offer all 5 to 16 year-olds in England five hours high-quality sport a week and all 16 to 19 year-olds three hours a week by 2012.
Getting people more active: help at least two million people in England to be more active by 2012

Elite achievement: aim for fourth in the Olympic medal table and at least second in the Paralympic medal table in 2012 (DCMS, 2008, p. 19).

In terms of the present research, the primary focus here is the second of these three ‘sporting legacy’ targets, as the emphasis here is entirely upon mass participation in either sport or physical activity as opposed to the more specific categories of elite and youth sport. However, recent academic literature demonstrates that ambitions of this nature are difficult to realise, with research upon previous editions of the Olympic Games demonstrating only a negligible increase in adult participation both in the host nation (Tsouros, Stergachi & Barbeschi et al., 2007; Soteriades et al., 2006; Veal, 2003; Bauman, Ford & Armstrong, 2001) and in other countries (Hindson, Gidlow & Peebles, 1994) following the staging of the event – although in some sub-national contexts there have been instances of participation rates increasing in the years before the Games (Wang & Theodoraki, 2007). Indeed, in a review of sport participation legacy effects from the Summer Olympics held in Beijing, Athens, Sydney and Barcelona, the Commission for a Sustainable London 2012 (2012) show that none could claim an increase in sports participation, with Barcelona and Athens not declaring this a target, Sydney not monitoring progress towards a stated intent to achieve it and Beijing being criticised for the prohibitive cost of Olympic facilities for the general population. These conclusions are consistent with the results of several reviews of the evidence base for the effect of major sporting events upon sport participation and physical activity (Mahtani et al., 2013, McCartney et al., 2010; Department for Health, 2009; Murphy & Bauman, 2007) – although a number of complexities should be noted here.

For example, while McCartney et al. (2010) note that there is insufficient empirical evidence to support any perceived positive link between hosting major events and subsequent health benefits, this lack of data means that it is similarly difficult to assert that this is impossible. For the Department for Health (2009), the logic that no previous Olympic Games have contributed to an increase in sport or physical activity participation is an “often quoted misrepresentation” (p. 4), on the basis that no Games before London 2012 has employed specific strategies to achieve this and because no formal measurement has been carried out. Put simply, a lack of evidence for the effects of the Games upon participation should not be assumed to demonstrate its impossibility. As Wellings, Datta, Wilkinson and Petticrew (2011) explain, this issue of measurement is particularly complex:

Attribution is complex. Many of the Olympic initiatives [around sport/activity participation] would have begun without the meta-evaluation, but efforts have been intensified and accelerated because of the 2012 deadline and the high profile of the enterprise. The catalytic effect
impedes measurement of the additional increment of the Olympic initiatives, which are not classic public health interventions with conventional health-related endpoints. There is little scope for controlled trials. Randomisation of programmes, possible in theory, is unlikely in practice (Wellings et al., 2011, p. 1194).

It is on a similar note that Weed (2010) describes how “detailed alternative scenarios” (p. 1205) known as counterfactuals are required in order to compare sport/activity participation rates with those that might have been witnessed if London had never won the right to host the Games at all. Indeed, the speculation required to implement these effectively serves to illustrate the complexity of attempting to determine if the London Games has any significant effect upon participation or not.

Another important debate around the potential effect of an Olympic Games upon mass participation levels concerns the unsubstantiated assumption that the staging of the event alone is sufficient to inspire a ‘trickle down’ or ‘demonstration’ effect that encourages participation automatically (Weiler & Stamatakis, 2010). For Coalter (2004), any subscription to this assumption must also recognise that efforts to capitalise upon the presumed inspiration of the event must also involve the systematic cooperation of supply-side organisations such as sport governing bodies, regional sports boards, sports clubs and local organisations. While there are some examples of this kind of local coordination around London 2012 (Prest & Partridge, 2010), achieving a significant long term participation increase remains fraught with complexity. As another example of this, the Department for Health (2009) suggest that in terms of sport participation, the Games may bring about an increase in frequency among people already – or previously – involved, and may also stimulate contemplation of physical activity participation among people who have never previously felt this – particularly if the ‘festival’ aspect of the Games is emphasised. However, important caveats are acknowledged in both of these regards, firstly because this increase in sport participation does not encompass individuals with no previous involvement and secondly because attempting to achieve any increase in activity participation is a “complex and untried” process (p. 58). Indeed, the scale of the overall challenge here is spelled out by Girginov and Hills (2008), for whom:

Both the bid committee and the UK government, as a major stakeholder in this project, promised to use the games to inspire the country’s people to become more physically active. This is the most ambitious project in the history of the Olympic Games in terms of both its scope and level of change, as, in order to be implemented successfully, it has to address not only people’s behaviour but also deeply rooted social structures and relations (2008, p. 2092).

The challenge of behavioural change described here is consistent with that explained above by the Department for Health (2009). However, the need to address certain social structures and relations can also be seen to relate to certain political dynamics. For example, Murphy and Bauman (2007) explain
the successful attainment of participation targets of this nature depends upon successful cooperation between the health and sport sectors, which as Weiler and Stamatakis (2010) acknowledge, is mitigated by how these are likely to find themselves competing for the same sources of funding. More specifically, Girginov and Hills (2008) describe how the overall concept of the London 2012 legacy soon became significantly politicised, which is particularly apparent in the changes of government that have taken place from London’s selection as host city onwards. In turn, the same authors (Girginov & Hills, 2009) have also called for the development of Olympic legacy policy to be regarded as a “set of interactions and a process of changing perceptions” (p. 178), and that related notions such as ‘sustainability’ and ‘sports development’ are therefore social constructions as opposed to static, objective truths.

Two important points should be made concerning London 2012’s overall sport and activity participation legacies as discussed here. The first of these is that although both are frequently linked to the promotion of ‘health’, this is typically presented in presumptuous terms relating to popular assumptions around sport and activity’s effects upon health – as opposed to any clear medical logic. Secondly, the overwhelming impression given here is that the successful long term realisation of each of these objectives would represent an unprecedented feat – which is primarily attributable to the sheer difficulty of bringing this about. In terms of sponsorship and CSR, the difficulty of bringing about a long term sport and activity participation increase poses a related challenge for CSR. Put simply, however laudable or nobly intended these may be, the evidence reviewed here suggests that wider factors such as social relations and behavioural change required may prove to be insurmountable. On a broader level, this demonstrates the importance of considering sponsor-led CSR schemes in relation to the wider social, cultural and political environment in which they are considered – and it is therefore imperative that this study is conducted accordingly. Overall, the case of the sport and activity participation can be seen to represent a particular aspect of London 2012’s legacy that is both prominent within the bid team’s visions for the event and a sufficiently popular area for sponsor-led CSR activity to demand academic attention.

3.5 Chapter Conclusion
Given that this study can best be understood as being primarily concerned with CSR – and therefore using both sport and the Olympic Games as a specific context in which to analyse this, the purpose of this chapter was to address the concept of CSR before clarifying how CSR is understood in this study as a whole, and to explore the Olympic Games as the context in which it is analysed here. The chapter was therefore divided into four main sections. The first of these concerned the development of CSR in
mainstream business, before the second considered the specific delivery of CSR in relation to both community development and health promotion. Next, the third section addressed the growing literature around CSR in the specific context of sport, before the fourth considered the London 2012 Olympic Games as a specific context for CSR’s delivery – specifically in terms of the wider political environment of the UK as a context for CSR, Olympism, Olympic legacies and the sport and activity participation legacy of London 2012, which is the specific area of CSR with which this research is concerned.

Overall, the different sections of this chapter can be linked by one important consistency. Just as CSR is understood in this research as any corporate activity that could be seen as intended for the benefit of society – regardless of whether this is fulfilled or whether it is labelled as such, the concepts of Olympism, Olympic legacy and sport and health participation can all be seen to be better understood as subjective constructions rather than static entities. This is demonstrated by how each has been interpreted in varying ways by different scholars and in relation to different social, cultural and political contexts. Indeed, this fits epistemologically with the understanding of governmentality outlined in the previous chapter, in the sense that this features an applicable concern for how power is exercised by different actors in different situations. This is important to clarify in the case of CSR, which can be seen to frame various debates about the roles of public, private and third sector organisations in society.

With the theoretical and empirical foundations of the research established in Chapter 2 and the present chapter respectively, it is now important to outline the methodological structure of the research – in order to show how these foundations will be translated into the practical stages of data collection used in the study. This is therefore provided in the following chapter (Chapter 4).
Chapter 4: Methodology

4.1 Chapter Introduction
The purpose of this chapter is to present and justify the research approach used in the study, following from the theoretical and empirical foundations that have been set out in Chapters 2 and 3 respectively. With this basis, the aim of the current chapter is to demonstrate the relationship between the philosophical, methodological and practical levels of the research. This chapter is therefore divided into three sections. The first outlines the underlying philosophical basis of the study in relation to the range of possible ontological, epistemological and methodological perspectives by which research can be informed, and links this to the social theory that frames the work. The second reviews the merits, disadvantages and suitability of the data collection and analysis techniques that were used in the research. Finally, the third section provides a rationale for the practical implementation of these techniques within the setting of the present study.

4.2 Philosophical Basis

4.2.1 Ontology and Epistemology
The need for research to articulate the basic philosophical stance(s) upon which it is premised can be attributed to the importance of showing the logic through which its more tangible methodological decisions have been reached. The two chief philosophical concepts to be acknowledged here are ontology and epistemology. To begin with, ontology is explained by Blaikie (1993) as follows:

The root definition of ontology is ‘the science of study of being’. For the purposes of the present discussion ontology refers to the claims or assumptions that a particular approach to social enquiry makes about the nature of social reality – claims about what exists, what it looks like, what units make it up and how these units interact with each other (Blaikie, 1993, p. 6).

The pertinence of Blaikie's (1993) definition here lies in its immediate concern with social research. In this regard, it can be taken to show how the importance of ontology lies in the way it shapes one’s most fundamental understanding of what exists to be researched and how this can be accomplished. It therefore follows that any effort to conduct social research will stem from an underpinning ontological perspective – whether this is explicitly acknowledged or not.

Grix (2004) divides ontology into two broad perspectives: foundationalism and anti-foundationalism. Of these, Grix (2004) states that a foundationalist ontology holds that reality exists independently of human perception. From this it follows that truth is indisputable and that knowledge is therefore either true or not. In contrast, an anti-foundationalist position sees reality as being both socially and discursively constructed by human actors. Knowledge is therefore viewed as subjective and dependent upon individual interpretation. These definitions of ontology betray its close relationship with
epistemology, which can be understood by appreciating how any belief about knowledge will be informed by one's basic understanding of the nature of reality and vice versa.

However, it could be argued that while Grix's (2004) description of these two primary positions may be accurate, smaller differences exist within and between them. For example, Blaikie (2010) identifies six possible ontological positions: shallow realist, conceptual realist, cautious realist, depth realist, idealist and subtle realist. Although it is not necessary to review each of these here, it is important to understand the criteria upon which these can be differentiated from one another. Indeed, the chief distinguishing factor among the realist positions lies in their differing approaches to reality. For example, while both the shallow realist and the cautious realist would broadly recognise that reality exists independently of the human mind, their respective understandings of how this reality can be understood bear some subtle differences. On one hand, the shallow realist would argue that this objective reality can be observed by a researcher. On the other, the cautious realist would contend that the inherent fallibility and interpretive nature of human observation necessitates a greater degree of caution in the way reality is approached by the researcher. Where the idealist position is concerned, Blaikie differentiates between the extremes of the atheistic idealist – who believes that external reality does not exist, and the perspective idealist – for whom an external world is understood and constructed differently by different individuals. While these are two of numerous – and potentially infinite - possible examples, the intention here is to show that subtle differences between existing positions demand that the social researcher is able to justify the precise ontological basis upon which their work is conducted.

Ontology's complexity also extends to the terms which are used to define different positions – a problem that can be identified at several levels of the research process. This is demonstrated by Steinmetz (2005), who describes “a core cluster of ideas that resurface periodically under different names and in varying guises” (2005, p. 31). Using the example of positivism, which he describes as “associated with an empiricist ontology” and “neither monolithic nor immutable” (p. 32-3), Steinmetz (2005) acknowledges that it has evolved to the extent that it can be combined with positions such as depth realism, which can in turn be deployed in research that is conducted from a range of differing theoretical or methodological perspectives. Again, this resonates beyond this particular example alone, as Steinmetz's (2005) articulation of how concepts such as positivism and realism have interacted and evolved over time serves to illustrate how terminological and conceptual confusion continues to exist here.

Despite the potential for overlap with ontology, epistemology can be understood as a separate philosophical concept. Again following Blaikie (1993), this can be defined as follows:
The root definition of epistemology is ‘the theory of science of the method or grounds of knowledge’. Again, in terms of the present discussion, epistemology refers to the claims of assumptions made about the ways in which it is possible to gain knowledge of this reality, whatever it is understood to be; claims about how what exists may be known. An epistemology is a theory of knowledge; it presents a view and a justification for what can be regarded as knowledge – what can be known, and what criteria such knowledge must satisfy in order to be called knowledge rather than beliefs (Blaikie, 1993, p. 6-7).

If ontology is understood as the nature of reality, then Blaikie’s account shows how epistemology concerns the nature of knowledge. This in itself belies the link between the two terms, as it follows that the way one constructs reality in the first place will shape their beliefs about how knowledge can be generated about it. However, the precise nature of this relationship has been debated. On one hand, Hay (2002) argues that ontology precedes epistemology on the basis that any question of one’s understanding of knowledge cannot be answered without first addressing the nature of the world in which such knowledge is produced. On the other, Furlong and Marsh (2010) show how this view has been challenged by post-structuralist writers – for whom any decision about one’s ontological position is informed by knowledge – which in turn demonstrates the primacy of epistemology. It is therefore worth acknowledging that the sequential presentation of ontology and epistemology in this discussion would draw criticism from those taking the latter of these two perspectives – although the bitterest manifestations of this debate do not merit further elaboration here. Indeed, the chief purpose here is to show how the concept of epistemology is understood in the conduct of the present study. Towards this end, the most pertinent debates about epistemology here concern the different approaches to the nature of knowledge that are evident in contemporary research – and these are more commonly referred to as research paradigms.

### 4.2.2 Epistemological Paradigms

Academic discourse typically presents epistemological positions as falling between two paradigmatic extremes: positivism and interpretivism. While the simplicity of this distinction will be addressed later, it is first worth considering how these ‘extremes’ are understood in the context of the present research.

Firstly, Blaikie (1993) summarises the central tenets of positivism:

Positivism entails an ontology of an ordered universe made up of atomistic, discrete and observable events. This order can be represented by universal propositions or constant conjunctions. Only that which can be observed, i.e. experienced by the senses, can be regarded as real and therefore worthy of the attention of science. Human activity is understood as observable behaviour taking place in observable, material circumstances. Social reality is viewed as a complex of causal relations between events which are depicted as an emerging patchwork of relations between variables (Blaikie, 1993, p. 94).
Although such definitions can vary considerably by author, Blaikie’s (1993) account does justice to the ways in which positivism is typically understood in social research. The first important point is that the ardent positivist is only concerned with observable behaviour that can be used to inform universal statements. If using a deductive approach, a particular conclusion about social reality in one instance would therefore be seen to be generalizable to any comparable context. Second, Blaikie’s reference to ‘an emerging patchwork of relations’ reveals how for the positivist, social research seeks to uncover more about what can ultimately be seen as a universal truth that is simply waiting to be discovered.

In relation to this definition of positivism, interpretivism stands diametrically opposite. Again following Blaikie, this position can be summarised as follows:

Interpretivism entails an ontology in which social reality is regarded as the product of processes by which social actors together negotiate the meanings for actions and situations; it is a complex of socially constructed meanings. Human experience is characterised as a process of interpretation rather than sensory, material apprehension of the external physical world, and human behaviour depends on how individuals interpret the conditions in which they find themselves. Therefore, social reality is not some ‘thing’ that may be interpreted in different ways; it is those interpretations (Blaikie, 1993, p. 96)

Where the positivist’s sole concern is for observable behaviour, the interpretivist believes that knowledge is subjective and individually constructed. Instead of seeking to produce universal propositions about social reality, the interpretivist attempts instead to understand more about the way that the social world is interpreted by individual actors. This in turn means that any conclusions drawn from the process of research cannot be taken to form the basis for wider generalisations.

The purpose of these brief accounts of positivism and interpretivism is to illustrate the two extremes of the range of possible epistemological standpoints. However, it should also be noted that the broader picture is more complex. First, a potential problem with stating the epistemological position of a given piece of research is that differing terminology can be used by different authors to describe different paradigms, and definitions of these may vary in similar fashion. In order to alleviate the drawbacks of this here, the present research will follow the definitions set out by Blaikie (1993), which have been outlined above. This is not to declare these superior to any other but to ensure consistency of terminology throughout the study. Second, rather than understanding epistemological paradigms as discrete and easy to separate, this study acknowledges that potential exists for overlap and evolution over time – depending on how they are deployed by individual scholars. Furthermore, this kind of complexity could also be argued to exist in terms of a nominally singular entity such as positivism or interpretivism – as the commitment of different researchers to the underlying tenets of the approach
may vary. This line of argument is broadly consistent with the position of Grix (2004), who states that such definitions of research paradigms are “broad and often overlap” (p. 78). As of helping to illustrate this, Grix presents the following continuum of the most common research paradigms:

**Figure 4.1: Grix’s (2004) paradigmatic continuum.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Explanation</th>
<th>Understanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positivist</td>
<td>Post-positivist Interpretivist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from Grix (2004, p. 78)

While Grix’s (2004) continuum provides an accurate representation of the relative positions of the three paradigms mentioned, it must be acknowledged that, as has been discussed in relation to ontology, the entire range of available standpoints is more diverse and complex. Table 4.1 presents a range of these in more detail, with each paradigm linked to its associated approach to the nature of knowledge, the goal of social inquiry, the role of values and the role of theory respectively.

**Table 4.1: An Overview of Epistemological Paradigms and their Implications for Research (Krane and Baird, 2005)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Epistemological Paradigm</th>
<th>Nature of Knowledge</th>
<th>Goal of Inquiry</th>
<th>Role of Values</th>
<th>Role of Theory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positivism</td>
<td>Observable, empirical, quantifiable, verifiable</td>
<td>Prediction &amp; explanation Hypothesis testing</td>
<td>Unbiased, objective</td>
<td>Theory testing Deductive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-positivism</td>
<td>Observable, empirical non-falsified hypotheses</td>
<td>Prediction Explanation</td>
<td>As objective as possible</td>
<td>Theory testing Deductive &amp; Inductive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naturalistic Constructivist</td>
<td>Multiple realities</td>
<td>Understand natural setting</td>
<td>Values inherent within research process</td>
<td>Social reconstruction Inductive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretive Phenomenological</td>
<td>Reality grounded in individual perceptions Hermeneutic</td>
<td>Understand individual perceptions and social reality</td>
<td>Researcher brackets values Values inherent in social norms</td>
<td>Hermeneutic(connect part and whole)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Here it can be seen that where Grix (2004) presents methodological orientation from left to right in simplistic fashion, Krane and Baird (2005) organise it vertically in accordance with a range of relevant factors. More importantly, Table 4.1 also demonstrates how each paradigm does not necessitate a specific understanding of associated concepts such as the nature of knowledge and the roles of values and theory. Furthermore, while the precise nature of each position is again possible to debate, the more significant implication of both Grix’s (2004) continuum and Krane and Baird’s (2005) table here is that both illustrate the complexity of the different available research paradigms. In terms of the present research, the epistemological paradigm to be followed is best considered in relation to a continuum or table of this nature, as this alleviates the need to tie the research specifically to a more discrete definition. Furthermore, these illustrations should be taken to help show the complexity that must be negotiated both within as well as between different paradigms.

It is also worth considering how the paradigms outlined above have been articulated and mobilised in research on sport - and sport management in particular. For example, Whaley and Krane (2011) state that positivism and post-positivism have been dominant in research in sport psychology to the extent that more interpretivism-driven research has found itself held to positivist standards. Closer to the topic of the current research, Henderson (2011) argues that the “somewhat binary thinking” (2011, p. 341) behind research in the leisure industry has led to the dominance of the methodological extremes of positivism and interpretivism – in their crudest guises. Henderson therefore advocates post-positivism as a satisfactory intermediate position that represents a more pragmatic basis from which to conduct future research in this field. Finally, where sport management is concerned, Pope (2011) highlights the risk of being insensitive to the broader cultural environment around it, and suggests how this may be achieved:

I hope to have made the case for a more conceptually-imaginative approach to sport management in theory and practice, one rooted in the problematical engagement with “culture”. As an offspring (perhaps an orphan) of physical education, sport studies and business studies,
the field of sport management has matured into advanced adolescence as an academic area of study and occupation (Pope, 2011, p.520).

Pope (2011) does not prescribe a specific epistemological or theoretical lens through which to achieve this – and indeed, it would be possible to defend the applicability of any standpoint to it if inclined. However, his call for greater awareness of the social and cultural factors that shape the field of sport management can be reconciled with the need for research to articulate the effect of its underlying philosophical convictions upon its practical conduct. If one does not appreciate how their own perspective constructs society, it is difficult to understand how new knowledge can be generated about the influence this perspective has upon the sport management organisations that operate within society. In order to answer this in terms of the present study, its ontological and epistemological positions will be outlined and justified next.

4.2.3 Positions of the Current Research
At an ontological level, the current study could be most accurately characterised, in accordance with Blaikie’s (2010) more sophisticated typology, as being conducted from a perspective idealist position. According to Blaikie (2010), perspective idealists “regard constructions of reality as just different ways of perceiving or making sense of an external world” (2010, p. 17). In other words, there exists an external reality, but each individual interprets this differently, and the focus therefore remains upon individual perceptions. At an epistemological level, there are some inherent problems with committing entirely to any given paradigm position. The most significant of these in relation to the current project is one of applicability. Put simply, if one wishes for the ultimate findings of a research study to have any wider significance or generalisability, then a strictly interpretivist position would render this theoretically incommensurate and practically impossible. While this may not be a significant consideration in some areas of social research, the fact that is study is broadly concerned with policy and management mean that such impossibility would be unwelcome. Classifications such as those presented by Grix (2004) and Krane and Baird (2005) offer a way of overcoming this. For example, in relation to the continuum of Grix (2004), the present study would be best defined as predominantly but not completely interpretivist. This enables it to retain its interpretivist focus on understanding how knowledge is socially constructed and produced without becoming susceptible to the aforementioned drawbacks of such an approach. More specifically, the epistemological position of the study could be categorised along the lines of the constructivist position (Krane & Baird, 2005) which is also summarised above. It is therefore necessary to justify and clarify how constructivism is understood in the context of the study.

As has been established in relation to a range of previous concepts already, constructivism is a broad enough term to require clear clarification here. Wendt (2004) describes two basic tenets:
1. The structures of human association are determined primarily by shared ideas rather than material forces.
2. The identities and interests of purposive actors are constructed by these shared ideas rather than given by nature (Wendt, 2004, p. 1).

Similarly, Parsons (2010) describes how “a constructivist argument claims that people do one thing and not another due to the presence of certain social constructs” such as ideas and beliefs. Constructivism is particularly associated with theories of learning and education (e.g. Vygotsky 1965; Piaget, 1950), to the extent that it has been described as having “become something akin to a secular religion” (Phillips, 2000, p. 1) in this field. Indeed, this popularity remains evident in research closer to the topic of the current research, as can be seen in the application of constructivism to different areas of research on sport, ranging from Olympism and Olympic education (Culpan & McBain, 2012) to tourism (Paris, 2011) and physical education (Patton, Parker & Neutzling, 2012). This popularity can be traced to constructivism’s status as an attractive alternative to more positivist-driven approaches such as behaviourism, which had dominated research in both education in particular and the social sciences in general. However, it is worth noting that although this kind of paradigmatic debate resonates with the earlier discussion of positivism and interpretivism, constructivism is understood as a separate position in this research – in line with Table 4.1 - although the more simplistic structure of Figure 4.1 demonstrates how some typologies may present it as synonymous with interpretivism. Following the classification of Krane and Baird (2005) set out above, it can be seen that while an interpretive approach holds that reality is “grounded in individual perceptions” and seeks to “understand individual perceptions and social reality” (p. 90), the constructivist sees reality as “grounded in consensus” and attempts to understand the “natural setting” of the enquiry. The significant distinction here lies in the difference between the beliefs that reality is based upon “individual perceptions” and “consensus” respectively. In terms of the present study, this means that a constructivist position is less susceptible to the problems of generalisability associated with interpretivism set out above. Indeed, Parsons (2010) articulates the implications of this problem in the context of the political sciences:

Many constructivists espouse an interpretive epistemology. If our world is deeply socially constructed, they reason, there is little ‘real world’ for political scientists to study. The social sciences thus amount to an interpretive search to understand meaning rather than a scientific search for causal relations. This view suggests little possibility for direct debate between constructivists and non-constructivist scholarship, since the latter are portrayed as illegitimate. This position can be labelled as postmodern. On the other hand, many constructivists do not break with science and causality (Parsons, 2010, p. 81).

In a similar vein, Henry, Amara, Al-Tauqi & Lee (2005) have addressed the implications of this issue for research in sport policy:
The only way we can know and express reality is through language, and different discourses there constitute different realities. Such an approach in its radical form therefore suffers from major epistemological difficulties: if discourse systems reflect different realities, none of which might be logically privileged over another, then arguing in favour of one interpretation over another is problematic, and indeed it is not clear how communication across discourses is possible at all (Henry et al., 2005, p. 490).

Put simply, these examples highlight the risk of deploying a version of constructivism that is too close to what could be considered ‘extreme’ interpretivism in accordance with the tables and continuums set out above. If it is impossible to declare one account of existence as more credible than any other, then it becomes difficult to argue that the findings of any one particular study merit broader acceptance – a significant drawback for any research in sport policy or management. However, for the present research to seek to alleviate this by taking a more realist-driven position (e.g. positivism or critical realism) would be to do an injustice to the socially constructed nature of the concepts being dealt with. For example, it has already been observed that concepts such governmentality (see Chapter 2), CSR, (Olympic) legacy and Olympism (see Chapter 3) – which are all central to the theoretical or empirical nature of the project – are all terms that have been debated and contested and will continue to be so.

For Blaikie (2000), interpretivist-oriented approaches form the logical basis for an abductive research strategy. Blaikie states that abductive research aims “to describe and understand social life in terms of social actors’ motives and accounts” (2000, p. 101). In other words, research is conducted by using the accounts of relevant actors to produce a theory which is then tested iteratively. At a more abstract level, its relationship with interpretivist epistemological perspectives can be seen to show its emphasis upon interpretations and motives as opposed to the acceptance of fundamental patterns of social life. To illustrate by comparison, the latter perspective is more associated with positivist-based strategies such as inductive or deductive approaches – as both ultimately acknowledge the existence of an objective reality, despite approaching it in different ways (Blaikie, 2010). However, it is again important to note that the precise definitions of specific research strategies are contested in a way that is becoming ever more familiar. For example, Blaikie (2010) describes how abductive research can be “based on various branches of interpretivism” (p. 101). It should therefore be recognised that subtly varying epistemological positions may have implications for the research strategy used. For example, the snowball sampling strategy used in the current research would be more difficult to use in a more positivist-based study. However, the important point to take from this discussion is that the conduct of the study must be reconcilable with the constructivist – as opposed to a strictly interpretivist – perspective on which it is based.
4.2.4 Theoretical Consistency

Just as any study’s ontological and epistemological stances should be commensurate with its overarching aims and objectives, there is a similar need for these to be consistent with the theoretical framework that is adopted within it. In the current research, the stated philosophical underpinnings must therefore be reconciled with the use of a Foucauldian governmentality perspective. However, it should be acknowledged that given the terminological difficulties mentioned above, this reconciliation cannot be seamless. In order to determine any individual’s particular epistemological stance a degree of interpretation is required – a requirement that is particularly apparent in relation to Foucault given both the difficulty of categorising his work as well as the way it evolved and changed over time (see Chapter 2). This is demonstrated by Andrews (1993), for whom:

The most dynamic aspect of Foucault’s intellectual development was his changing epistemic understanding. Indeed, his increasingly complex and ambivalent attitude toward knowledge provided the basis for three distinct phases of scholarly output (Andrews, 1993, p. 153).

Despite this potential lack of clarity, it is possible to link Foucault’s underlying ontological and epistemological stances with the perspective idealist ontology and constructivist epistemology that have been articulated as the basis for the present study. Although the tenor and focus of his work may have changed over the course of his career, some enduring themes can be identified. For example, Scott (2009) notes that in the entirety of Foucault’s scholarship, it can be observed that:

Throughout Foucault’s work, we confront in unique and forceful ways questions about values that organize people and things and values that operate definitively in formal knowledge and in practical recognitions and judgments (Scott, 2009, p. 350).

But how does this link to the epistemological stance of the present research? Put simply, Scott’s reference to Foucault’s “unique and forceful” approach to “formal knowledge” belie the way that his work can be seen to focus upon how knowledge is socially and subjectively constructed. This focus, along with his recurring interest in the exercise of power, show how the theories he developed represent a feasible way for this study to approach the questions at hand while remaining faithful to the philosophical basis of the research. However, it should also be noted that one seeking to translate Scott’s (2009) account of Foucault’s work into contemporary epistemological parlance would be most naturally drawn towards a strict interpretivist position. However, Foucault’s epistemological position is more complex. For example, Radford and Radford (2005) claim that:

For Foucault, discursive formations are real and concrete, just like the arrangement of books on a library shelf or the sentences in this article. Discursive formations are entities to be seen, touched, and experienced because they are composed of material objects, such as books. It follows, then, that because discursive formations are material, they have material effects (Radford & Radford, 2005, p. 70).
Indeed, this reference to the real and concrete nature of discursive formation suggests that there would be some difficulty in confining Foucault’s understanding of discourse to a strict interpretivist position. It is therefore upon this basis that the governmentality perspective used here is understood in relation to the perspective idealist ontology and constructivist epistemology that underpin the work.

In order to clarify the relationship between this study’s theoretical and methodological positions, it is worth considering how governmentality has been deployed – and shaped methodological conduct - in recent research around sport policy and management. For example, Piggott’s (2012) work on coach education across a range of sports draws upon governmentality in order to understand more about the “governing rationalities” (p. 535). Piggott’s (2012) understanding of governmentality is demonstrated by his acknowledgement that “for Foucault, studies in governmentality should be concerned not with ‘the best’ form of government, but with ‘how’ people are governed” (2012, p. 542). In order to achieve this, the research uses semi-structured interviews to examine how individual coaches ‘govern’ themselves in relation to dominant coaching discourses. While this study should not be compared directly to the present research – as its focus is solely upon what could be termed the micro level of the coaching context, it can be taken as a recent example of how Foucault’s governmentality can be used to help understand how broader discourses are interpreted in qualitative research. In a similar fashion, Svender, Larsson and Redelius (2012) applied governmentality to the context of girls’ participation in sport in Sweden, using materials produced by local clubs as the basis for their empirical work. Governmentality was therefore used as a way to help analyse “the interpretations and representations of a political issue (Larsson et al. 2012, p. 468).

Perhaps most relevantly, Piggin et al.’s (2009) work on sport and recreation policy in New Zealand used governmentality to help understand how different types of knowledge (e.g. positivist, post-positivist) may or may not be privileged in terms of their impact upon public policy. Of the implications of a Foucauldian approach, Piggin et al. (2009) note that:

Foucauldian research approach automatically renders the research as interested in the discursive construction of social practices. This is at odds with research used to construct contemporary public policy, which (as exemplified by ‘evidence based’ policy) is often defended on the grounds of being transparent and rational. Foucauldian-informed research makes no such claims (Piggin et al., 2009, p. 90).

This quotation does well to capture the methodological implications of a Foucauldian theoretical perspective. Most importantly, it can be seen that the focus about how social life is discursively constructed lends itself most naturally to a primarily interpretivist or constructivist-oriented
epistemological standpoint and a qualitative methodological approach. Indeed, and without wishing to be prescriptive, it is difficult to see how Foucauldian-informed research can take place from any other perspective.

4.2.5 Methodology
If ontology and epistemology can be seen to underpin the conduct of research, then methodology can be seen to represent a bridge between these abstract concepts and the specific practices involved in data collection. Methodology is defined by Grix (2004), for whom:

Methodology is a branch of science concerned with methods and techniques of scientific enquiry; in particular, with investigating the potential and limitations of particular techniques and procedures...

A certain methodological approach will be underpinned by and reflect specific ontological and epistemological assumptions. These assumptions will determine the choice of approach and methods adopted in a given study by emphasising particular ways of knowing and finding out about the world (Grix, 2004, p. 171).

The important point here is that Grix’s definition shows how methodological decisions rest upon the philosophical basis of a given study. In order to better illustrate the relationships involved, Furlong and Marsh’s (2010) (Table 4.2) links the most commonly used methodological approaches to their deeper ontological and epistemological underpinnings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ontology</th>
<th>Foundationalism</th>
<th>Anti-Foundationalism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Epistemology</td>
<td>Positivism</td>
<td>Realism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>Quantitative and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Privileged</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2: Adapted from Furlong and Marsh (2010, p. 186)

On a basic level, this table shows how methodological approaches are typically divided in terms of qualitative and quantitative. However, Furlong and Marsh’s (2010) presentation of these as ‘privileging’ research shows how these may not be discrete entities. This resonates with the previous acknowledgement that the nature of epistemological research paradigms is similarly difficult to categorise. However, before justifying the methodological approach used in the present research, it is worth outlining the outermost extremes of the methodological continuum. Although opposing methodological approaches are typically separated into quantitative and qualitative, these terms have proved difficult to define, For example, Avis (2005) notes that:
It has been observed that definitions of the term often focus on how it is simply ‘anything but quantitative research’, with quantitative approaches similarly defined as ‘anything but qualitative research’ (Avis, 2005).

Such assertions of vagueness are primarily a product of the varying ways in which both terms are defined. If no clear definitional consensus exists, then this kind of confusion is almost inevitable. Indeed, although it may be impossible to define either qualitative or quantitative research perfectly, certain traits can be seen to characterise both in the majority of instances. A brief definition of qualitative research is offered by Creswell (2003), who states that:

In a qualitative project, the author will describe a research problem that can best be understood by exploring a concept or phenomenon. I suggested that qualitative research is exploratory and researchers use it to explore a topic when the variables and theory base are unknown (Creswell, 2003, p. 74-75).

Deliberately or not, Creswell’s definition here links qualitative research to a primarily inductive approach to data collection. In other words, research typically seeks to increase knowledge of something that is not currently understood to the highest possible extent. However, absent from this definition is the way that qualitative research typically focuses upon the social construction of subjective meaning. At the opposing extreme of the methodological continuum to qualitative research is quantitative research, of which Creswell (2003) asserts that:

In a quantitative project, the problem is best addressed by understanding what factors or variables influence an outcome...

In addition, in quantitative introductions, researchers sometimes advance a theory to test, and they will incorporate substantial reviews of the literature to identify research questions that need to be answered (Creswell, 2003, p. 75-76).

Again, it can be seen that Creswell largely equates quantitative research with deductive research, in which the focus is primarily upon testing the applicability of an established theory or model in a new setting or context. A broader definition of quantitative research would perhaps also focus upon the priority it gives to producing findings that are replicable, controlled and precise. By contrast, qualitative research can be understood as seeking more to uncover findings that are individual and more subjective. Indeed, the difficulty of defining both qualitative and quantitative research should perhaps be seen as secondary to the more important issue here. Specifically, it can reasonably be asserted that these types of methodologies represent broader approaches to research as opposed to specific models from which it can be carried out. One example of this is mixed methods research, which commits to neither extreme and embraces any method that can help achieve its purpose (e.g. Creswell, 2003;
Bryman, 2008). The methodological orientation for the present research is qualitative. The main reason for a qualitative approach here is that the research aims to understand more about a topic on which little prior information or research exists, and because the topic in question can be seen to be best approached by understanding the dynamics of the social processes which involve individual actors such as policy makers and representatives of both corporate and charity organisations.

4.2.6 Section Summary
This section sought to outline the ontological, epistemological, theoretical and methodological basis of the research – as well as the relationships that exist between these levels. It is therefore intended to show that the positions taken at each one are consistent, and follow naturally from one another. A summary of how this could be understood on a superficial level is presented in Table 4.3. With this established, it is now necessary to articulate which data collection techniques were used upon this philosophical foundation.

Table 4.3 – Consistency of Knowledge Production

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ontology</th>
<th>Perspective Idealist: “Constructions of reality” are “just different ways of perceiving or making sense of an external world” (Blaikie, 2010, p. 17).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Epistemology</td>
<td>Constructivist: Social reality is regarded as the product of processes by which social actors negotiate the meanings for actions and situations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical Basis</td>
<td>Foucault’s governmentality: Focus is upon understanding the dynamics of power at different levels of society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Strategy</td>
<td>Abductive: Emphasis upon understanding the motives and interpretations of social actors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3 Data Collection and Analysis Techniques and Methods
This section presents an account of the data collection techniques and methods that were used in the research. The two primary methods were qualitative document analysis and semi-structured interviewing. This section therefore comprises a discussion of the respective merits and disadvantages of these methods, as well as an outline of the sampling strategies that were used to select data beforehand – followed by an account of the thematic analysis approach that was used in the study. The section concludes with a summary of how these techniques are consistent with the underpinning
philosophical and methodological basis of the research. Following this, the final section will articulate how these methodological tools were used in the specific context of this particular study.

4.3.1 Document Analysis
In discussing the role of document analysis in the present research, it should first be acknowledged that several overlapping terms may be used. This is because the conduct of the documentary analysis throughout the study bears considerable relevance to what might be termed discourse analysis, content analysis, textual analysis and policy analysis in existing literature. Although each of these terms brings its own definition and debates, each can be linked to specific methodological issues that affected the document analysis stage here. To begin with, content analysis has been defined by Holsti (1969) as “any technique for making inferences by objectively and systematically identifying specified characteristics of messages (1969, p. 14). This broad definition could be applied with equal merit to each of the different terms listed above. This is because common to each is a focus upon the identification of ‘messages’ and how these are put across. However, such a broad method of data collection inevitably possesses both significant advantages and disadvantages. For example, Bryman (2012) notes how content analysis benefits from its transparent and unobtrusive nature, lends itself well to longitudinal study and is highly flexible. However, most pertinent to the present research is possibly his assertion that:

Content analysis can allow information to be generated about social groups to which it is difficult to gain access. For example, most of our knowledge of the social backgrounds of elite groups derives from content analysis (Bryman, 2012, p. 304).

This point is particularly significant in relation to the present research, as the analysis of government policy documents can be seen to represent a level of access to the opinions of influential policy makers that would not otherwise be possible. However, Bryman (2012) also acknowledges a number of disadvantages to this approach, which include but are not limited to the possibility of unsatisfactory document quality, the risk of research becoming atheoretical, and most significantly here, the problem of analysing latent content:

Particular problems are likely to arise when the aim is to impute latent rather than manifest content. In searching for traditional markers of masculinity and femininity or inferring a social science discipline, the potential for an invalid conjecture being made is magnified (Bryman, 2012, p. 306).

This is a particularly important point in terms of the present study as the document analysis was conducted in order to determine latent content – and specifically that concerning the discursive construction of the sporting legacy from London 2012. Furthermore, two additional significant disadvantages of document analysis are evident in Vromen’s (2010) discussion of historiography:
Selecting primary source materials for a historiography is not straightforward and as the selection process tends to prioritise some sources over others for reasons of accessibility and requires that the researcher is aware of their existence. This kind of ‘selection bias’ is somewhat inevitable (Vromen, 2010, p. 262).

Although the documents analysed in the present study were not done so through a historiography, it is worth noting that several of the drawbacks listed here could still be levelled. The broad point that selecting materials for analysis is not straightforward is similarly applicable, as is the risk of selection bias as highlighted here. Put simply, a researcher must be careful to avoid simply choosing documents that fit most comfortably with the overarching aims of the research at hand. In order to overcome these potential problems a clear sampling strategy was required, and this is outlined in the next section.

4.3.2 Discourse Analysis

While document analysis – however it may be termed represented – represented the means by which this study collected data for analysis, it is also important to acknowledge how this collection and analysis of documents was underpinned theoretically. More specifically, as this study’s document analysis focussed primarily (but not exclusively) upon policy documents, it is therefore worth considering how policy can be understood theoretically. For example, Bacchi (2000) describes how policy analysts can follow a comprehensive rationalism, political rationalism or ‘policy-as-discourse’ approach. The last of these will be followed here. Following Bacchi (2000), Shaw (2010) describes how:

Rather than seeing government as responding to ‘problems’ that simply ‘exist’ in the community; policy-as-discourse theorists believe that ‘problems’ are ‘created’ in the policy proposals that are offered as responses…

Policy is thought of as a set of processes and actions (or inactions) that have some broad purpose (rather than a discrete decision or programme administered at one moment. Unlike conventional accounts that separate politics from policy and focus on ‘what governments do’, policy-as-discourse theorists see them as inherently intertwined (Shaw, 2010, p. 201).

A ‘policy-as-discourse’ can therefore be seen to construe policy as socially constructed and complex. This is consistent with the underlying philosophical and theoretical orientation of the project, which is based primarily upon social constructivism and Foucauldian thought. When following this approach, policy discourse is therefore seen as being subject to change and contestation over the course of time. More broadly, this understanding of discourse is consistent with the definition provided by Piggin (2014):

A discourse (such as madness, neoliberalism, health promotion or coaching) governs the way a topic can be meaningfully talked about, reasoned about and it influences how ideas are put into practice. While a discourse produces a way for a topic to be discussed, and defines an acceptable and intelligible way to talk, write and conduct oneself, it also rules out, limits and restricts other ways of talking and conducting oneself. This is not to say that only one discourse is present in each social setting. Indeed, it is the interplay of different discourses that is often of interest for discourse analysts (2014, p. 24).
In terms of the present study, topics such as sport, the Olympic Games, health promotion and the role of business could all be understood as discursively constructed. More specifically, this research also differentiates between the discourses produced by both official Olympic ‘legacy actor’ organisations and private sector sponsors in relation to certain topics and themes relating to the sport and activity participation legacy of London 2012. For clarity, a complete account of precisely which units of analysis represented the ‘official legacy actor’ and ‘sponsor’ discourse examined here is provided later in this chapter.

It is also worth noting that, following Fairclough (1995), discourse analysis has frequently been associated with ‘critical’ approaches to social research. For Piggin (2014), “since the policy terrain is inherently political, its analysis must be undertaken with a methodology that acknowledges or accommodates this” (p. 24). In terms of the ‘critical’ orientation of the documentary/discourse analysis carried out in the present research, this study’s position is consistent with that set out in Chapter 2 in that rather than regarding concepts (e.g. neoliberalism) as inherently negative (Ferguson, 2009), the emphasis is upon understanding the conditions of formulation that contribute to particular modes of governing in relation to specific contexts.

4.3.3 Semi-structured Interviewing
For Janesick (1998), an interview is “a meeting of two persons to exchange information and ideas through questions and responses” which can enable the “joint construction of meaning about a particular topic” (p. 30). This fits with both the central problem of the research question as well as the philosophical and theoretical basis of the study. However, both positive and negative criticism has been levelled at the method of interviewing in general.

Gratton and Jones (2004) state that advantages of interviewing include how they enable the respondent to provide data from their own perspective, facilitate the emergence of unforeseen insights into the topic at hand and help to investigate certain groups who may be less inclined to respond to methods such as surveys. Most pertinently of all, interviewing can allow the researcher “to develop a sense of time and history rather than providing a series of ‘static’ responses” (Gratton & Jones, 2004, p. 143). This is particularly helpful in the context of this study, where the emphasis is upon the nuances of an overarching discourse. On a more practical level, it should also be observed that interviews represented a practical and accessible way of generating rich qualitative data, which was particularly important in relation to the interviewees who were desired here – as the vast majority were only accessible through this method, and any other form of qualitative data collection would have been
impractical or unwelcome. However, it should be noted that in the specific context of sport and sport organisations, the presence of academics has been claimed to be unwelcome – particularly in comparison to those in other fields. For example, Jarvie (2007) asserts that “disparaging remarks are often made about academics and intellectuals as if they have no place in the public debate about sport” (2007, p. 421). In terms of the current research, where a range of different sport organisations were approached with interview requests, Jarvie’s (2007) view can be seen to represent a significant practical barrier to data collection – although this narrow focus upon sport organisations could be argued to apply similarly to corporate organisations such as the sponsors analysed in this study.

Gratton and Jones (2004) also note how the interview method could be criticised for the way data may be contaminated by the researcher’s presence and questioning schedule. Furthermore, Warren (2002) notes how these issues can become exacerbated when interviews are recorded, and cites examples in which “respondents have continued to speak after the tape recorder has been turned off” (p. 92), and may continue once the interview has ended. For Warren (2002), this may demonstrate that the interviewee wishes to articulate their own concerns as opposed to those of the interviewer, which demonstrates the importance of structuring an interview correctly for a particular context. Indeed, the present research exclusively used semi-structured interviews, which can best be understood as following a standard set of questions while providing scope for further articulation of topics of particular significance (Gratton & Jones, 2004, p. 141). Gibson and Brown (2009) highlight an important consideration in their conduct:

Semi-structured interviews are conducted with the researcher’s interests in mind. The whole interview process is managed and negotiated in relation to the concerns of the project and therefore requires the researcher to make judgements ‘in the heat of the moment’ about ‘what counts as relevant’. This is no small matter as it involves the researcher thinking beyond the unfolding structure of the conversation being held and reflecting on the overall aims of the research (Gibson and Brown, 2009, p. 88).

It can therefore be seen that the effectiveness of the semi-structured interview is dependent upon the ability of the interviewer to guide the conversation in a way that is faithful to the purpose of his or her research but permits elaboration upon potentially unanticipated topics of particular interest. This is consistent with the qualitative approach used in the current research, as illustrated by Warren’s (2002) account of the philosophical nature of the semi-structured interview:

The constructionist epistemological leanings undergirding much of qualitative research beg the researcher to move ahead and interview open-endedly. The goal is to unveil the distinctive meaning-making actions of participants. As such, the design of qualitative interview research

However, it is worth justifying the semi-structured interview in relation to both the unstructured and the structured interview. In an unstructured interview, the interviewee acts as a storyteller and is only guided through the conversation by the interviewer (Atkinson, 1998). However, the decisive limitation of the unstructured interview here would have been the time required to perform it successfully – which would have undermined this particular study given that each interviewee was a representative of a specific organisation who was actively involved in the delivery or overseeing of CSR activity at London 2012. Semi-structured interviewing was also decided to be preferable to the fully structured interview. For Marvasti (2004), this type of interviewing is limited first because of how the structured conversation forces interviewers to speculate about the respondent’s true viewpoint and second because of how the coding schemes used may not do justice to the complexity of the responses given. Although this could arguably be levelled at the semi-structured interviewing used here as well, the intention is that it enables respondents to express themselves in greater detail on topics they find particularly provoking, and the subsequent questioning can be changed to suit this accordingly. In light of this, it was decided that the semi-structured interview represented the best way to attain the information demanded by the research questions without causing the flow of conversation to become awkwardly prescriptive or fixed.

For practical reasons, interviews were conducted either face-to-face or via telephone. Gibson and Brown (2009) note that while face-to-face interviews represent “a communicatively rich mode of exchange in which the gestural aspects of the discourse are visible to the participants” (2009, p. 94), they may also be expensive or require too much travelling to carry out. By contrast, telephone interviews “can be quicker and easier to conduct” but cannot produce the rich data that can be generated in a face-to-face setting. It can therefore be seen that the comparative drawbacks of the face-to-face interview are primarily practical, and in the current research this is the form that was sought at first, with telephone interviews only conducted when face-to-face interviews proved to be logistically impractical. Overall, it can be seen that the semi-structured interview was preferred to both the unstructured and the structured interview, as it represented a compromise between both that remained consistent with the objectives of the study. These objectives were therefore used to inform the design of an interview guide that is presented in Appendix 1.

4.3.4 Purposive and Snowball Sampling
The research drew primarily upon two types of sampling: purposive and snowball. The respective merits and disadvantages of these positions will be addressed here. Firstly, Silverman (2010) states that purposive sampling enables the researcher to select participants on the basis of their significance
to the topic at hand. However, this selection demands careful consideration, much in line with Silverman’s (2010) assertion that it therefore requires researchers to “think critically about the parameters of the population” (p. 141) that is being studied and to choose the sample with appropriate care. In terms of qualitative interviewing, Bryman (2008) highlights the specific advantage of purposive sampling:

Most writers on sampling in qualitative research based on interviews recommend that purposive sampling is conducted. Such sampling is essentially strategic and entails an attempt to establish a good correspondence between research questions and sampling. In other words, the researcher samples on the basis of wanting to interview people who are relevant to the research questions (2008, p. 458).

In other words, purposive sampling allows the researcher sufficient scope to align their choice of interviewee with the aims of their work. To use interviewing as an example, it may not always be possible to gain access to these individuals, which could in turn be argued to compromise the consistency of the research. However, it is abundantly clear that both the merits and disadvantages of this type of sampling can primarily be attributed to the role (or the competence) of the researcher who settles upon it.

The second form of sampling used by this study was snowball sampling. Put simply, this refers to the practice of using the advice or recommendations of certain participants in order to gain access to others (Babbie, 2011). Its metaphorical title can therefore be seen to stem from the idea of “a snowball growing in size as it is rolled in the snow” (Blaikie, 2010, p. 179). As Babbie (2011) highlights, the outstanding benefit of snowball sampling is that it can offer access to participants who could not be reached through any other type of sampling, and is therefore most useful when research focuses upon individuals who may otherwise be less willing to be interviewed. This could cover a number of different types of participants, ranging from individuals involved in illicit activity to those whose professional commitments may see them otherwise unresponsive to the advances of the general public – and it is with the latter extreme of this – senior professionals - with which the current research is most concerned. However, where purposive sampling’s efficacy could be linked to the role of the researcher, the strength of snowball sampling ultimately depends upon the initial interviewees and the extent to which they can suggest other suitable individuals. Indeed, Noy (2008) notes that this issue of selection should be understood as part of the research process, as the act of snowball sampling will reveal who is perceived to be important in terms of the research that is being conducted. Ultimately, while it can be seen that both of the sampling strategies outlined here can be hugely beneficial, it would be naive to
ignore the social factors that will determine the success of both purposive and snowball sampling in practice.

4.3.5 Data Analysis
All three sections of the project used thematic data analysis, its implementation was guided primarily by the ‘phases of thematic analysis’ outlined by Braun and Clarke (2006). In light of Esterberg’s (2002) assertion that “there is no single “right” way to organise and analyse qualitative data” (p. 153), this choice should be judged more upon its suitability for the current study as opposed to its relative strength in comparison to other approaches to qualitative data – such as ethnographic (Wolcott, 1994) and narrative (Crossley, 2000) analysis. Indeed, although thematic data analysis has been used in related fields such as psychology (Clarke & Kitzinger, 2004), health education (Yardley, Donovan-Hall, Francis and Todd, 2006) and sport media (Osborne & Coombs, 2009), the complexity of this decision is further exacerbated by the claim that “thematic analysis is widely used, but there is no clear agreement about what it is and how you go about it” (Braun & Clarke, 2006, p. 79). In order to overcome this confusion, the present research broadly followed Braun and Clarke’s (2006) six phases for conducting thematic analysis, and these are set out in Figure 4.1:
Figure 4.1: Braun and Clarke’s (2006, p. 87) phases of thematic data analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Familiarising yourself with your data:</td>
<td>Transcribing data, reading and re-reading the data, noting down initial ideas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Generating initial codes:</td>
<td>Coding interesting features of the data in a systematic fashion across the entire data set, collating data relevant to each code.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Searching for themes:</td>
<td>Collating codes into potential themes, gathering all data relevant to each theme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Reviewing themes:</td>
<td>Checking if the themes work in relation to the coded extracts and the entire data set, generating a thematic ‘map’ of the analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Defining and naming themes:</td>
<td>Ongoing analysis to refine the specifics of each theme, and the overall story the analysis tells, generating clear definitions and names for each theme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Producing the report:</td>
<td>The final opportunity for analysis. Selection of vivid, compelling extract examples, final analysis of selected extracts, relating back of the analysis to the research question and literature, producing a scholarly report of the analysis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It should be noted that as this research was divided into three distinct stages, there was a need to adapt these phases in accordance with the practical demands of each one. To avoid confusion, more detail upon these adaptations will be provided in the next section. However, Figure 4.1 serves to show that the guiding principle of thematic analysis is that the researcher follows a clear process that allows for familiarity with data to be increased to a sufficient extent that it can be organised into certain themes. While thematic analysis alone is inherently descriptive, it must be acknowledged that for the purpose of this study it represents a way of organising a potentially huge amount of data into a manageable number of distinct but related categories. The critical approach of the project will then be demonstrated more clearly in the analysis stage, where governmentality analytics are applied in an attempt to treat the themes with the sensitivity their social complexity deserves. The use of thematic analysis here is therefore better understood as a means of organising data into categories that are convenient for theoretical analysis.

4.3.6 Section Summary: Practical Consistency of Knowledge Production

This section has outlined the two primary methods that are used in the current research, along with the sampling techniques and analytical approach that were implemented. However, it is important to note the consistency between each and the underlying philosophical and theoretical basis of the study. First, the use of qualitative document analysis is used to establish dominant discourses for further analysis. This is specifically informed by Foucault’s articulation of governmentality and can also be reconciled
with the qualitative and interpretivist methodological and epistemological grounding of the work – as this form of document/discourse analysis represents a practical way of analysing the discursive constructions of influential groups who would otherwise be inaccessible. Second, the use of semi-structured interviewing built upon the findings from this discourse analysis by using an interview guide that was informed both by these and by the Foucauldian governmentality perspective that frames the research theoretically. Furthermore, it has also been shown that thematic data analysis can be conducted in a way that does justice to this theoretical orientation.

4.4 Research Procedure
Data collection in this project was divided into three distinct but related sections. These three stages correspond to the three overarching research aims stated in Chapter 1, which will be revisited here in relation to each stage. Overall, the two key groups of organisations and actors used for analysis here were ‘official legacy actors’ and those who were directly involved in the design and delivery of sponsor-led CSR activity relating to the sport and activity promotion legacy of London 2012. This section therefore provides more detail on the design and implementation of data collection at each of these three stages, as well as the way in which the thematic analytical approach described above was deployed in each one.

4.4.1 Stage One: Macro Level ‘Official Legacy Actor’ Discourse Analysis
In line with the first aim of the research, the first stage of data collection sought to understand more about the proclaimed sport and activity participation legacy of London 2012 as a context for the delivery of CSR by exploring how this was discursively constructed by organisations responsible for its development and delivery. In order to fulfil this aim, there was therefore a need to trace not only the development of the sport and activity participation legacy, but also the ways in which the potential contribution of private sector business was constructed, both in terms of this in particular and the political context in which the broader legacy of the Games in general was conceived. Given that documentary content represents a form of data that allows an understanding of political processes that would otherwise be inaccessible (Harrison, 2001) – both practically and temporally – the focus was therefore upon using policy documents and media articulations of certain policy developments to establish how the sport and activity participation legacy was constructed over time by the organisations most responsible for its delivery. This sub-section therefore provides more detail on how this process was carried out.

The first step in this procedure was the establishment of the time period from which documents would be used for analysis. It was originally decided that this period would begin in May 2003, when then
Secretary of State for Culture, Media and Sport Tessa Jowell announced in Parliament that London would bid to host the 2012 Games, and end in August 2012, when the Games were to be staged. However, this was ultimately extended to October 2012 in order to encompass the publication of two further documents that provided the first retrospective accounts of the Games and its potential legacy from both LOCOG and the UK Government. Owing to both the practical constraints of the research project, and in line with Gratton and Preuss’s (2008) suggestion that Olympic legacies require at least 15 years to measure, it was determined that no consideration would be given to documents published after this.

With this timescale established, the next step was to determine which organisations – and therefore the documents they had produced – would be selected for analysis. Given the ever-increasing number of local, national and international organisations involved to some extent in the delivery of the Games (Chappelet & Kübler-Mabbott, 2008), there was a practical need to limit the scope of data collection here. This was primarily achieved by focussing upon organisations that bore a direct responsibility for the design and delivery of the social legacy of the Games – which therefore excluded bodies such as the Olympic Delivery Authority and the Olympic Park Legacy Company (now defunct and replaced by the London Legacy Development Corporation), as the remit of these primarily concerns the ‘physical’ legacy of the facilities developed for the event. Beyond this, the focus was also restricted to organisations concerned with the legacy of the Games within the United Kingdom at a national level. This therefore eliminated international bodies such as the IOC and more regional organisations such as the Nations and Regions Group. It is also worth noting that in relation to the UK Government, the organisation’s sheer size demanded that only certain departments were used for analysis, and this selection was made on the basis of specific departments’ contribution to the published sport and activity participation legacy targets of London 2012.

The one exception to the above criteria was the Greater London Authority’s (2009) A Sporting Future for London, on the basis that London’s high population distinguishes its role in promoting sport in London from those of other local organisations. With these criteria established, specific documents were selected purposively (Silverman, 2010), on the basis that they either concerned the sport and activity participation legacy in particular, or – more commonly – covered this as one of several strands of the event’s legacy as a whole – either in terms of its initial proposal, planning or adjustment (such as those made following the change of Government in 2010). Within the selection criteria established above, the four distinct organisations used were the UK Government, the London Bid Team/LOCOG, Sport England and the Greater London Authority. For brevity, these organisations are hereafter referred to as ‘official legacy actors’, and a brief outline of each is provided next:
The **UK Government** encompasses two departments of the United Kingdom central government that held a direct responsibility for the delivery of the proposed sport and physical activity legacy. The first of these was the Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) – the department responsible for coordinating London 2012 from the bidding stage onwards and for overseeing the organisation of the event. In terms of the sport and activity participation legacy, the DCMS was responsible for leading on increasing participation in sport. The other government department used here was the Department for Health (DH), who were responsible for increasing participation in physical activity in the years leading up to the Games. Beyond this, the ways in which each of these departments’ published material addressed the role of business was also examined. In the DCMS’s output this typically focussed upon Olympic sponsors while the DH’s (2011) *Public Health Responsibility Deal*, outlined the broader context of the government’s position regarding health-based relationships between government and business.

It is worth clarifying that the **London 2012 Bid Team** evolved into **LOCOG** following London’s selection as host city for the 2012 Games in 2005. Before this decision was made, the London Bid Team was responsible for outlining the initial visions for a possible London Games and for preparing and submitting the official bid document to the IOC. Upon London’s selection as host city for the 2012 Games, LOCOG was formed and became chiefly responsible for the planning and delivery of the Games – alongside the Olympic Delivery Authority, responsible for the development and post-Games use of infrastructure and venues for the Games. From the bidding stage onwards, these organisations advocated as a potential legacy of the London Games, and this was addressed in more specific detail under LOCOG’s (2005) *London 2012 Sustainability Policy*. LOCOG were also responsible for securing domestic sponsors for the Games and ensuring that their activations were consistent with the visions of the event.

**Sport England** is a non-departmental body of the DCMS of which a significant role is to increase and sustain participation in sport. In terms of London 2012, Sport England was therefore involved in the delivery of the DCMS’s (2008) target to increase participation in sport by one million in the years leading up to 2012.

The **Greater London Authority (GLA)** is the highest administrative body for Greater London and is led by the Mayor of London. The GLA was responsible for helping to deliver a sporting legacy from the Games within Greater London, as set out in their 2009 publication of *A Sporting Future for London*.

It is worth noting that the first two of these four organisations produced significantly more material that was relevant to the focus of this stage, which is reflected in Table 4.4. From these sources, 15 policy documents (listed in Table 4.4) with a total combined length of 634 pages were used for analysis.
However, while these documents provided official accounts of the various stages of the sport and activity participation legacy’s proposal, planning and delivery – as well as how this fitted within the broader context of the event’s legacy in general and how the role of business was treated in relation to this – there was one drawback to the exclusive use of documents. Indeed, this related to the way that certain significant events in the development of the sport and activity participation legacy were not necessarily covered in official documents. Specifically, the four most significant events in this regard were the first official announcement of London’s intention to bid for the Games in 2003, its selection as host city for the 2012 Games in 2005, the 2010 announcement of Places People Play and the 2011 decision to abandon the sport and activity participation targets published in 2008. In order to address these gaps, a further 30 pages of data were collected, which took the form of speeches and media articulations of specific policy developments (see Table 4.5). This meant that the overall dataset for this stage of the project consisted of 22 different sources which contained a total of 664 pages of content.

Table 4.4 – List of Policy Documents Selected for Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title of Document</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Publication Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>London 2012: A Vision for the Olympic Games and Paralympic Games</td>
<td>London 2012 (Bid Team)</td>
<td>January 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London 2012: Response to the questionnaire for cities applying to become Candidate cities to host the Games of the XXX Olympiad and the Paralympic Games in 2012</td>
<td>London 2012 (Bid Team)</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London 2012 Candidate File</td>
<td>London 2012 (Bid Team)</td>
<td>November 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Towards a One Planet Olympics</td>
<td>London 2012 (LOCOG)</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before, During and After: Making the Most of the London 2012 Games.</td>
<td>DCMS</td>
<td>June 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be Active Be Healthy: A Plan for Getting the Nation Moving</td>
<td>DH</td>
<td>February 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Sporting Future for London</td>
<td>Mayor of London/GLA</td>
<td>April 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Towards a One Planet 2012</td>
<td>London 2012 (LOCOG)</td>
<td>December 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plans for the Legacy from the 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games</td>
<td>DCMS</td>
<td>December 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Public Health Responsibility Deal</td>
<td>DH</td>
<td>March 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating a Sporting Habit for Life: A New Youth Sport Strategy</td>
<td>DCMS</td>
<td>January 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Get Set Story: How London 2012 Inspired the UK’s schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Format</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Submission of London 2012 Candidate File</td>
<td>Media article</td>
<td>London promises ‘best ever’ Games</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Selection of London as Host City</td>
<td>Speech transcript</td>
<td>Singapore presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Announcement of Places People Play</td>
<td>Media article</td>
<td>Lottery boost for London 2012 mass participation legacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Abandonment of official sport and activity participation legacy targets</td>
<td>Media article</td>
<td>Jeremy Hunt admits London 2012 legacy targets will be scrapped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Media article</td>
<td>London 2012 Olympics: Sport England to miss legacy target as Games fail to inspire youngsters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Media article</td>
<td>Hugh Robertson admits to struggling with legacy for grassroots sport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of these documents followed Braun and Clarke’s (2006) phases of thematic analysis as set out in sub-section 4.2.4, although one modification was made to the first of these to better suit the focus of the section. This concerned the initial reading of the documents, in which one preliminary stage was added in order to establish whether content related to either the sport and activity participation legacy or the role of business/CSR in relation to the event. Content that did not relate to either of these topics was then disregarded. This was particularly necessary in the analysis of documents that covered every aspect of the event’s legacy, which were defined by the DCMS (2008) as including “making the UK a world-leading sporting nation”, “transforming the heart of East London”, “inspiring a new generation of young people”, “making the Olympic Park a blueprint for sustainable living” and “demonstrating that the UK is a creative, inclusive and welcoming place to live in, visit and for business” (p. 1). Within these, the sport and activity participation legacy was detailed within the first ‘promise’ (to make the UK a ‘world-leading sporting nation’), which in turn was divided into three headline ambitions: “inspiring young people through sport”, “getting people more active” and “elite achievement” (DCMS, 2008, p. 6). Furthermore, it is worth clarifying that the term ‘sport and activity participation legacy’ as used in the
present document does not refer to the third of these - as the focus of the study was upon participation sport. Documentary content pertaining to elite sport was therefore disregarded.

Following this preliminary stage, data was then organised under two headings: the sport and activity participation legacy and the role of business and CSR in delivering the Games. This content was then sorted into themes and sub-themes according to the phases set out by Braun and Clarke (2006). Once these had been written up, each theme was then subjected to theoretical analysis using the governmentality analytics set out by Vallentin and Murillo (2011), Rose and Miller (1992) and Miller and Rose (1990) as described in Chapter 2.

4.4.2 Stage Two: Macro Level Sponsor Discourse Analysis
The second stage of data collection and analysis corresponds to the second aim of the project, which was to establish how CSR activity around the London 2012 Olympic legacy was justified and rationalised by private sector sponsors and to investigate how specific CSR programmes involving sport and activity participation were promoted. Data collection here was therefore divided into two stages, with the first focussing on sponsors’ published rationales for CSR and the second upon six specific sponsors whose CSR activity involved participation in sport or activity.

The first part of this stage of data collection sought to establish how CSR activity around the Games was articulated and rationalised by sponsors. Content from a total of 20 different sponsors was used, with six of these being TOP Worldwide sponsors – whose partnerships are managed by the IOC – and 14 being domestic sponsors, organised by LOCOG, whose Olympic sponsorship focussed solely upon London 2012. This total of 14 is comprised of all seven Official Olympic Partners (the top tier of domestic sponsorship) and all seven Official Olympic Supporters (the second domestic tier). Beneath this were a further 28 organisations in the third – and lowest – category of Official Olympic Suppliers and Providers. This final group was not used for analysis on the basis that the sheer number of different sponsors here would have significantly extended the process – and this was an extension deemed unnecessary on the basis of the lower level of financial contribution and CSR activity at this level. The six Worldwide sponsors were selected from a total of 11 that held sponsorship rights for London 2012, and their inclusion was based upon either having signed their sponsorship deal with the IOC since London was awarded the Games in 2005 (in the cases of Acer, Dow, GE and P&G) or having organised activities around the event involving participation of sport or activity participation (in the cases of Coca-Cola and McDonald’s – see the IOC’s (2012) 2012 Marketing Report for a full summary
of these sponsors’ activations). The organisations selected, along with their product or service categories for London 2012 are listed in Tables 4.6 and 4.7.

Table 4.6: TOP Worldwide Partners for London 2012 (those used for analysis in bold).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Start of Sponsorship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coca-Cola</td>
<td>Non-alcoholic Beverages</td>
<td>1928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acer</td>
<td>Computing Equipment</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atos</td>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dow</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE</td>
<td>Energy/Healthcare/Electronics/Transportation/Water Treatment/Lighting</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDonald’s</td>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omega</td>
<td>Timekeeping</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panasonic</td>
<td>Audio and Visual Equipment</td>
<td>1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P&amp;G</td>
<td>Personal Care and Household Products</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samsung</td>
<td>Wireless Communications</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visa</td>
<td>Payment Services</td>
<td>1996</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.7: Official Olympic Partners and Supporters for London 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Official Olympic Partners</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adidas</td>
<td>Sportswear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMW</td>
<td>Automotive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP</td>
<td>Oil and Gas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Airways</td>
<td>Airline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BT</td>
<td>Telecommunications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDF</td>
<td>Utilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lloyds TSB</td>
<td>Banking and Insurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Official Olympic Supporters</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adecco</td>
<td>Recruitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ArcelorMittal</td>
<td>Steel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadbury</td>
<td>Treat Provision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cisco</td>
<td>Network Infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deloitte</td>
<td>Professional Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Cook</td>
<td>Holiday/Short Breaks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPS</td>
<td>Logistics and Express Delivery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of how documents were selected for analysis, it should first be noted that private sector organisations are not typically required to produce official policy documents of the same nature as those listed in section 4.3.1. This meant that a more flexible approach to data collection was required in order to gain a sufficient idea of how sponsors rationalised their CSR activity. With the focus exclusively upon content published by sponsors themselves, three primary types of sources were collected. The first of these took the form of official documents or booklets produced by sponsors in which their overall...
Olympic sponsorship plans and visions were outlined and articulated for the public, although it should be noted that – inevitably - the precise nature and focus of these varied between organisations. The second type concerned material published on sponsors’ official websites – where it was typical for an organisation to devote significant attention to both promoting and explaining their sponsorship of the event. In some cases, this was presented in the form of a dedicated sub-site. Each of these first two types was obtained in relatively straightforward fashion in accordance with the lists of sponsors provided in Tables 4.6 and 4.7. Finally, the third source of data used here was taken from instances of sponsors articulating themselves in the media. These took two main forms, the first of which concerned media coverage of a specific announcement – usually that of a sponsor’s relationship with the Games but also in some cases that of a specific CSR initiative. The second of these took the form of web articles in which representatives of sponsors outlined their brand’s sponsorship strategy in response to a series of interview questions – notably on a dedicated Olympic website such as Inside the Games but also on more business-oriented sites such as Ad Age and Sport Industry Group. In total, this phase of data collection used 45 independent sources which totalled 186 pages in length – although it should be noted that the absence of page numbers in online articles meant that all of these were counted as one page irrespective of length. Appendix 2 provides a summary of the documentary data used for this stage.

Following this first stage, in which the focus was upon broader rationales for CSR, the second stage sought to establish how specific CSR schemes involving the promotion of participation in sport and physical activity were constructed and presented by the sponsors delivering them – with the data collected for the first stage of analysis providing the basis for this. It is worth noting that while these may not have been explicitly labelled as ‘CSR’ by the sponsors themselves, the above description refers to the interpretation of the term set out in Chapter 2 that is adopted in this thesis. Six sponsors were used here: Coca-Cola, McDonald’s, GE, Lloyds TSB, adidas and Cadbury. These organisations were selected on the basis that each organised some form of CSR activity around London 2012 that involved a specific effort to encourage participation in sport or physical activity – although it should be acknowledged that the both the profile and relationship to London 2012’s official legacy targets around sport and activity participation varied across the different sponsors.

A full summary of the initiatives organised by each of these sponsors and their respective foci is presented in Chapter 6 – although this should not be taken to suggest that each of these committed to sport and activity to precisely the same extent. Data collection here followed primarily the same approach as that listed above, although one significant difference was that in some cases it was necessary to draw upon documents that had not been published by the sponsor alone but either in
collaboration with an organisation helping to deliver their CSR initiative (as in the case of adidas’s adiZones, delivered by The Great Outdoor Gym Company) or by these delivery partners alone. In total, this stage drew upon 63 different documentary sources which totalled 211 pages in length (with the caveat noted above also applying here).

Both of these phases followed Braun and Clarke’s (2006) phases of thematic analysis as set out in subsection 4.2.4. As sources had been selected specifically with the focus of this stage in mind, there was no need to determine whether content was germane to this or not when beginning the analytical process. The governmentality perspective outlined in Chapter 2 was then applied to these themes in order to understand them in relation to the wider theoretical framework of the study as a whole.

4.4.3 Stage Three: Meso Level Interviews with Individuals Involved in the Delivery of CSR at London 2012

The third and final stage of data collection comprised a series of semi-structured interviews with individuals who had been actively involved in the delivery of sponsor-led CSR programmes at London 2012. In line with the third aim of the research, the purpose of this was to understand more about the dynamics of how sponsor-led CSR activity was organised in relation to the roles of other organisations and how individuals involved in this process articulated both the wider role of business in society and the London 2012 Olympics as a particular context for this.

Given the sheer number of different local, national and international actors which cooperate in and around CSR at the Olympic Games, there was a practical need to organise these into a manageable list of potential interview participants. The organisations selected for analysis in the previous two sections therefore represented a useful starting point, firstly because these had already been established as significant actors in the delivery of CSR or the sport/activity participation legacy and secondly because their use in previous stages of the study permitted a greater degree of consistency with the organisations studied at the macro level. On this basis, the three primary ‘official legacy actors’ approached were the DCMS, Sport England and LOCOG – although transpired that of these only LOCOG would ultimately be represented in the research. While these were not involved in the process of delivering CSR activity at the Games, each could be seen to have shaped it through either partnerships with sponsors (in the case of Sport England), or in the responsibility they held for ensuring that sponsor CSR activity was consistent with the ethos of the event (in the cases of LOCOG and the UK Government). Table 4.8 summarises the responses of each to the requests that were made to participate.
Given the difficulty of accessing representatives of these ‘official legacy actors’, it was therefore decided that a greater emphasis would be placed upon approaching representatives of sponsors. In the second phase of Stage Two, six organisations were identified for their focus upon sport and activity participation. Of these, four were approached for interviews: Coca-Cola, Lloyds TSB, adidas and Cadbury. McDonald’s and GE were not, on the basis that their activity around these areas was much less extensive than the four chosen. As summarised in Table 4.9, Coca-Cola, Lloyds TSB and Cadbury agreed to participate while adidas did not respond. Over the course of the first two interviews with sponsors (Lloyds TSB and Cadbury), the significance of the contribution made by their charity delivery partners became increasingly apparent, and representatives of each were therefore sought for interviews as well. This strengthened the dataset by providing a parallel account of sponsor CSR activity that was provided by individuals who had been directly involved in its delivery.

Indeed, with these organisations established as relevant to the purpose of this stage, the next step was to identify specific representatives for interview. The primary criterion here was that interviewees should have had an active role in the design, management or delivery of CSR activity on behalf of their organisation. This meant that for sponsors, members of either Olympic sponsorship teams or CSR departments were most desirable. For (charity) delivery partners, the ideal candidates were individuals responsible for either managing the organisation’s relationship with corporate sponsors or for delivering specific initiatives within these partnerships. The specific roles of each interviewee are listed in Table 4.9. Given the difficulty of accessing organisations in the first place, this selection process was benefitted by the cooperation of other individuals at each organisation, who were typically those that dealt with initial requests for interviews, which were all sent through e-mail. In the majority of cases contact was therefore made with two to three individuals at an organisation, who were able to identify the person who would be most capable of discussing the topics listed— which can be seen as one advantage of snowball sampling (Babbie, 2011; Noy, 2008) in the context of this research. These dialogues also acted as a source of preliminary information about an organisation, which contributed to a clearer picture of its overall strategy around CSR and the Games. In all, five interviewees were accessed through this approach while two were only contacted after being recommended as relevant to the focus of the research by a previous interviewee. Indeed, both of these individuals represented organisations that had previously declined earlier requests for interviews. The other important consideration at this stage concerned the occupational status of interviewees at the time of the interview. This was particularly important as – for practical reasons - all were conducted after the Games had finished. This meant that there was a risk of important individuals having moved to different roles or organisations, as corporate Olympic sponsorship teams typically disbanded shortly after the
Games. While this risk did not manifest itself given that all three corporate interviewees remained in the same position during the Games as at the time of the interview, it should be noted that the individual interviewed regarding LOCOG had left the organisation and was employed elsewhere by the time of the interview. This issue was not problematic with representatives of charity organisations as all held the same roles both before the Games and at the time of the interview.

It was also important to ensure that the interviewees could be understood as representing logical clusters relating to the delivery of CSR at London 2012. Indeed, the seven individuals who were ultimately interviewed can be understood in terms of three distinct sub-sets. Each of these relate to a specific sponsor’s activity around sport or activity promotion: Coca-Cola, Lloyds TSB and Cadbury. Full details of each interview are provided in Tables 4.9, 4.10 and 4.11, and all include representatives of both the sponsor, a charity delivery partner, and in the case of Lloyds TSB, a representative of LOCOG who had worked closely in aligning the sponsor’s objectives with those of LOCOG. In terms of the specific individuals interviewed, the key criteria used were that they had been directly involved in working on the design and delivery of the relevant sponsor’s sport or activity-based CSR and that they would therefore be able to provide significant insight beyond what had been established in the first two stages of data collection in this project.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation Approached</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organisational/Legacy Bodies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCMS</td>
<td>UK Government department with chief responsibility for 2012 Olympic Games</td>
<td>Did not respond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport England</td>
<td>Non-departmental public body responsible for increasing and sustaining participation in sport.</td>
<td>Did not agree to participate after being informed of purpose/focus of the research and potential interview.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCOG</td>
<td>Organising Committee of London 2012</td>
<td>Agreed to participate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legacy Trust UK</td>
<td>Charitable trust responsible for supporting cultural/sporting activities based around legacy of London 2012.</td>
<td>Declined to participate – cited that the remit of the organisation was not in line with the aim of the research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Olympic Sponsors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coca-Cola</td>
<td>Worldwide TOP Partner of the Olympic Movement</td>
<td>Agreed to participate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lloyds TSB</td>
<td>London 2012 Official Olympic Partner</td>
<td>Agreed to participate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adidas</td>
<td>London 2012 Official Olympic Partner</td>
<td>Did not respond.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadbury</td>
<td>London 2012 Official Olympic Supporter</td>
<td>Agreed to participate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CSR Delivery Partners</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Sport Trust</td>
<td>Lloyds TSB Delivery Partner</td>
<td>Agreed to participate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>StreetGames</td>
<td>Coca-Cola Delivery Partner</td>
<td>Agreed to participate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groundwork UK</td>
<td>Cadbury Delivery Partner</td>
<td>Agreed to participate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.9 – Interviewee Cluster 1: Coca-Cola

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Role of Interviewee at Organisation</th>
<th>Type of Interview</th>
<th>Access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coca-Cola GB</td>
<td>Corporate Responsibility &amp; Sustainability Manager</td>
<td>Face-to-face (Hammersmith, London, UK)</td>
<td>Recommended and given contact details by StreetGames interview participant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>StreetGames</td>
<td>Special Projects Manager</td>
<td>Face-to-face (Eccles, Manchester, UK)</td>
<td>Recommended and given contact details by StreetGames Knowledge Manager after initial enquiry.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.10 – Interviewee Cluster 2: Lloyds TSB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Role of Interviewee at Organisation</th>
<th>Type of Interview</th>
<th>Access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lloyds TSB</td>
<td>London 2012 Sponsorship Manager</td>
<td>Face-to-face (Holborn, London, UK)</td>
<td>Given contact details after initial enquiry via social networking site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Sport Trust</td>
<td>Programmes and Events Officer</td>
<td>Face-to-face (Loughborough, UK)</td>
<td>Recommended and given contact details after initial enquiry to organisation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCOG</td>
<td>Client Services Manager</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>Recommended and given contact details by Lloyds TSB interview participant.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.11 – Interviewee Cluster 3: Cadbury

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Role of Interviewee at Organisation</th>
<th>Type of Interview</th>
<th>Access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cadbury</td>
<td>London 2012 Community Manager</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>Recommended and given contact details by Cadbury’s London 2012 Corporate Affairs Manager.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groundwork UK</td>
<td>Programmes Manager</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>Responded directly to initial enquiry.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These interviews are consistent with Dexter’s (1970) description of elite interviews as any in which “the interviewee is given special, ‘non-standardized’ treatment” (p. 5), usually on the basis that their seniority and greater insight means that it is the interviewee who more determines the line of discussion. Indeed, Richards (1996) describes how this approach is beneficial in that it facilitates the identification of further interview participants and can strengthen the use of documentary data by virtue of an interviewee’s practical experience of the environment in which it has been designed and published. Both of these benefits apply to the use of documentary analysis here, although it should be acknowledged that the UK Government and Sport England’s refusal to participate in interviews meant that this did not occur unanimously. Furthermore, Jarvie’s (2007) concern about the scepticism faced by academics in public discourse around sport was also justified in terms of the problems this posed for access. One example
of this occurred in the case of Sport England, who refused to participate after being e-mailed an outline of potential interview content. As this occurred relatively early in the recruitment process, it was subsequently determined that later such e-mails should be less specific in order to diminish the risk of further rejections of this nature.

Once an individual had agreed to take part in an interview, they were informed that the data generated in each interview would be used in the final writing up of the research project, and that they would therefore have the opportunity to request that certain information should be withheld from this if they desired. For practical reasons this was achieved by recording and then transcribing each interview and e-mailing the transcript to the interviewee within a week of the meeting – although it should be noted that no interviewees asked for information to be omitted.

Interviews were conducted following a guide (see Appendix 1) that contained four main sections: background information, the joint delivery of CSR by sponsors and charities, perceptions of CSR and perceptions of the Olympic Games as a context for its delivery. This guide was informed by two primary sources: the governmentality perspective than underpins the project and the themes established in the preceding discourse analysis stages. However, while these themes might have theoretically helped in informing a critical approach to certain topics, it became apparent in the first interview that – in line with the advice of Gratton and Jones (2004) - phrasing questions in this way served to inhibit the flow of the conversation. In response to this, the interview guide was subsequently amended to ensure that questions were presented in a more open-ended fashion that permitted interviewees the greatest possible scope to articulate their perspectives in as much detail as possible.

Once interviews had been transcribed, data were analysed using the thematic analysis procedure described in sub-section 4.2.4. However, it is worth noting that while each step was conducted in the same fashion as during the documentary stages of the project, the use of the aforementioned interview schedule meant that the process of generating initial codes was shaped by the themes that had been established beforehand. Overall, a total of seven interviews of between 23 and 49 minutes were conducted - of which four were conducted face-to-face and three by telephone.

4.4.4 Reliability and Trustworthiness
Bryman (2012) describes how the nature of qualitative research has given rise to debate about to how it can best be judged, with opinions varying from those who advocate the direct translation of quantitative notions of validity and reliability to others who propose that entirely different metrics are required. Indeed, this latter argument can be reconciled with the underpinning philosophy of qualitative research as set out earlier in this chapter. While it could therefore be seen that the pure interpretivist would
regard any attempt to apply any form of external measurement to a given piece of research as inherently flawed, the risks of adopting such an extreme interpretivist position in the context of the present study (Parsons, 2010; Henry et al., 2005) could also be extended to the issues of validity, reliability or trustworthiness. In other words, for a study to claim any broader significance it must be possible to demonstrate its reliability to some degree. The two data collection methods used here will therefore be addressed in these terms.

Scott (1990) outlines four criteria for assessing the quality of documents: ‘authenticity’, ‘credibility’, ‘representativeness’ and ‘meaning’. Of these, ‘authenticity’ concerns the extent to which the origin of a document can be questioned. In the present study this issue was primarily overcome by selecting only documents published by the particular organisations that were to be analysed. This was relatively straightforward as all of these were national or international bodies and therefore their authorship was easy to verify. Next, ‘credibility’ concerns the accuracy and sincerity of the documents. In terms of the policy documents used here, this issue is most significant in terms of the way that these alone do not provide a complete account of the activities of the organisations that publish them. This study sought to overcome this in two ways; firstly by analysing media articulations of key events that were not covered in official policy and secondly by using interviews to gain a richer understanding of the corporate sponsors beyond what was published in writing – although there is a need to recognise that the views of specific interviewees may vary from other individuals at an organisation due to differing roles around CSR and specific experiences of its delivery. After ‘credibility’, ‘representativeness’ refers to how far the selected material provides an accurate sample of the entirety of the existing documents that could possibly have been analysed. This was more easily achievable here in the analysis of sponsor discourse, as corporations do not typically produce the same volume of written policy as state organisations. In terms of the ‘official legacy actor’ discourse, data collection was organised by focussing upon the most significant events in the development of the sport/activity participation legacy and only upon a limited number of organisations with an explicit role in its national-level delivery. Finally, ‘meaning’ concerns the degree to which “evidence is clear and comprehensible to the researcher” (Scott, 1990, p. 8). While the formal nature of the documents analysed here did not pose any problems of intelligibility, it should be noted that ‘meaning’ also encompasses how a particular text is interpreted in a given social context. For example, a native English speaker from Australia may understand the documents without difficulty, but could be less able to relate them to the broader context of British sport and society, and this hypothetical example illustrates the subjective nature of the process – a subjectivity that is consistent with the epistemological and theoretical foundations of the project.
For Gratton and Jones (2004), reliability in interviewing can be addressed through measures such as “using a standardised interview schedule, maintaining a consistent interviewing environment and recording with the interviewees’ permission” (p. 150). Beyond this, the practice of sending transcripts to interviewees for approval offered a further way of ensuring that these provided an accurate representation of the perspectives that each of them wished to express, although – while not an issue in the present study - it could also be argued that this approach permits the subsequent amendment of views that might later be deemed unsuitable for publication. Furthermore, the fact that at least one other interviewee had worked directly upon the CSR initiative about which a given sponsor was interviewed meant that multiple perspectives were provided on the CSR activity of each of the three sponsors studied. However, it should be noted that the difficulty of ensuring ‘validity’ in interviewing is borne out by Gratton and Jones (2004) statement that “transcriptions are a tool for interpreting the interview rather than an analysis in themselves” (p. 150). Furthermore, notions of validity such as Morse and Richards’ (2002) reference to how this can be understood as the possibility for the same results to be obtained if the research was to be carried out again are difficult to apply here, as it would not be possible to conduct the same series of interviews in practice given that many of the individuals interviewed have moved to different roles or jobs since the interview – something which is particularly symptomatic of the one-off nature of Olympic sponsorship. Despite this, it may still be possible to gain the same data provided the relevant individuals could be successfully accessed. More broadly, this resonates with a broader point that applies not just to interviewing but to the project as a whole. Specifically, the perspectives expressed in this series of interviews must only be seen to represent the views of these individuals at a specific point in time as opposed to being understood as a more permanent belief. Indeed, the extent to which CSR has developed over time – as described in Chapter 3 – shows that all understandings of this articulated here would be more safely interpreted as evidence of how it was viewed at one particular ‘moment’ in time as opposed to a finalised ‘conclusion’ to the historical development described in Chapter 3.

4.4.5 Section Summary
This section has sought to set out the procedures that were followed in the three stages of data collection performed in this research, and to explain how each of these relates to issues of reliability and trustworthiness. In the following concluding section, these practical choices will be situated within the methodological structure of the project as a whole.

4.5 Chapter Conclusion
The purpose of this chapter was to outline the philosophical foundations of the research and to provide a rationale for the methods and procedures that were used on this basis. This was organised into three
separate sections, of which the first concerned the underlying philosophical orientations of the research, and how these could be reconciled with the theoretical and empirical nature of the study as outlined previously in Chapters 2 and 3 respectively. Next, the second section reviewed the specific techniques of data collection and analysis that were used in the research, including document analysis, semi-structured interviewing, purposive/snowball sampling and thematic data analysis. Finally, the third section set out the practical conduct of the three stages of data collection carried out in the project, and addressed the related concerns of reliability and trustworthiness. A full summary of these three stages of data collection is provided in Table 4.10.

Most significantly, this chapter has articulated that the study is based upon an idealist ontology (Blaikie, 2010) and a constructivist epistemology (Krane & Baird, 2005), which enables it to remain faithful to the Foucauldian underpinnings of the governmentality perspective set out in Chapter 2 whilst alleviating the inherent risk of committing to a purely interpretivist position (Parsons, 2010; Henry et al., 2005). The use of qualitative documentary analysis and semi-structured interviewing can therefore be reconciled with both the abstract underpinnings of the work and the study’s subjective approach to concepts such as CSR, Olympic legacy and Olympism, while representing the best means of accessing relevant data within the practical context of the study.

**Table 4.12—Summary of Three Stages of Data Collection**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Summary of Data Collection</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Scale of Observation</th>
<th>Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>‘Official legacy actor’ discourse analysis.</td>
<td>To establish construction of sport/activity legacy and CSR by Games organisers</td>
<td>Macro</td>
<td>Documentary Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Private sector Olympic sponsor discourse analysis</td>
<td>To establish how CSR and the sport/activity-based initiatives were rationalised by sponsors.</td>
<td>Macro</td>
<td>Documentary Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Interviews with individuals who had worked on design/delivery of CSR schemes linked to the Games</td>
<td>To understand more about the dynamics of how sponsor-led CSR activity was organised in relation to the roles of other organisations and how individuals involved in this process articulated both the wider role of business in society and the London 2012 Olympics as a particular context</td>
<td>Meso</td>
<td>Semi-structured Interviewing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Following the theoretical framework presented in Chapter 2, and the discussion of CSR provided by Chapter 3, this chapter has sought to demonstrate how the organisation of data collection within the
study represented a logical of translating these broader foundations into practice. With this basis established, the following three chapters (Chapters 5-7) present the findings and contributions generated by the three stages of data collection set out in Table 4.10 respectively.

5.1 Chapter Introduction
This chapter presents an analysis of the macro level discourse produced by official legacy actors that was examined for the first stage of the project. The overall aim was to understand more about the broader social and political environment in which London 2012 took place, in order to establish the context this represented for the delivery of CSR around the event. As efforts to contribute to the long term legacy of the event were a popular focus for CSR, discourse relating to one aspect of this - the proclaimed sport and physical activity participation legacy – was analysed in order to establish the social context this represented for sponsors wishing to contribute towards the legacy of the Games. In addition to this, attention was also given to the ways in which the role of private sector business was represented. The chapter is therefore structured as follows. Following a brief introduction, a chronological review of discourse around the sporting legacy is provided, in order to provide context and background information. Following this, an analysis of the main themes established from this discourse is presented, with each of these situated within the theoretical framework of the study as a whole.

5.2 Sport and Activity Participation Legacy Timeline: Key Events and Statements
This section presents a chronological account of the most significant events and statements relating to the development of the proclaimed legacy of London 2012 for sport, physical activity and health promotion in the discourse examined. The purpose of this is to provide context for the thematic and theoretical analysis to follow. The earliest sources used are from May 2003 – when the UK Government officially gave its support to a London bid for the 2012 Games – and the most recent published in October 2012 – two months after the Games and the latest possible time period to collect data from given the practical constraints of data collection in the study as a whole.

5.2.1 2003-2005: A London Games: From Early Visions to Victory in Singapore
In May 2003, then Culture Secretary Tessa Jowell gave official confirmation that a London bid for the 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games would be supported by the UK Government. In announcing this to the House of Commons, Jowell made specific reference to the potential for London 2012 to benefit sport in the UK, and linked this to a number of broader social issues:

Our Olympics will also rest on a growing commitment to grassroots sport. It will be central to our efforts to increase physical activity, and identify and develop talent. We want to harness the power of sport to help address some of the key issues our nation faces - health, social inclusion, educational motivation and fighting crime.
We want the Olympics to be the catalyst that inspires people of all ages and all talents to lead more active lives. We want to spread the benefits around the country (Jowell, 2003, para. 3-4).

Here it can be seen that the promotion of sport and physical activity and its proclaimed benefits featured prominently in UK government’s reasoning for hosting the Games from the very start of the process. Following this initial announcement, responsibility for bringing Jowell’s visions to fruition fell upon the London 2012 Bid Company, which was first headed by Barbara Cassani. Under Cassani’s leadership, the first proposal for the London Games was published in a January 2004 document entitled *London 2012: A vision for the Olympic Games and Paralympic Games*, and outlined the benefits London and the UK would witness from hosting the Games in greater detail. The potential for the Games to benefit sport and health promotion was again given significant attention, as described in the document’s foreword by then UK Prime Minister Tony Blair:

> Just as England’s World Cup victory last year has led to a tremendous surge of interest in rugby at all levels, so a London Olympics would be an unparalleled boost for sport throughout the UK. By encouraging the young and the not-so-young to take up sport, it would help us to produce the champions of the future and, importantly, a healthier and fitter population (London 2012 Bid Company, 2004a, no pg. number).

The fact that these sentiments were presented before the main text of this document again demonstrates the significance afforded to the advocacy of a potential sporting legacy in the first publications relating to a possible London bid. Following this first submission to the IOC, Barbara Cassani stepped down as head of the bid team to be replaced by Lord Sebastian Coe – who had previously been a vice-chair to Cassani. Under Coe’s leadership, the Bid Company’s first significant publication was entitled *Response to the questionnaire for cities applying to become Candidate Cities to host the Games of the XXX Olympiad and the Paralympic Games of 2012*. The purpose of this questionnaire is to help the IOC decide upon a shortlist of Candidate Cities, and responses given can therefore be taken as an accurate summary of a given city’s proposals for hosting the Games. London’s responses again made significant reference to a potential sporting legacy and the broader national implications of this:

> The Olympic Games and Paralympic Games in 2012 would enhance sport in London and the United Kingdom forever. Our people, especially our youth, will benefit from much-needed facilities. Our next generation of athletes will be better equipped to develop into future Olympians, reinforcing and strengthening the Olympic Movement in this country. Wide-ranging sport programmes will encourage greater participation. The nation will be healthier, happier and more active (London 2012 Bid Company, 2004b, p. 1).

The culmination of this early work was the final London 2012 Candidate File/Bid Book. This document explains – in exhaustive detail – precisely how a host city will approach the hosting of the Games, and must therefore be seen as the most important source produced by the London 2012 Bid Company.
before their selection as host city in 2005. The Candidate File was officially submitted to the IOC in November 2004, and although the expression of similar visions for sport participation to those outlined above are apparent, it should be noted that the sport/activity legacy of the Games is approached in more tentative terms:

Mounting excitement in the seven years leading up to the Games in London will inspire a new generation of youth to greater sporting activity. During this period the UK will continue to deliver programmes to develop high performance athletes, coaches and technical officials so that the national team can excel at the first Olympics to be hosted in London since 1948.

After the Games are over, London will possess some of the finest sports facilities for hosting national and international events. These facilities will enable London to create The London Olympic Institute, a world-class institution for sport, culture and the environment, which will provide facilities and services for elite athletes as well as encouraging participation in sport (London 2012 Bid Company, 2004c, p. 19).

Here it can be seen that the London 2012 Bid Company sought to express their interest in the sport/activity-based aspects of the legacy without committing to any specific targets relating to sport participation or activity take-up. In addition to this, the London Bid Company's (2005) vision for sport and health was also set out in Towards a One Planet Olympics: Achieving the first sustainable Olympic Games and Paralympic Games, and featured the statement that:

This total Games will offer unparalleled opportunities to plan for minimising the potential impact of the event itself, to increase public awareness of the positive links between sport, environment and healthy living, and to create sustainable legacy communities (London 2012 Bid Company, 2005a, p. 2).

Indeed, this document was the first evidence of London’s ‘One Planet’ strategy for the Games, which focussed upon ‘sustainability’ as the overarching theme under which it pursued its vision to host the first ‘sustainable’ Games. In terms of sport and health, the previous quotation shows how these concepts were interwoven into the grander concept of sustainability. This ‘One Planet 2012’ sustainability vision also proved significant for sponsors, as shown by LOCOG Corporate Sustainability Manager Phil Cummings’ (cited in adidas, 2009) statement that “all [commercial] partners have to adopt or further develop practices” that were coherent with the ‘One Planet 2012’ vision.

On 6 July 2005, London was selected as the host city for the 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games at the 117th IOC Session in Singapore. As part of London’s final presentation to IOC members in Singapore, London bid chair Lord Coe stated that a London Games would seek to deliver a “lasting sporting legacy” - which was primarily phrased in terms of young people’s participation, on the basis that Olympic success requires “millions of young people around the world to be inspired to choose sport”
London's confirmation as hosts therefore gave policy-makers the opportunity to establish London’s sport and activity legacy goals in complete detail.

5.2.2 2006-2009: LOCOG and DCMS develop their Legacy Visions and Targets

Following the confirmation of London as hosts of the 2012 Games, the Bid Company was replaced by a London Organising Committee of the Olympic Games (LOCOG), who assumed responsibility for planning and overseeing the development of the event. LOCOG’s (2006) London 2012 Sustainability Policy was their first strategic publication relating to the potential sport and activity legacy of the Games, and outlined how the Games would be used to encourage people to take up sport and live healthier lifestyles. Working in cooperation with LOCOG, the DCMS was the UK Government department responsible for coordinating the delivery of the Games, and oversaw the delivery of the event. In 2007, the DCMS (2007) outlined their initial legacy promises for the Games in Our Promise for 2012: How the UK will benefit from the Olympic Games and Paralympic Games. This brief document outlined five key legacy-based themes: making the UK a world-leading sporting nation, transforming the heart of East London, inspiring young people, making the Olympic Park a blueprint for sustainable living and demonstrating the attractiveness of the UK as a place to do business. Its legacy for sport and health was therefore covered primarily under the first of these headings, and this was explained in greater detail in 2008 with the publication of Before, During and After: Making the Most of the London 2012 Games. Precisely what was meant by a ‘world-leading sporting nation’ was therefore defined as follows:

- Inspiring young people through sport: offer all 5 to 16 year-olds in England five hours high-quality sport a week and all 16 to 19 year-olds three hours a week by 2012
- Getting people more active: help at least two million people in England to be more active by 2012.
- Elite achievement: aim for fourth in the Olympic medal table and at least second in the Paralympic medal table in 2012 (DCMS, 2008, p. 6).

Given that the focus of the present research is upon the participation-based aspects of the sporting legacy, the third of these pledges will be disregarded given its focus on elite sport. In terms of the first two, it should be clarified that although youth participation in sport was included in the analysis here, this was for its relationship with the broader notion of using the Games to encourage sport participation, and not with any specific concern for sport participation among young people. Given this, it is worth considering the DCMS’s (2008) further explanation of how two million people would become more active:
The Games will help to unlock talent. And the first priority of the Games is to make the UK a world-leading sporting nation. We hope to see people becoming increasingly active, with a goal of seeing two million people more active by 2012 through focused investment in our sporting infrastructure and better support and information for people wanting to be active.

While the way these claims will be addressed later, the significance of these statements to the current timeline is that this document can be taken to represent the UK Government’s first official statement of their confidence in “getting at least two million more people active by 2012” (DCMS, 2008, p. 22) – with this being defined here as “doing at least three or more sessions per week of at least moderate intensity activity” (2008, p. 22). The relationship between these sport and activity participation based targets and the legacy of the Games for public health is evident in the contribution of the DH to the legacy objectives noted above. In February 2009, the DH published Be Active Be Healthy: A Plan for Getting the Nation Moving, in which it stated that while the DCMS would lead on promoting activity through sport, the DH would work with a range of other organisations towards bringing about an increase in physical activity participation. Progress in both sport and activity would be measured by the Active People Survey every year until 2012. Alongside these government-led contributions, LOCOG published an updated version of its sustainability plan in December 2009 entitled Towards a One Planet 2012, which reiterated its commitment (LOCOG, 2009) “to inspire people across the country to take up sport and develop active, healthy and sustainable lifestyles” (LOCOG, 2009, p. 11). Overall, it can be seen that in the four years following the IOC’s selection of London to host the 2012 Games, LOCOG and the UK Government can be seen to have articulated the sport and activity participation targets of the Games – and their link to promoting healthy lifestyles - in clear terms and established how these would be approached.

5.2.3 2010-2012: Change of Government and Policy Change: Moving the Goalposts?

In May 2010, the Labour government that had held office since 1997 was replaced by a Conservative-led coalition government after a hung parliament was returned in that year’s UK General Election. In terms of the Olympic Games, this meant that the DCMS personnel who had overseen progress towards London 2012 throughout the bidding and planning stages were entirely replaced. The new government’s first reference to the Games was presented in the initial Coalition Agreement of May 2010, wherein it was stated that the new government would commit to delivering a “safe and successful Olympic and Paralympic Games in London in 2012” declared a need to “urgently form plans to deliver a genuine and lasting legacy” (HM Government, 2010, p. 14).

However, alongside the implications of the change of government for the Olympic legacy, it is also worth considering the new administration’s approach to responsibility. As noted previously, the flagship policy in this regard was the Big Society, although here it should be noted that the Big Society has
received significant political criticism, which has chiefly focused upon both its lack of practical clarity and the way that it could be seen to represent a smokescreen for the coalition government’s public sector spending cuts (e.g. Cameron, 2011c). However, the most important implication for the present study lies in the underlying assumptions about responsibility upon which it is based. These are largely evident in Cameron’s tone above, as it can be seen that for him, community development or improvement is better organised by the individual than by national government. Although this does not consider the role of business, Cameron’s *Building a Better Future* speech of March 2011 made similar reference to its role in society:

> There’s only one strategy for growth we can have now, and that is rolling up our sleeves and doing everything possible to make it easier for people to start a business to grow a business.

> Back small firms. Boost enterprise. Be on the side of everyone in this country who wants to create jobs, and wealth and opportunity (Cameron, 2011a, para. 165-66).

While this appraisal of small businesses cannot simply be extrapolated to the government’s stance on the broader role of corporations in society, the combination of these sentiments and Cameron’s rationale for the Big Society contribute to the impression that his coalition government could reasonably be understood as one that places a significantly stronger emphasis upon the private sector than the public.

In terms of the Olympic Games, The Coalition Government’s first significant announcement relating to the sport/activity legacy was made in November 2010. A new initiative, Places People Play, was described by Minister for Sport Hugh Robertson as “the cornerstone of a grassroots legacy from hosting the Games” because of how it would “enable everybody to play sport” (cited in Slater, 2010, para. 4). Further detail on this initiative was provided in December 2010’s *Plans for the Legacy from the 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games*, which was the new government’s first attempt to articulate their approach to the sport/activity legacy in policy. Within this document it was asserted that:

> Harnessing the United Kingdom’s passion for sport to increase grass roots participation, particularly by young people –and to encourage the whole population to be more physically active (DCMS, 2010, p. 1).

While the sentiments expressed here are consistent with those of the preceding government, it should be noted that by this stage, the Coalition were drawing criticism for making no mention of the specific targets that had previously been published in relation to encouraging more people to become active (e.g. Slater, 2010). Indeed, by March 2011, such suspicion was to prove well founded, with new Culture Secretary Jeremy Hunt explaining that:
I do think it’s reasonable to ask whether, with resources as constrained as they are, if it’s an appropriate use of taxpayers’ money to be focusing on adult participation when really what we want is to be getting young people into a habit for life (Hunt, cited in Gibson, 2011, para. 3).

Indeed, it should be clarified that Hunt’s mention of ‘constrained resources’ refers primarily to the 2008 global economic crisis and the claim that this was mismanaged by the preceding Labour government (e.g. Landale, 2013), which was cited by the Coalition government in justifying its 2010 decision to reduce public spending. As statistical evidence showed that progress towards the sport and activity participation targets published in 2008 was disappointing, references to the role of the economic climate, with Sport England Chief Executive Jennie Price stating that:

I am very disappointed that we have only got 111,000 more people into sport when we were counting on 1 million people, but we have to be realistic about the climate in which we are working.

Jeremy Hunt [the Culture Secretary] has already said he does not believe that the one million target is the right measure of participation immediately after the Olympics, though I do think we will get a good measure of participation in the year or two after and we will get a bounce from the Olympics (Price, cited in Slater, 2010, para. 9-10).

In line with Hunt’s earlier statements about turning the focus to young people, Price’s words here foreshadowed the January 2012 announcement that this would represent a formal change in policy direction, as set out in Creating a sporting habit for life: A new youth sport strategy (DCMS, 2012). This decision was primarily based upon the difficulty of bringing about a mass participation legacy – which no previous Games had achieved – and the more attractive option of seeking to foster such a permanent ‘sporting habit for life’. Beyond this, Minister for Sport Hugh Robertson also criticised the original policy for its flawed interpretation of the Olympic legacy:

For us to think we could start all of this [the participation increase] and get it done by 2012 was foolish. Government is to blame for allowing people to believe this was the date by which all this should be judged. Legacy is what it says on the can. In 2012 we should start the legacy (Robertson, cited in Gibson, 2012, para. 7).

Robertson’s argument here was largely consistent with the perspective taken in the DCMS’s Beyond 2012: The London 2012 Legacy Story (DCMS, 2012b), published in March 2012. In terms of the sporting legacy, this acknowledged that sporting legacy was “core to the original bid” (p. 10) but represented a “challenge never achieved by an Olympic host” (p. 11). Despite the previous intimation that any intention of bringing about a mass participation legacy would be replaced by a narrower focus on young people, sport among the broader population was addressed under the heading “community: improving grassroots sport”, which articulated community sport participation in relation to factors such as “Olympic-inspired funding from Sport England” (p. 17) and the “increased provision of local facilities”.
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Overall, it should be noted that although the 2011 abandonment of the sport/activity participation targets set out in 2008 represented a direct retreat from the way a mass participation legacy had been advocated from the outset of the bidding stage, the decision to focus upon young people ensured consistency with the vision set out by Lord Coe in Singapore. Furthermore, LOCOG’s (2012) publication of *The Get Set Story: How London 2012 inspired the UK’s schools* illustrates how the focus of the proclaimed benefits of London 2012 for young people were to run broader than sport alone:

Launched in 2008, Get Set aimed to use the power and excitement of the Games to inspire young people across the UK to fulfil their potential in sport, education and personal development, and to give them opportunities to play a part in the Games (LOCOG, 2012, p. 6).

This statement – along with many of those related above - demonstrates the complexity that characterises any social legacy objective that an Olympic Games may seek to bring about. Put simply, it is difficult to separate the sport/activity legacy – and its relationship with healthy living – from numerous other facets of the Games. In this instance this is shown by how LOCOG’s flagship initiative in relation to the event’s headline aim of inspiring young people is categorised as an educational scheme. Considering the discourse examined more broadly, such complexity is also apparent in the way that the delivery of the legacy is coordinated by a number of different organisations against a backdrop of political change and economic problems in the host nation – factors that can both be seen to have shaped and reshaped the ways in which the sporting legacy was discussed, developed and delivered. Against such a backdrop of complexity, the next section will seek to establish the main themes that were evident in how state and organisational discourse constructed the sport/activity legacy and its broader implications for public health in the UK.

5.3 Thematic and Theoretical Analysis

With this background picture established, this section presents a thematic and theoretical analysis of the discourse examined for this stage of the research, which is organised into four distinct themes. The first of these concerns the way in which official legacy actors constructed sport and physical activity, and their proclaimed benefits. The second addresses how this became intertwined with more intangible concepts associated with the event, such as ‘power’ and ‘inspiration’. The third sub-section then focuses upon how the participation legacy was adjusted and redefined over time before ultimately being abandoned in 2011. Finally, the fourth centres upon how official legacy actors articulated both the broad role of business in contributing to the event and the specific ways in which this applied to sport and activity promotion.

5.3.1 Discursive Constructions of Sport, Physical Activity and Health
In the discourse examined here it was apparent that sport and physical activity – and their effect upon health - were constructed in complex and varied fashion. These constructions can be understood in terms of the governmental/political rationalities, programmes and technologies that have been developed around Foucault’s (1994) original articulation of governmentality (Miller and Rose, 1990; Rose and Miller, 1992; Vallentin and Murillo, 2011). Indeed, at the broadest of these – the level of the rationale – both sport and activity were held to represent different means of achieving similar health and society-oriented goals. Indeed, although some sources attempt to differentiate between the two terms, a degree of overlap was also apparent, as demonstrated by statements about how recreational activity can ‘provide a pathway into sport’ and how new sporting facilities were hailed as having the potential to bring about ‘fitter society’ and to ‘reduce health inequalities’. This ambiguity demonstrates that while official state discourse divides sport and physical activity participation into two distinct categories, the practical context shows this to be overly simplistic.

For example, although official attempts to define both sport and physical were made, the relationship between the two terms and their proclaimed benefits were more complex. The significance of the proposed sport participation legacy to the Games as a whole was expressed by the Greater London Authority in 2009:

One of the main reasons we were awarded the Games was that we made a firm commitment to use them to transform the sporting landscape – providing a lasting legacy of engaging people in sport and providing the infrastructure and support necessary for them to enjoy it (Johnson, cited in GLA, 2009, p. 5).

The sport participation legacy of the Games was to be led by Sport England on behalf of the DCMS. Upon the publication of Sport England’s Strategy from 2008 until the year of the Games, Sport England stated that:

The driving force behind the strategy and investment is to address the needs of sport participants across the country. This provides a clear distinction with the physical activity agenda being driven by a number of departments, including the Department of Health and Department of Transport (Sport England, 2008, p. 1).

Here it can be seen that sport participation is clearly set apart from physical activity. Further clarification upon the difference between these two terms was presented by the DCMS (2008, p. 22) under the heading “what we mean by sport and physical activity”:

Physical Activity is more than just sport. It includes ‘everyday’ forms of exercise, such as walking, recreational cycling and dancing. Sport means activities that are often more vigorous and undertaken competitively, including football, tennis and swimming. Both have potential health benefits. We want to help people find an activity that suits them and that they enjoy, and we want to encourage them to exercise regularly (2008, p. 22).
It could be noted that the need to distinguish between sport and activity in the first place demonstrates the complex relationship between them. Indeed, this complexity is born out in the following paragraph by the way that an activity such as cycling – an Olympic sport – is compartmentalised in relation to ‘more vigorous’ pursuits such as swimming – which could similarly be characterised in more recreational terms. This is not to ridicule the logic of the DCMS, but rather to illustrate the complex definitional challenge this extract shows them to have been facing. In order to overcome this, the following target was set:

The target will be to increase by two million the number of people doing three more sessions per week of at least moderate intensity activity (at least 30 minutes long), as a contribution to the five or more sessions per week recommended by the Chief Medical Officer for general health benefits. Data will come from the DCMS Taking Part Survey and the Sport England Active People Survey, based on existing baselines (DCMS, 2008, p. 22).

Sport participation can therefore be seen to have been defined in terms of increasing the number of 30-minute sessions of ‘moderate intensity activity’ per week. As the DCMS held official responsibility for the sporting legacy plans, their definition carries particular significance. Indeed, this was acknowledged by LOCOG (2009), who acknowledged this aim to increase activity participation as one of the “three headline ambitions” (p. 62) of the UK Government’s aims in relation to sport and activity participation. Overall, it can be seen that although a formal distinction between sport and activity promotion was recognised in the DCMS’s published targets, at a practical level this is more ambiguous. Indeed, the overlapping nature of sport and physical activity was evident in how certain state organisations portrayed participation in the latter as a possible precursor to involvement in the former. For example, in A Sporting Future for London, the GLA (2009) suggested that:

This plan is about increasing participation in sport and physical activity. Whilst there are definitions of what each of these mean, on the ground the division is far more blurred. We recognise that for many people, particularly older people, physical activity is an easier and more appropriate avenue. Initiatives such as the Green Gym programme, which encourages outdoor activity, are hugely valuable in terms of improving health, building self-confidence and, in some cases, providing a pathway into sport (GLA, 2009, p. 9).

Intentionally or not, the reference to how activity can provide ‘a pathway into sport’ supports the earlier acknowledgement of the complex relationship between the two terms. The implication here is that activity functions better when it leads to involvement in sport, and this resonates with the way the sporting legacy was constructed by the London 2012 Bid Company in the Candidate File, under the heading ‘benefitting the community through regeneration’:
The new facilities in the Olympic Park will be open to the whole community, not just elite athletes. This will lead to more opportunities for everyone to participate in sport and physical activity. This will create a more inclusive, more active community, leading to a fitter society and reducing health inequalities (London 2012 Bid Team, 2004, p. 19).

As this document was prepared approximately four years before the official legacy plans were announced, to expect terminological consistency between this and the DCMS’s formal targets would be unreasonable. Indeed, the lack of clarity here is not an isolated case. For example, in Chapter 3 it was demonstrated that definitions of sport may focus narrowly on competition (Coakley, 2007) or may take a broader sense such as in that advocated by the UN (2013). However, it can be seen as another example of how sport and physical activity are constructed, with the suggestion being that the newly built facilities alone will benefit both in similar measure. Furthermore, the final sentence of this quotation also illustrates the proclaimed wider benefits of sport and activity participation, as they are seamlessly linked to tackling problems such as health inequality and improving the fitness of the population.

Indeed, the promotion of sport or physical activity participation was largely approached in two contrasting ways. On one hand, this involved warnings about the negative consequences of not taking sufficient exercise, while on the other there was a greater focus upon its potential long term benefits for both individuals and society. As an example of the former, consider the DCMS’s (2008) reference to the Foresight Report:

According to the Foresight Report, Tackling Obesities: Future Choices, by 2050 60% of men and 40% of women could be clinically obese, if we do nothing. The London 2012 Games are our best chance in a generation to encourage people to be more physically active and to give them the opportunities they need to do so. Previous Games’ hosts have aspired to do this but few have achieved long term success (DCMS, 2008, p. 22).

It is important to note that within the DCMS’s Legacy Action Plan document, this quotation is placed immediately before the announcement of the official sport and physical activity participation targets for 2012, which contributes to an impression that if the opportunity offered by the Games is not taken, the spectre of obesity could prove difficult to avoid. A similar logic can be seen to underpin Kate Hoey’s foreword to the GLA’s A Sporting Future for London, in which a possible solution is also offered:

The reality is that, despite all that has gone before, we face huge challenges of rising obesity and falling participation. Our objective must be to find new ways to engage people of all ages, and to empower our communities and clubs, acting as a catalyst for genuine change. This plan provides a foundation on which we all can build (Hoey, cited in GLA, 2009, p. 7).

Obesity is again cited as the primary reason for action, with sports clubs and local communities being identified as ways to overcome this. However, the suggested ‘risks’ of low participation were also
argued to have broader consequences, with the DCMS’s (2010) Plans for the Legacy from the 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games containing the warning that:

Sports participation drops off sharply – with the number of 16-19 year-olds doing sport falling by a third compared to 11-15 year olds. The cost is enormous, not just in terms of health, where one in four adults in this country is now classed as obese - the highest level in Europe - but also in terms of educational attainment, since teachers know that physical activity boosts concentration and feeds through directly into improved academic performance (DCMS, 2010, p. 2).

Although the argument set out here runs beyond the physical risks of inactivity alone, the underpinning logic remains the same. Put simply, this holds that declining participation in sport is a crucial factor in both concentration and, more significantly, academic success. Indeed, the tone of these warnings about health and academic performance is largely consistent with McDermott’s (2007) notion of risk discourses, and of how these can be used towards particular ends:

When a population is understood through discourses of responsibilisation, choice, and self-governance, health concerns are managed in an individualistic way, whereby physical inactivity and obesity are understood as due to an individual’s inability to make the “right” choices to commit to a healthy lifestyle. Risk discourses are thus moral technologies. They serve as a medium through which the regulatory practices seeking to shape and guide people’s conduct are deployed (McDermott, 2007, p. 318).

While McDermott’s (2007) focus is constrained to healthy lifestyles, it is possible to extrapolate this logic – in more abstract terms - to the societal problems associated with inactivity in the discourse examined here. However, while these ‘risk discourses’ are clearly evident here, this was not the only way in which sport/activity participation was promoted. Indeed, other arguments focussed instead upon the potential benefits that could derive from increased participation. For example, in Be Active Be Healthy, the DH (2009) phrases its rationale for activity in more positive terms:

London 2012 provides us with a unique opportunity to promote healthier lifestyles and the benefits of physical activity. Key activities such as walking, cycling and swimming, which contribute to a wide range of important health benefits, are also Olympic sports and provide a showcase that can help to encourage young people and adults to change their lifestyles (DH, 2009, p. 53).

In contrast to the alarmist tone of the discourse examined above, the Games are presented here as more of an opportunity for personal growth, and the proclamation of activity’s benefits here is consistent with Sport England’s (2008) assertion that “sport can and does play a major role in achieving wider social and economic benefits - notably on the health front” (p. 1) as well as the London 2012 Bid Team’s claim that were London to host the Games, “an already sports-mad nation would get fitter and healthier” (London 2012 Bid Team, 2004, no pg. number). However, in addition to this perception of
Sport for sport’s sake should be celebrated. But we will also be doing so because of the huge benefits that it brings to our community. Sport can act as a great leveller – allowing people from all backgrounds to come together and join in positive activity. It can help our young people stay healthy, and it can help tackle issues such as obesity, academic underachievement and crime (Johnson, cited in GLA, 2009, p. 5).

The rationale for the societal benefits of sport set out in these examples is consistent with Godfrey’s (2009) description of the “institutional aura of moral goodness” (p. 712) it enjoys, as well as Smith and Westerbeek’s (2007) contention that aspects which render sport unique include its youth appeal, health benefit and facilitation of social interaction. Indeed, although the concern of each of these authors is for sport’s use in CSR, the fact that this resonates with the discourse produced here by state and Olympic organisers demonstrates the widespread adherence to these views. Furthermore, these cases for sport contrast directly with the above reference (DCMS, 2010) to the disadvantages of decreasing participation. In line with the way health could be constructed both positively in terms of risk and negatively in terms of reward, this shows how the social case for sport can be made in similarly differing ways. Indeed, although this ‘reward’-based discursive approach is geared towards the same ultimate purpose as the ‘risk’-based language addressed above, it can be seen that its tone betrays a marked contrast. However, it is still possible to reconcile this ‘reward’-based discourse with Dean’s (1999), understanding of governmentality, in which:

Government is any more or less calculated and rational activity, undertaken by a multiplicity of authorities and agencies, employing a variety of techniques and forms of knowledge, that seek to shape conduct by working through the desires, aspirations, interests and beliefs of various actors, for definite but shifting ends and with a diverse set of relatively unpredictable consequences, effects and outcomes (Dean, 1999, p. 18).

This account of governmentality demonstrates that the term is sufficiently flexible to be linked to such notions of ‘reward’ upon the same basis as McDermott (2007) applies it to ‘risk’, as both can ultimately be understood as conscious attempts to influence individual conduct. Overall, this particular example of the respective – and overlapping – definitions of sport and physical activity and their construction in policy content demonstrate the discursive complexity of the context at hand.

5.3.2 The Intangibles: Power and Inspiration
The previous section highlighted that although sport and activity participation were associated with a range of potential benefits, the construction of these was inconsistent and complex – both on a definitional basis and in terms of whether these were presented in relation to potential ‘risks’ or ‘rewards’. In relation to this, the current section expands further by analysing the ways in which the
Games was promoted in association with the notions of ‘power’ and ‘inspiration’ – terms that featured prominently around the Games in many different ways, and which were closely associated with the proclaimed sporting legacy and the desirable benefits that this might bring. Indeed, the notion of specific governmental/political rationalities is again useful here, as this represents a framework in which the positive constructions of the power and inspiration of sport and Olympism can be understood.

Throughout the bidding stage, the inspiration ascribed to the Olympic Games was linked to the potential of the Games to encourage sport participation among younger people. This rhetoric was typified by Lord Coe in his closing address to the IOC in Singapore:

> We can no longer take it for granted that young people will choose sport. Some may lack the facilities. Or the coaches and role models to teach them. Others, in an age of 24-hour entertainment and instant fame, may simply lack the desire. We are determined that a London Games will address that challenge. So London’s vision is to reach young people all around the world. To connect them with the inspirational power of the Games. So they are inspired to choose sport (Coe, 2005, para. 36-40).

Here, the ultimate significance of the ‘inspirational power’ of the Games is that it will ultimately help increase the number of young people taking up sport – in a way that, presumably, other sport events are less capable of. This resonates with the idea that hosting sport events can generate a form of ‘psychic income’ (Agha et al., 2011) that “may be manifest in civic pride, self-confidence, or a festival atmosphere” (Burgan & Mules, 1992, p. 709), although it should be noted that the role of ‘inspiration’ here is also geared towards a more tangible effect upon participation. While Coe’s focus here is exclusively upon young people, it can also be seen that this notion of inspiration was to be applied across the population when the formal plans for the sporting legacy were announced in 2008:

> The Olympic Games and Paralympic Games have a unique power to inspire all of us as individuals, to motivate everyone to set themselves a personal London 2012 challenge (DCMS, 2008, p. 8).

> The Olympic Games and Paralympic Games represent the pinnacle of world sport. Hosting the London 2012 Games will help our best athletes achieve their potential and inspire every person, young and old, to take part in a range of sporting activities and to lead healthier, more active lives (DCMS, 2008, p. 19).

The inspiration applied to young people by Coe in 2005 can therefore be seen to have been extended to ‘everyone’ by 2008, and also to encompass healthy and active lifestyles beyond sport participation alone. Furthermore, the suggestion is that inspiration will specifically result from the sheer spectacle of the Games and the elite competition within it. Indeed, the role of these role models in producing inspiration was set out more explicitly by then Health Secretary Alan Johnson in 2009:
This [physical activity] is even more important than ever as we prepare to host the Olympic Games and Paralympic Games, which will showcase the best athletic talent and will provide inspiration and opportunities for all of us to take part in sport and be more active (Johnson, cited in DH, 2009, p. 3).

While Johnson associates inspiration with the elite sport on show at the Games, his statement also contains an acknowledgement that this must be combined with sufficient opportunities for participation. This resonates with the 2010 announcement of Places People Play, which was justified by Coe using a similar logic to that of Johnson above:

Places People Play will harness the inspirational power of the Games to promote sport and leave a lasting legacy of facilities (Coe, cited in Slater, 2010, para. 27).

Although Coe’s reference to the ‘inspirational power’ of the event is consistent with the discourse produced by both himself and LOCOG from the bidding stage onwards, his statement – along with that of Alan Johnson - also has problematic implications for the notion of inspiration. On one hand, the impression given in earlier material is that the power of this inspiration alone would be sufficient to encourage participation, while on the other it can be seen that this power requires ‘harnessing’ in the form of both facilities and sporting opportunities. Overall, this is consistent with MacAlloon’s (2008) account of the “magical properties of today’s highly fetishized legacy talk in Olympic circles” (p. 2069) and shows that while the acceptance of this ‘inspiration’ and ‘power’ by a range of political and sporting figures in the lead up to the game demonstrates its popularity; there is no clear consensus about how exactly it is supposed to function. Furthermore, it was also apparent that as opposed to being associated directly with the sporting legacy alone, this notion of ‘inspirational power’ was also argued to have implications for society more broadly.

Indeed, these statements about the ‘inspirational power of the Games’, the ‘appreciation that the Olympic Games are a power for good’ and the assumption that the Games held the potential to ‘harness the power of sport’ to address key national issues can be linked to the assumed benefits of sport participation described in the previous section. To better understand the antecedents of these assumptions, it is worth considering Rose, O’Malley and Valverde’s (2006) description of the exercise of governmental power:

This perspective [governmentality] views such power as always operating in terms of specific rationalizations and directed toward certain ends that arise within them. An analysis of governmentalities then, is one that seeks to identify these different styles of thought, their conditions of formation, the principles and knowledges that they borrow from and generate, the practices that they consist of, how they are carried out, their contestations and alliances with other arts of governing (Rose et al., 2006, p. 84).
Within these terms, the positive assumptions – or ‘styles of thought’ - that were shown to be associated with sport/activity participation can be linked to more intangible discourses about inspiration and the power of sport. In line with Rose and Miller’s (1992) assertion that it is “possible to discern regularities that we term political rationalities” (p.5), the Olympic Games – within the broader field of sport – as well as health, could be understood as examples of rationalities. For Rose and Miller (1992), this involves three particular elements; a “moral form” – which concerns the “ideals or principles” upon which government should be based, an “epistemological character” relating to the “elements of a population to be managed”, and a “distinctive idiom” that shapes what is “amenable to political deliberations” (p. 179).

In terms of the overarching rationale about sport and health, these terms can be applied to the assumption that physical activity represents a desirable – or ‘good’ means of improving health, and that the Olympic Games represents a particular manifestation of this that can legitimately be used as a stimulus for increasing participation. From this perspective, the abovementioned ‘inspiration’ that is ascribed to the event therefore represents a product of commonly accepted assumptions around what constitutes a healthy lifestyle and the way that sport represents a suitable way to encourage this.

Just as the complexity of the Games’ inspiration and power in relation to sport and activity participation rendered their meaning elusive, the same is apparent in relation to broader society. For example, in the first parliamentary announcement of the bid, Tessa Jowell expressed the social benefits of the Games in terms of the power of sport:

We want to harness the power of sport to help address some of the key issues our nation faces - health, social inclusion, educational motivation and fighting crime (Jowell, cited in Davies, 2003, para. 3).

This statement further demonstrates the complex nature of qualities such as power and inspiration in relation to the Olympics, and this is demonstrated by the contrast between the broad-ranging effects of the ‘power of sport’ in general here and the way that Lord Coe could be seen to set apart the power of the Olympic Games from that of wider sport in his closing speech to the IOC in Singapore. However, common to both approaches is the assumption that sport can have beneficial effects that go beyond participation alone – which is also evident in the perspective of the GLA upon the sporting legacy of the Games:

It was hoped that the Games would be used as a catalyst to drive up participation across the country and help to tackle issues such as obesity, ill health and crime (GLA, 2009, p. 9).

The idea of the Games as a catalyst recurred throughout the discourse examined for this chapter, and can primarily be understood in similar terms to the notions of power and inspiration outlined above. However, while the previous quotation links the power of the Games to increase participation to its
subsequent effects on broader society, it could also be argued that the sport and activity aspects of the event’s legacy represent just two of several social objectives, such as those highlighted by the London 2012 Bid Company (2004) during the bidding phase:

Throughout our country there is an appreciation that the Olympic Games and Paralympic Games are a power for good. For London 2012, that power for good will be the most powerful catalyst imaginable for the regeneration of one of our most underdeveloped areas. It will accelerate the most extensive transformation seen in London for more than a century. Tens of thousands of lives will be improved by new jobs and sustainable new housing, new sports venues and other facilities; all set in one of the biggest city centre parks created in Europe for 200 years. This will be a real and long-lasting legacy (London 2012 Bid Company, 2004, p. 1).

This quotation summarises how rather than divorcing the sport or activity participation legacies from the rest of the event’s after-effects, it would be more accurate to regard them as just two parts of a larger social effort. This further demonstrates the complexity of concepts such as power (and inspiration) in relation to the Games, as the suggestion here is that their status as a ‘power for good’ will bring exclusively positive benefits for the host nation. The problematic nature of this complexity can be better understood in relation to Gratton and Preuss’s (2008) legacy cube, which provides a more accurately comprehensive framework for explanation of how specific legacy effects may be ‘planned or unplanned’, ‘tangible or intangible and ‘positive or negative’. Within this, the proposed sport participation legacy could be seen as planned, tangible and positive. However, the discourse examined here may suggest otherwise – firstly in how this is tied to abstract notions of power and inspiration and secondly in how the assumption that sport’s power will translate into broader social progress appears less pre-meditated.

When understood within this framework, the previous section’s focus upon risk and reward can be seen as attributable to the wider acceptance of sport as a ‘power for good’ – and therefore as symptomatic of broader political and governmental rationalities rather than a set of naturally occurring thought formations. However, while these attitudes may be accepted at a broad level – as their prominence in the examined discourse shows – this does not automatically ensure their translation into practice through the levels of governmental programmes and technologies, as shown by how London 2012’s official mass participation legacy targets were abandoned after negligible progress.

Overall, this section has shown first how the notion of the governmental/political rationality can help demonstrate the relationship between the proclaimed values of sport/activity participation addressed previously and the more intangible ideas of sport and the Games’ supposedly inherent ‘power’ and ‘inspiration’ described here. Secondly, it has also shown how despite their discursive dominance, these ideas require satisfactory translation to the levels of governmental programmes and technologies in order to be influential in practice. However, while this use of Rose and Miller’s (1992) framework offers
an explanation for the failure of London 2012 to meet its mass participation targets, it alone does not account for whether this can be more attributed to flawed policies or external contextual factors. In order to address this, the following section focuses upon the published articulations of the ‘rise’ and ultimate ‘fall’ of the mass participation legacy.

5.3.3 The Rise and Fall of the Sporting Legacy

In the timeline section above, a brief overview of the advocacy and ultimate abandonment of the UK Government’s official mass participation sport and activity targets was provided. Indeed, the UK Government’s decision to abandon the official mass participation legacy targets represents a direct contrast with the lofty statements about inspiration and the power of sport described previously. Just as the previous section concluded by acknowledging the importance of the translation between governmental/political rationalities and governmental programmes and technologies, the current section demonstrates the difficulty of this translation’s practical implementation. As Miller and Rose (1990) acknowledge, government is “not only a matter of representation” but is “also a matter of intervention” (1990, p. 7), while “the relays and linkages” between rationalities and technologies “are decisive conditions for the elaboration of each” (1990, p. 11-12).

However, the ways in which this change in policy was explained demand further attention. As has been addressed, the bidding stage saw repeated references to a potential mass participation legacy, ranging from that of how “grassroots participation would be boosted” (London 2012 Bid Team, 2004, no pg. number) by a possible London Games to how this would also provide “more opportunities for everyone to participate in sport and physical activity” (London 2012 Bid Team, 2004, p. 19). However, none of these statements were accompanied by clear objectives or targets. This changed in 2008, with the DCMS’s publication of its official Legacy Action Plan. Before turning specifically to the sport or activity legacy, the DCMS (2008) first clarified how legacy would be understood:

What we mean by ‘legacy’
The ‘legacy’ of the London 2012 Games refers to the imprint they will leave. It is therefore not just what happens after the Games, but what we do before and during them to inspire individuals and organisations to strive for their best, to try new activities, forge new links or develop new skills (DCMS, 2008, p. 8).

It was upon this basis that the DCMS published their target of one million more people taking part in sport. However, following the change of government and the subsequent decision to abandon the target, new Minister for Sport Hugh Robertson was critical of the decision to approach the legacy of the Games in this way:
2012 is not the end of the story; it’s the start of one. For us to think we could start all of this and get it done by 2012 was foolish. Government is to blame for allowing people to believe this was the date by which all this should be judged. Legacy is what it says on the can. In 2012 we should start the legacy (Robertson, cited in Gibson, 2012, para. 7-8).

This debate is difficult to address in terms of the existing literature, as while the IOC’s (2013) Olympic Charter does not elaborate upon its definition of legacy, certain writers (e.g. Cashman, 1999) have conceptualised the legacy of the Games as following the event. However, the more subjectivist perspectives of Olympic legacy advocated by others (e.g. Leopkey & Parent, 2012b; MacAloon, 2008) could be taken to show that – in line with the examples presented here – no overall consensus exists regarding when legacy should be measured from.

At the level of the governmental technology, it is possible to approach the specific techniques that were discussed in relation to the sport/activity participation legacy here. A significant example here is the question of measurement, in line with Miller and Rose’s (1990) statement about how rationalities function:

The emergence of a particular political vocabulary requires as one of its conditions of possibility the implanting of a number of mechanisms of inscription, recording and calculation. Political rationalities, even those which profess to limit the scope of government and promote autonomy and freedom of choice, require for their functioning a complex array of technologies if they are to operate (Miller & Rose, 1990, p. 12).

The prominent example of ‘calculation’ or ‘measurement’ here concerns the differing views upon the most ideal timescale for the measurement of the participation legacy, which varied from concerning “not just what happens after the Games” (DCMS, 2008, p. 8) to the reflection that “for us to think we could start all of this and get it done by 2012 was foolish” (Robertson, cited in Gibson, 2012, para. 7-8). Although this question of measurement is more methodological than practical, it can be understood as a governmental technology in that it relates directly to the perceived success of a given policy objective. However, the ultimate failure of this objective demonstrates the lack of proficiency in this particular use of technology – although it should be acknowledged that this was designed and abandoned by two separate governments, which illustrates the complex context of Olympic-based social targets.

In a similar vein, Robertson also stated that successive governments were “foolish” to target pre-event legacy benefits and described the participation measurement system devised by Sport England as “utterly duff” and in need of overhauling (Robertson, cited in Gibson, 2012, para. 2). Sport England Chief Executive Jennie Price expressed similar sentiments but also made reference to broader economic factors in explaining why progress towards the target had been disappointing:
Jeremy Hunt has already said he does not believe that the one million target is the right measure of participation immediately after the Olympics, though I do think we will get a good measure of participation in the year or two after and we will get a bounce from the Olympics.

One third of the people we spoke to cited economic factors as a reason for a reduction in participation, be it a lost job or working longer hours. Sport needs to listen to these people and offer pay-and-play schemes, and other ways of allowing to people access sport more affordably (Price, cited in Kelso, 2011, para. 10-11).

The contrast between the initial outline of the participation targets and Robertson’s subsequent criticism is significant, as is the way that Price can be seen to have linked their abandonment to broader factors such as working hours or spending power. This demonstrates firstly the flexible nature of an Olympic legacy target and secondly the way that it must be regarded within its broader social context – which is particularly significant here given the economic crisis of 2008 that began in the year of the target’s publication.

In terms of the framework set out by Miller and Rose (1990), it can be seen how the components of Foucault’s (1994) governmental ‘ensemble’ here could fit within their definitions of rationalities, programmes and technologies as they have been followed here. However, in terms of the present discussion it is apparent that both acknowledge a link between broader institutional rationalities and the more specific ways in which they are delivered. But this link is complex. For example, in the discourse examined here, what is first proclaimed as a mass participation legacy is later abandoned and repackaged as a more specific focus upon youth. However, while on one hand this represents a direct retreat from the original government policy, the sentiments expressed around youth remained consistent with LOCOG’s vision to encourage more children into sport on the other – meaning that the same policy could present the two organisations in contrasting ways. This demonstrates the complexity of translating a governmental rationality into a particular programme, as while both organisations can be seen to have been working towards the same overarching objective, the policies published by each in relation to it may be interpreted differently.

Another significant policy shift around the sporting legacy concerned the decision to focus solely upon young people – as opposed to the previous emphasis upon mass participation, which is demonstrated by the DCMS (2008):

> We want to reach many of those who are reluctant or unable to participate, including women and girls, people with disabilities, those from minority communities, the elderly, and those from more deprived areas where participation rates are lower than average (DCMS, 2008, p. 23).
The initial decision to focus upon participation among all members of society was accompanied by a published desire to help those with problems of access become involved in sport. However, upon the decision to narrow the focus to young people, Culture Secretary Jeremy Hunt commented that:

I do think it’s reasonable to ask whether, with resources as constrained as they are, if it’s an appropriate use of taxpayers’ money to be focusing on adult participation when really what we want is to be getting young people into a habit for life. We are looking very closely at whether we should target our resources in that respect (Hunt, cited in Gibson, 2011, para. 3).

Once again, the decision to change the policy is accompanied by reference to economic resources, which again demonstrates the influence of context upon the achievement or otherwise of Olympic legacy targets. However, Hunt’s logic to aim at participation among young people specifically warrants further attention, and was expanded upon in the formal announcement of this shift in focus (DCMS, 2012):

As children grow older, sport can often be eclipsed by other priorities. But with every national sporting body now focusing on youth sport, the UK is helping more young people start a sporting habit that will last a lifetime

Launched in January 2012, the new youth sport strategy will build on wider investment in community facilities and projects, creating better links between schools and sports clubs, and allowing more school sports facilities to be used by the whole community (DCMS, 2012b, p. 13).

This emphasis upon youth resonates with both the assumption that increasing sport participation among young people is desirable (Griffiths & Armour, 2013) as well as the fact that the focus of the London Bid Team and LOCOG can be seen to have been upon young people from the bidding stage onwards. Indeed, this could be seen to demonstrate the complexity that arises from the fact that while the vision for event’s legacy was set out by LOCOG, the formal pursuit of these was the responsibility of the DCMS.

Reference has already been made to the ambitious nature of London’s attempt to be the first Games to achieve a permanent legacy for sport or physical activity, and the fact that academic literature has shown that the evidence for the capacity of events such as the Olympics to bring this about is insufficient (Mahtani et al., 2013; McCartney et al. 2010; Department for Health, 2009; Murphy & Bauman, 2007) This was acknowledged in policy both before and after the decision to abandon the official participation targets. Following LOCOG’s (2007) claim that it would “use the Games as a springboard for inspiring people across the country to take up sport and develop active, healthy and sustainable lifestyles” (LOCOG, 2007, p. 2), the DH also acknowledged the difficulty of what was to be attempted:
No previous Olympics have achieved any lasting increase in physical activity, but through careful planning, investment and evaluation we will break new ground in delivering a health legacy for the Games (DH, 2009, p. 21).

Upon the publication of *Creating a Sporting Habit for Life: A new youth sport strategy*, Culture Secretary Jeremy Hunt referred again to how London had been attempting something not previously achieved:

Back in 2005, when Lord Coe and the rest of the bid team triumphed in Singapore, they did so with a simple promise: choose London and we will inspire a new generation to take up sport.

Since then, the UK has been attempting something that no other host nation has achieved – to harness the power of the Olympics and Paralympics to create a deep and lasting legacy of sports participation in every community.

Yet what we’ve also learnt over the last six years is that there can be no ‘plug and play’ sporting legacy from the Games (Hunt, cited in DCMS, 2012a, p. 1).

The fact that Hunt begins by referring to LOCOG’s initial visions around young people is important, given that this is the direction of the new policy and because LOCOG did not state that the Games would bring about a mass participation legacy among all demographics in explicit terms – as responsibility for this was held by the UK Government and specifically the DCMS and DH. The attempts to achieve this can therefore be seen as an ‘ambitious’ challenge, which is consistent with Girginov and Hills’ (2008) account of the behavioural change required to overcome this, that was pursued alongside the vision of inspiring young people as opposed to a central promise of London’s original bid that was not fulfilled. However, it is possible to identify inconsistency between the discourse of LOCOG and that of the state in relation to sports facilities and their potential effect upon the sport or activity participation legacy. For example, in 2009 LOCOG stated that:

The Olympic Park can have an impact on everyone’s lifestyle by providing opportunities for walking, jogging, informal play and sport, including the opportunity to try something new in a world-class setting (LOCOG, 2009, p. 65).

In line with the discourses around the ‘catalysing’ or ‘inspiring’ ‘power’ of the Games, the assumption evident here is that the Olympic venues should bring about an automatic increase in participation and therefore lifestyles by virtue of their association with the event alone. However, this perspective runs contrary to that taken by the DCMS in 2012, where:

As recent figures show, the challenge is not simply to build sports facilities but to fill them; and not simply to provide a short-term burst of interest and excitement, but offer long-term pathways that help young people continue playing sport into adulthood (Hunt, cited in DCMS, 2012a, p. 1).

The fact that this admission was published in 2012 - only months before the event can be seen to justify Coalter’s (2004) assertion that to bring about a sustainable legacy of sports participation, a broader
strategic effort was required in advance of the Games, involving the cooperation of supply-side organisations such as sports governing bodies at national and local levels. This is consistent with the literature review commissioned by the Department for Health (2009), which concluded that the Games should not be seen as a “magic bullet” (p. 58) to increase participation but instead required a broader strategy to bring this about.

Beyond this – and linked to a number of other aspects of the failure of the sport/activity participation legacy – was the mitigating role of the global economic downturn, which was primarily expressed in terms of its impact upon the opportunities for individuals to take part in sport or exercise – as noted above. Taken together, each of these factors serve to demonstrate how the process of translation between rationality, programme and technology is ultimately susceptible to the influence of such global external factors. However, it could also be argued that the period of nine years from the confirmation of a London bid to the staging of the Games represents a sufficiently long time for such broader factors to shape the translation of particular rationalities. Overall, this section has demonstrated that despite the establishment of a governmental rationality in mainstream discourse – such as those of the power or inspiration of sport - its translation into specific technologies that can successfully reshape individual conduct is both essential and vulnerable to becoming impeded by the wider environment in which this may be attempted. Such a risk can be seen to be increased in the case of major events such as the Olympic Games, as its protracted planning phase affords increased opportunities for negative environmental forces to have an effect.

5.3.4 The Proclaimed Role of Business

The preceding analytical sections have explored the London 2012 Olympics as a context for CSR by seeking to understand its flagship mass participation sport/activity legacy in accordance with the framework of governmental/political rationalities, programmes and technologies. Given the extent to which sponsor contributions are emphasised in the current section, the role of private sector sponsors can be approached in the same terms. For example, a sponsor looking to contribute towards particular health objectives would do so within the context of the same overall rationality around health as the government or LOCOG department concerned with this aspect of the legacy on their behalf. In attempting to reconcile the role of the corporation with that of state bodies, it is worth considering the perspective of Moss (1988), for whom governmentality represents:

The presumption that 'everything' can, should, must be managed, administered, regulated by authority. This point should not be confused with a claim about the growth of the state or the rise of a disciplinary society, both of which are connected but ultimately distinct from our
modern governmentality, which is a style of political reasoning more than a specific institution or practice (Moss, 1988, p. 179-180).

Instead of viewing governmentality as the exclusive preserve of government organisations, it is therefore better understood as applying to any actor that can be seen to engage in the behaviour of governing in a given situation.

Although sponsorship of London 2012 was organised by LOCOG and the IOC, the discourse of state organisations – along with that of LOCOG – is important in helping to better understand how the contribution of sponsors was treated by other organisations – in relation to the Olympic legacy in general and the sport and physical activity legacy in particular.

In terms of the DCMS’s (2008) Legacy Action Plan, the broadest level upon which the role of private sector sponsors was significant concerned how the fulfilment of the Olympic legacy was not the sole responsibility of the government. The role of the private sector was therefore presented as comparable to those of the public and charity sectors:

Everyone should have an opportunity to participate in events linked to the Games and the Cultural Olympiad. Providing such opportunities will require public, private and charitable sector help from across the UK. This plan is an invitation to get involved and a challenge to everyone to show just how much can be achieved through the Games (DCMS, 2008, p. 2).

In terms of the respective contributions of private and charity sector organisations, it was clarified that while Olympic sponsors are licensed to use the Olympic and Paralympic marks by the OCOG, the negotiation of the Inspire Programme meant that “outstanding programmes run by non-commercial organisations” could apply to use the marks on the condition that they could show themselves to be helping to “deliver on one of the key legacy objectives shared by government and the Mayor of London” (DCMS, 2008, p. 15). This shows how although the central UK Government held chief responsibility for setting and achieving legacy objectives for the Games, their policy output also recognised the capacity of the private and charity sectors to play significant parts in helping to realise them. Indeed, this fits with Dowling et al.’s (2013) recognition of the value of moving beyond the “typical dyadic relationship” between the public and private sectors by acknowledging the contributions of other organisations to CSR in the context of sport.

Against this backdrop of cooperation between different sectors, the private sector was noted for both its financial and social contributions. For example, the DCMS’s (2008) statement that “private sector investment is also crucial to ensuring the ongoing benefits are spread before, during and after the London 2012 Games”, using the example of how “an additional £50 million for training” was being
committed to the construction industry (DCMS, 2008, p. 8). However, the financial contribution of sponsors was also shown to be contingent upon wider factors such as the economic crisis, as shown by the DCMS’s (2012) acknowledgement that:

The global economic downturn inevitably presented challenges for London 2012. When there were difficulties in securing private sector investment for the Olympic Park, for example, Government had to step in (DCMS, 2012, p. 31).

This again demonstrates the importance of considering the Olympic legacy – and the contribution of sponsors to it – in relation to the broader context of the years leading up to the Games. However, despite such constraints, it can still be seen that both state and LOCOG representatives praised the capability of business to help work towards social goals. Although the Public Health Responsibility Deal of March 2011 was not explicitly focussed around London 2012, then Health Secretary Andrew Lansley’s foreword represents a strong government endorsement of how business can be seen to help to promote health:

Business is a powerful influence on the lives of all of us, whether as employers, through commercial actions, or through community action. For example, nearly 17 million families use a major supermarket every week. Businesses have both the technical expertise to make healthier products and the marketing expertise to influence purchasing habits. If the full strength of these skills can be directed towards activities to encourage and enable people to make healthier choices – as many responsible businesses do already – the benefits could be great (Lansley, cited in DH, 2011, p.2).

It should be noted that in line with scholarly perspectives upon the possible motives for corporations to become involved in health promotion (Holmqvist, 2009), the Public Health Responsibility Deal has been criticised for a perceived conflict of interests (Hughes, 2011). Despite this, the quotation above can still be seen to provide a reliable insight into the Coalition Government’s perspective of the capacity of business to benefit society. Furthermore, the underpinning logic here is broadly consistent with LOCOG’s (2009) description of how Olympic sponsors were to contribute towards their sustainability agenda:

Sponsors – London 2012’s commercial partners will play an important role in helping to deliver this Sustainability Plan. This will be achieved in part through the supply of products and services which improve environmental performance, but also through actively engaging with London 2012 sustainability projects and using their employees, customers and supply chains to promote behavioural change (LOCOG, 2009, p. 7).

LOCOG’s emphasis upon the contribution of sponsors here is consistent with their stated intention to “show off the best that the host city and nation have to offer” through actions such as “changing people’s behaviour through the power of sponsorship” (LOCOG, 2009, p. 5). It should be clarified that
while all LOCOG partners were required to demonstrate a commitment towards their sustainability agenda in some regard, a special category of ‘Sustainability Partners’ was created for organisations that would make a specific contribution towards certain aspects of sustainability. LOCOG’s logic for this was primarily based upon the capability of these sponsors to ensure that these sustainability effects were more enduring:

The collective reach of these companies through their employees, customers and supply chains is considerable. The focus on sustainability is a powerful message to convey to these large stakeholder groups. The added benefit is that while the specific Games-related sustainability initiatives may be temporary, the positive impacts on sponsors and their constituents can be much more long-lasting (LOCOG, 2009, p. 78).

This quotation bears out both the importance attached by LOCOG to the role of sponsors in helping to realise their sustainability agenda and the capacity of the private sector to fulfil legacy objectives that might otherwise be harder to achieve. Indeed, the extent of sponsors’ contribution received particular attention from the Coalition Government in their first publication regarding the 2012 Olympic Legacy (DCMS, 2010):

These businesses [Olympic sponsors] are not just investing in the Games. They are also helping to deliver the Games by providing their commercial and other expertise. And in addition many of them are investing in community based activities as part of their activation programmes. This goes beyond conventional Corporate Social Responsibility activity – they are setting a template for enlightened business activity for the 21st century (DCMS, 2010, p. 10).

Although the sentiments expressed here are largely consistent with those addressed previously, the fact that here the DCMS go as far as to suggest that sponsor activity represents a ‘template for enlightened business’ for the coming century is particularly striking, as it can be seen to demonstrate how this is how the present UK Government desires business to behave in the future. Furthermore, the difficulty of defining “conventional Corporate Social Responsibility” (as noted in Chapter 3) renders this statement problematic, as what the DCMS propose here could be argued to be consistent with long-established definitions of CSR (e.g. Walton, 1967; Bowen, 1953).

The contribution of sponsors to the sport and activity legacies of the Games also received significant attention from a range of state organisations. This was apparent from the publication of the Legacy Action Plan, with the DCMS (2008) stating that:

The commercial sponsors of the London 2012 Games are all considering how they would like to contribute to the legacy. [For example] adidas has pledged to go further than just inspiring people to get into sport and is looking at ways to help people participate (DCMS, 2008, p. 8).

On a similar note, the GLA (2009) also highlighted how the private sector could strengthen sport:
Despite the recession many private sector companies continue to support grass-roots sport, both financially and with services in kind. Many of them have been consulted in relation to this document and the Mayor is looking forward to seeing their continued engagement as we move towards 2012 (GLA, 2009, p. 12).

Both of these statements demonstrate how from 2008 onwards, there was a clear recognition of the capacity of sponsors to contribute towards the fulfilment of sport participation legacy objectives by both the UK Government and the GLA. It is also significant that in both cases, this contribution is approached in broader terms than financial support alone, which is largely consistent with the construction of ‘enlightened business activity’ noted above – in which government organisations work alongside others towards social objectives. However, the DH (2009) – intentionally or otherwise – shows where this contribution might be limited:

Providing the ‘nudge’ to prompt using the stairs rather than the lift or the information to support longer-term activity plans, however, is not just a job for Government. Voluntary, private sector or community organisations are often best placed to address diverse audiences (DH, 2009, p. 20).

The description of how individuals can be ‘nudged’ to take more exercise here is consistent with the argument that as healthy behaviours cannot be forced upon individuals, there is a need for these to be targeted by governmental techniques such as ‘nudging’ (Vallgårda, 2012) and ‘steering’ (Vallentin & Murillo, 2011). This also demonstrates firstly that business may witness the same difficulties in encouraging exercise as government but secondly that this common obstacle demonstrates the ways that the two spheres of society can be understood to have become increasingly homologous.

It is possible to see these corporate sponsors as working underneath the same governmental/political rationalities of health and sport as has been described of the private sector. For example, this is apparent in the assertion that sponsors’ contribution to LOCOG’s official Sustainability Plan would involve attempts ‘to promote behavioural change’ and the Government statement that CSR activity was ‘setting a template for enlightened business activity’ illustrate firstly how far sponsors were expected to shape individual behaviour and secondly how this level of activity was viewed as a favourable model for the role of business in years to come. In the more specific pursuit of sport/activity participation objectives, the acknowledgement that the private sector was helping in ‘providing the ‘nudge’ towards healthy living typifies the perception of business having a valuable role to play in this field but also, as the term nudging can be taken to imply, that this contribution alone cannot guarantee success.

It is therefore possible to see these corporate sponsors as working underneath the same governmental/political rationalities of health and sport as has been described of the private sector. An
associated implication of this is that just as with state-led participation activities, the success of their efforts is similarly contingent upon the successful translation of these broader rationalities and programmes into more specific governmental technologies. The complexity of the overlap between private CSR activity and government activity is demonstrated by Vallentin and Murillo (2011):

In the eyes of government, CSR does not constitute a particular rationality in and by itself. Rather, it tends to be incorporated into existing policy areas and to be viewed through the lenses of already established governmental rationalities (Vallentin and Murillo, 2011, p. 10).

In terms of the broad context of sponsor activity at London 2012, CSR could be linked to a number of rationalities including, society, economics and the environment in addition to those listed above. While this section has shown that this can be reconciled with the same governmentality framework that has been applied here to state and legacy actor constructions of the sport/activity participation legacy, the specific ways in which sponsors approach this demands further attention.

5.4 Chapter Conclusion
This chapter presented the findings of the project’s first stage of data collection, which sought to understand more about the proclaimed sport and activity participation legacy of London 2012 as a context for the delivery of CSR by exploring how this was discursively constructed by organisations responsible for its development and delivery. This chapter was therefore comprised of two main sections. The first of these offered a chronological overview of the development of London 2012’s sport and activity participation legacy from 2003 – the year in which the UK formally decided to bid to host the event – and 2012 – the year of the Games. Second, four themes relating to the nature of London 2012’s sport and activity participation legacy that were established by the current analysis were presented: discursive constructions of sport, physical activity and health, ‘intangible’ factors such as ‘power’ and ‘inspiration’, the advancement and ultimate abandonment of London 2012’s official sporting legacy and the ways in which the role of business was articulated in relation to both London 2012 and this specific strand of its legacy. Summaries of the empirical and theoretical contributions ensuing from this thematic analysis are presented in the following two sub-sections.

Overall, while the explicit focus of this chapter is not upon CSR itself, the themes presented within can be seen to present a broader picture of the complex social context that London 2012 represented for business activity such as CSR. With this broader context established, the focus of the next two chapters narrows to concentrate more specifically upon specific CSR schemes that were delivered at London 2012.
5.4.1 Empirical Summary
Overall, the themes presented here demonstrate – in different ways - that this particular sphere of the event’s legacy can be understood as a particularly complex social context for the delivery of CSR. Firstly, the lack of consistency in how sport and physical activity were constructed by the organisations – along with their touted relationships to intangible qualities such as power and inspiration - contrasts markedly with the unproblematic construction of ‘sport’ in work on CSR, such as that of Smith and Westerbeek (2007), who give no consideration to the different ways in which it might be understood. Secondly, following Dowling et al.’s (2013) calls to consider issues of context and timing in which CSR is delivered, the case of the rise and subsequent abandonment of London 2012’s official sport and activity participation legacy suggests this to be a particularly problematic context for a corporate sponsor that wishes to contribute towards this in the form of specific CSR initiatives. Thirdly, it can be seen that despite these complexities of the sport and activity legacy, the Games as a whole offered a fertile environment for organisations seeking to contribute towards its legacy via CSR, partly because of the new Coalition government’s published belief in the place of business in public life and partly because of the legacy visions developed by the London 2012 Bid Team that were similarly evident in LOCOG’s sustainability policy leading up to the event. This builds upon Séguin et al.’s (2010) identification of the role of organising committees and the positioning of specific events as social causes in order to attract sponsors, in that this process of positioning an event is – in the case of the Olympic Games - shaped not just by an event’s organisers but also by the host nation’s government and the contribution they desire from business to public life.

5.4.2 Theoretical Summary
Two broad macro level conclusions can be drawn from the four sections of theoretical analysis presented in this chapter. The first of these is that the governmentality perspective used – within the framework of rationalities, programmes applied here (Vallentin and Murillo, 2011; Rose and Miller, 1992; Miller and Rose, 1990) – can be seen to provide a better understanding of the social complexity described above. For example, in the first three thematic sections it can be seen that while positive views of both sport and the Olympic Games’ capacities for social advancement may have been prevalent across the discourse of actors responsible for the legacy of London 2012, the ultimate abandonment of the sport and activity participation legacy targets demonstrates that this alone is insufficient. In terms of the governmentality perspective applied here, this demonstrates although a particular governmental rationality may be widely accepted at an abstract level, this does not guarantee its translation into successful programmes of government. The second wider theoretical point that can be made across the different themes presented here concerns how governmentality should not be used in relation to predefined notions of its applicability. For example, in the first thematic section it was
suggested that rather than focussing exclusively upon ‘risk’ discourses in an overly pessimistic fashion, it is possible to apply governmentality to the opposing idea of ‘reward’. By the same logic, the final thematic section can be seen to show how governmentality analyses should not be confined exclusively to explicitly named or situated ‘government’ organisations such as the state – with the way that official legacy actors hailed the contributory role of businesses towards both public life in particular and the legacy of London 2012 in particular serving to warrant their inclusion in any consideration of macro level ‘governing’ behaviour – much in line with Dean’s (1999) conceptualisation of government.
Chapter 6: A Changing World? Sponsor Constructions of CSR, the Olympics and Health Promotion

6.1 Chapter Introduction
This chapter presents an analysis of the macro level private sector discourse that was examined in the second stage of data collection. The focus of this was upon official Olympic sponsors that organised CSR activities based around participation in sport and physical activity, and how these were rationalised and promoted. The overall aim of the chapter is therefore to demonstrate how sponsors articulated, justified and promoted sport/activity participation-based CSR initiatives in a broader context of complexity around this aspect of the official Olympic legacy objectives. The chapter is therefore structured as follows. The first set of findings was generated by a wider analysis of the published rationales of international and domestic sponsors of London 2012 for the CSR activity their specific organisations delivered. Following this, a more detailed examination of discourse produced by six sponsors whose CSR activity involved the promotion of sport or physical activity participation is presented. In both sections, an account of how the prevalent themes established in each stage can be situated within this study’s overall governmentality framework is also provided.

6.2 Sponsor Rationales for CSR

6.2.1 The Values of Business, Sport and the Olympics: Improving Lives?
As might reasonably be expected, it was typical for announcements of a brand’s sponsorship of the Games to begin with a partner first justifying their sponsorship of the Games in commercial terms such as brand association and revenue. However, this was frequently followed by an attempt to tie intangible characteristics of sport or the Olympic Games to the specific nature of their organisation. For example, Acer (2013) state that:

In our vision, the world of sports and technology share the same ideals: vision and inspiration, dedication and strength, determination and focus. By joining the Olympic Games, we take our commitment to sport to the very highest level, providing innovative and dependable computing equipment to support the organization and the staging of the Olympic Games (2013, para. 2).

Similarly, upon the announcement of Adecco’s sponsorship of the Games, Catherine King (Around the Rings, 2009), Adecco Group Chief Executive Officer, made reference to the parallels between sport and Adecco’s chief focus:

We believe that many analogies can be drawn between the workplace and sport. These shared qualities include the importance of leadership, dedication, teamwork, competition and a belief that people can truly make a difference; all of which reflect Adecco’s own group values (King, cited in Around the Rings, 2009, para. 4).
While common aspects of sport and business are identified here, it is apparent that these are not consistent. While Acer cite more competitive aspects of sport such as strength and focus, King turns to broader qualities such as leadership and its ability to ‘make a difference’. These statements therefore represent an interesting comparison with Smith and Westerbeek’s (2007) seven ‘unique’ aspects of sport that business can capitalise upon, as the emphasis of these is more upon socially-oriented features such as sustainability, community integration and youth appeal. By contrast, the above emphasis upon competition draws more upon elements of participation in competitive sport than its broader implications for society.

However, it should be noted that although in these cases it is the values of sport in general that are mentioned, sponsors generally referred more explicitly to those of the Olympic Games. Indeed, just as the examples above demonstrate how sport’s applicability to business was interpreted in different ways, it can be seen that there was a similar flexibility in how representatives of sponsors constructed the values of the Olympic Games. In a straightforward fashion, this could be done by linking sponsorship to the published legacy goals of the OCOG. For example, EDF Energy’s London 2012 Program Director Gareth Wynn (Inside the Games, 2012b) described how the sustainability vision of London 2012 was consistent with the concerns of EDF as a business:

The values of the Olympics align really well with the values of EDF. It becomes something we can relate to comfortably. London 2012 made sustainability a core part of their strategy, and we have that as a core part of our strategy (Wynn, cited in Inside the Games, 2012b, para. 3).

These sentiments were echoed by Ian Robertson of BMW’s management board, who stated that sustainability’s importance to BMW gave them a “natural affinity with London 2012 and its commitment to low carbon and healthy living” (Robertson, cited in What Car, 2009, para. 5). As has been seen with the values of sport above, these articulations of the consistency between the priorities of a sponsor and those of the Games provide clear examples of how partners linked themselves to the event. However, beyond this there was also evidence of the Olympic Values being applied in more intangible ways. For example, upon the confirmation of BP’s sponsorship, Chief Executive Tony Hayward (BP, 2008) linked the competitive aspect of the Games to BP as an organisation, asserting that the basis of the Olympic movement is a “belief in human endeavour and high performance, attributes which are at the heart of BP’s own agenda” (2008, para. 5). On a more abstract level, George Hamilton, vice-president of Olympic operations at Dow (Inside the Games, 2012c) – who also expressed Dow’s commitment to sustainability in the fashion outlined above – went beyond this to point out the broader significance of the Olympic Values:
Dow and the International Olympic Committee (IOC) realised that we are committed to the same values and priorities that are part of the Olympic vision. The Olympic Games are about peace, progress, sustainability and the world coming together to celebrate our common humanity. The Games are about respect for people of different cultures, diversified backgrounds and capabilities. Integrity and respect for people are among the key pillars on which we are doing our business (Hamilton, cited in Inside the Games, 2012c, para. 3).

Hamilton’s references to peace and progress must be seen to be consistent with Spaaij’s (2012) account of how these represented the broader reasons for the revival of the modern Games in the first place, and also with the words of Cadbury Chief Executive Todd Stitzer, who tied the ethos of the Olympics to the founding values of Cadbury as a brand, referring to the “long held ethos of the Games” as being about “inspiration, optimism and community” (Stitzer, cited in Mackay, 2008, para. 11). While these sentiments all serve to demonstrate the continuing broader salience of the Olympic Values upon today’s sponsors, it was also apparent that some sponsor discourse saw their impact as extending even further. For example, the Olympic section of McDonald’s website describes how the Games can have a powerful influence upon the world around them:

McDonald’s is a proud sponsor of the Olympic Movement for more than 35 years and as a System, we share the Olympic values of teamwork, excellence and personal best. We believe in the spirit of the Games and their unique ability to engage the world in a way that is constructive, positive and inspirational. We recognize the power of the Games to reinforce excellence, unity and achievement among people the world over. Our goal is always to bring that spirit to our customers. That is what our Olympic sponsorship is all about (McDonald’s, 2013, para. 1).

This quotation encapsulates how while sponsors can be seen to associate themselves with the Olympic Values in primarily commercial terms, they can move beyond this to the extent that these values are assumed to have the sufficient power to ‘engage the world’ in ‘constructive’ and ‘inspirational’ ways – a variance of interpretation that fits with DaCosta (2006) and Parry’s (2006) assertions that the Olympics’ underpinning philosophy is not static and can be mobilised differently in different social contexts—of which that of business provides a particular example. It therefore follows that the most formalised way in which Olympic sponsors can demonstrate their commitment to the Olympic Values is by contributing to the long term legacy of the event, and this was something given great importance by P&G (2010) upon the announcement of their sponsorship in 2010:

This partnership is a natural fit because it unites two similar purposes: the IOC’s purpose to improve life through sport, and P&G’s Purpose to touch and improve lives, now and for generations to come (2010, para. 2).

Here it should be noted that as a TOP Worldwide sponsor, P&G’s sponsorship is not confined to London 2012 alone, and therefore this reference to ‘improving lives’ should not be seen to refer solely
to the legacy of London 2012. However, similar sentiments are evident in the discourse of domestic sponsors. For example, in reviewing their decision to support London 2012 from the bidding stage, Deloitte (2013) placed a similar emphasis upon its potential to have a positive impact upon Britain in several different ways:

Nine years ago we chose to back London’s bid to host the Games. Considering London wasn’t favourite to win, it was a bold move for our firm. But we believed the Games would be a force for good, that they would create new social, economic and business potential and reinforce the UK’s position as a leading global player – and this was the vision we stayed true to as our London 2012 journey unfolded (2013, para. 1).

Regardless of how the Olympic Values are understood, these examples are consistent with Kay’s (2012) description of how they – or Olympism – are “captured” (p. 899) or become manifest in the notion of legacy. With this in mind, the construction of London 2012’s legacy as specific context for the delivery of CSR will now be discussed.

6.2.2 More Than Business? ‘The World has Changed and the World will Change’

Indeed, the second prevalent theme among the discourse examined here concerned the contribution of sponsors to the legacy of the Games and how this was attributed to both a sense of this being the ‘right’ thing to do and a recognition of the place of CSR in modern business. The importance of working towards the legacy of the Games is demonstrated by Janette Butler (2013), P&G Community Relations Manager for UK & Ireland, who stated “the legacy of our IOC sponsorship is just as much a matter of pride to us” (2013, para. 1) as the activities delivered during the Games. Going further than this, Coca-Cola (2012) articulated that their relationship with the Games is premised upon using the ‘power’ of the event to change the host nation for the better:

Coca-Cola has supported the Olympic Games since 1928, making us the longest continuous supporter of the Olympic Movement. We are delighted to be extending our sponsorship into London 2012 and beyond, bringing the excitement of the Olympics and Paralympics to every corner of the UK this summer. We’re proud of the role that we will play in harnessing London 2012 to inspire change, participation and a lasting legacy (Coca-Cola, 2012, para. 1).

In a similar vein, Cisco (2013) expressed their intention to face the grander assignment of contributing towards a permanent shift for the better:

For Cisco, London 2012 is not the finish line, but the starting gun for a bigger challenge. The foundation of London 2012 is that it builds a lasting legacy of regeneration and prosperity.

...Cisco was founded over 25 years ago on the principles of education, innovation and entrepreneurship and that’s how we’ve run our business ever since. It’s why we became the official network infrastructure supporter for London 2012 and why we’re investing in and supporting so many exciting initiatives to make things better (2013, para. 1-2).
Both of these quotations provide examples of how sponsors articulated their activity around the legacy of London 2012 in significantly broader terms – in these cases with particular reference to long term social change in the host nation. Indeed, these statements would appear to suggest that the corporation’s role in society – in the context of sponsorship – has developed from the provision of funding, services and expertise to encompass a more general concern for society. This is consistent with the view of GE Chairman and CEO Jeff Immelt (GE, 2008), for whom:

The world has changed and the world will change - capitalism is being redefined as the intersection between government and industry. The Olympics give a forum to allow business and industry to interact with that not just for a year or two but for a long time. We believe that 2012 can be a turning point for London... investments in the Olympics will go to support societal problems such as healthcare and education (Immelt, cited in GE, 2008, para. 8).

Here, Immelt presents GE’s legacy-based activity as symptomatic of a broader change in the role of business in society, which is consistent with Coca-Cola GB Head Jon Woods’ (Wind-Cowie & Wood, 2012) assertion that “today simply badging an event is regarded as superficial and inadequate” and that “the general public expect much more” (p. 9). The fact that these sentiments are linked to the Olympic Games contributes to the impression of London 2012 representing a particular moment at which to accelerate social development, and is consistent with the belief that sport should increasingly be held to the same standards as mainstream business (e.g. Babiak & Wolfe, 2013; Bradish & Cronin, 2009; Godfrey, 2009; Crow & Bradish, 2002). Similarly, the unique nature of the Games was presented by BT (2010) as a potential catalyst to improve sustainability in a number of different aspects of social life:

As one of six Sustainability Partners we are working with the London Organising Committee of the Olympic and Paralympic Games (LOCOG) helping to ensure London 2012 is truly sustainable. We see London 2012 as a ‘once in a lifetime’ opportunity to inspire and support people to change the way they build, live, learn, work and travel to create a more sustainable society (2010, para. 2).

...We are focussing our efforts in two key areas - delivering a sustainable communications technology solution and creating a lasting social and economic legacy by connecting with society in positive ways (2010, para. 4).

It is therefore apparent that although the growing responsibility of business to society could be seen as a more general trend, London 2012 can be seen to be understood as a stimulus that could accelerate the process. However, this does not explain what has caused such a shift in attitudes. In order to address this, it is therefore worth considering how sponsors sought to justify their contributions in this regard. For example, McDonald's President and Chief Operating Officer Don Thompson (Inside the Games, 2012a) declared that:
It really goes far beyond the pure sales building aspect because we have committed sales growth, but to give some back to our customers and communities is what we are all about. As Ray Kroc (the Founder of the McDonald's Corporation) said: "We have an obligation to give back to the communities that give us so much" (Thompson, cited in Inside the Games, 2012a, para. 2).

This is consistent with the rationale of P&G global marketing and brand building officer Marc Pritchard (Baker, 2010), who described how his organisation’s sponsorship of the Games was also born of greater concerns:

This [relationship with the Games] is about much more than a sponsorship. For P&G, it’s about partnering with the IOC to make life better for athletes, moms and their families as we take the Olympic movement to our four billion consumers around the world that our brands already serve (Pritchard, cited in Baker, 2010, para. 7).

The impression given once again here is that sponsor-led CSR activity around the Games typifies the growing obligation felt by business towards society. However, it should be acknowledged that to approach this purely in terms of the increasingly charitable nature of companies would be naïve. Indeed, Gordon Lott (2012), Head of Olympic Marketing and Group Sponsorship at Lloyds Banking Group, shows how the social responsibility-focused activity of Lloyds TSB could be reconciled with the organisation’s commercial interests:

In our case, becoming a partner of the Games was a brand-led decision. Sponsorship sits within our marketing portfolio alongside other channels – advertising, branches and social media and so on – to communicate our messages and values in the round. The Games have been an extraordinary platform to bring to life our brand promise ‘for the journey’ and to re-establish our community presence (2012, para. 3).

...The Games show that commercial and CSR benefits can be delivered hand-in-hand. For example, our support for schools to do more sport through the Games, and support for young talented athletes who are the future of Team GB, is good for the community and the brand. The PR off the back of these programmes has been the greatest driver of brand advocacy for us – a third of customers are more likely to recommend the brand as a result of them (2012, para. 5).

Lott’s (2012) explanation illustrates the balance that is required of CSR-based Olympic activation programmes. Put simply, sponsors must satisfy the increased expectations of their role in society in a way that suits them commercially. This is similarly evident in the perspective of Jon Woods, General Manager, Coca-Cola Great Britain and Ireland, (Wind-Cowie & Wood, 2012), who describes both the business benefits and the social objectives of Coca-Cola’s London 2012-based programmes:

Sponsors are vital to making the Games happen, and at Coca-Cola we are proud of the part we play. London 2012 will help us build deeper relationships with our consumers, but our
sponsorship of the Games delivers much more. As a presenting partner of the Olympic Torch Relay we will give communities from across the country the chance to share in the excitement of the Games. We have used the power of the brand to find inspirational young people from up and down the UK – our future flames. We hope to inspire and motivate them, their peers and their communities by giving these young people the once in a lifetime opportunity to run with the Olympic Flame (2012, p. 9).

On a broader level, this – and particularly Lott’s (2012) description of benefits being delivered ‘hand-in-hand’ resonates with the notion of a ‘business case’ for CSR, which concerns the “relationships between the corporation and society” and the way that these must be understood by business “as the corporation and the related groups pursue their respective goals” (Walton, 1967, p. 18). In addition to this, more critical perspectives might focus here upon the possibility of corporations attempting to exploit the “value and altruistic nature of sport” associated with the Games “to fulfil their own goals” (Carey et al., 2011, p. 259). Although these perspectives should not be disregarded, the accuracy of either side of this debate about corporate exploitation of the Games would be impossible to prove here, and the issue is ultimately beyond the scope of this discussion. Rather, this analysis has demonstrated that corporate rationales for sponsorship of London 2012 featured repeated references to how CSR activity around the event’s legacy was symptomatic of a growing commitment felt by business to society. This unprecedented level of commitment can also be reconciled with prevalent assumptions regarding sport and, more prominently, the Olympic Games.

6.2.3 Theoretical Analysis

In considering the ways sponsors can be seen to have articulated and justified their contributions to the social legacy of the Games as shown here, it is possible to identify a specific form of consistency between both these positive attitudes to both sport and the Olympic Games and the documents published by official legacy actors examined in Chapter 5. For example, here it can be seen that partners such as Acer and Deloitte cited intangible virtues of the event such as ‘inspiration’ and its potential as a ‘force for good’ as significant factors behind their sponsorship. This consistency of sentiment is further evident in the ways that sponsors also sought to emphasise the relevance of these characteristics to the workplace and business life – although it was observed that different sponsors expressed the applicability of the Games itself in varying ways. These discursive patterns can be understood within the framework of governmental rationalities, programmes and technologies set out by Rose and Miller (1992) and Vallentin and Murillo (2011), as they serve to further demonstrate how such attitudes to the Olympics can be understood in relation to the broader rationality of sport. Specific CSR schemes can therefore be seen as particular ‘governmental programmes’ within the rationality of
sport that informs attitudes in both the public and private sectors. This is consistent with Vallentin and Murillo’s (2011) account of how governmentality can be deployed to uncover complexity:

This insistence [on governmentality analytics] calls for analyses looking into the concrete organization of government in governmental programmes and for exploration of the technological means employed by such programmes. Also, it leads to a questioning of unproblematic, hierarchical and causal relations between the three levels, i.e. that rationalities unequivocally determine the content of programmes and that technologies simply (more or less effectively) carry out the goals set by programmes (Vallentin & Murillo, 2011, p. 6).

There is one sense in which the sentiments expressed here could be developed upon. Here, Vallentin and Murillo’s (2011) concern is solely for the differences between levels of society, as opposed to the nuances that could be identified within each one. The evidence presented here could therefore be taken to highlight a need to consider how a given rationality may be accepted by different entities at the same level – such as government and private sector actors here. Indeed, at an epistemological level this is consistent with Vallentin and Murillo’s claim that governmentality analyses offer a “multi-directional view of government” that can help to establish how “different levels of governments attain ‘a life of their own’” and “how programmes enable rationalizations of CSR” (p. 6) – as this focus could similarly be applied to actors within the same level.

In addition to the similarity of how official legacy actors and sponsors constructed the positive social potential of both sport and the Games, it can also be seen that the way that the Games were described was consistent with justifications of CSR, as both could be reconciled with an obligation to work towards the benefit of wider society. For example, P&G sought to align the “IOC’s purpose to improve life through sport” with their intention to “touch and improve lives” for generations to come (P&G, 2010, para. 2). While offering sponsors an opportunity for alignment or fit with the Games on a more practical marketing level, this consistency of sentiment could again be seen in theoretical terms as the appreciation of the same overarching rationality by different (public and private) macro level entities.

On a broader level, the commitment of Olympic sponsors to social legacy objectives could be seen as an example of how – in Foucault’s (1994) original terms – the private sector could be construed as behaving in a fashion that could be understood as ‘governing’, which could be seen to be consistent with Boden’s (2005) assertion that “CSR and corporate governance regimes are not neutral processes but aspects of ‘governmentality’” (p. 71). Perhaps because of the magnitude of the Games, the legacy of London 2012 could therefore be seen to represent a moment at which this notion of the private sector ‘governing’ was especially apparent – although significant differences between the two exist, such as the fact that the private sector had no formal responsibility or accountability for legacy beyond
the commitment to sustainability that was outlined by LOCOG (2009) in their One Planet Olympics vision – which corporate partners were officially required to agree to.

Overall, the evidence presented here further highlights the need to consider the ‘governing’ behaviour of the private sector in the sense that governmentality analyses may have too often restricted to state organisations (Vallentin and Murillo, 2011). This resonates with one of the overriding conclusions drawn from Chapter 5, which centred on the broader point that governmentality analyses should not be predefined in terms of focussing on public as opposed to private sector bodies or upon negative modes of governing rather than positive. In order to explore the issue of corporations ‘governing’ in further detail, the next section of this chapter will narrow its focus to six sponsors that delivered CSR activity involving sport or activity participation.

6.4 Sport and Activity-based CSR Programmes

The previous section sought to establish how sponsor-led CSR activity was justified at the macro level, but focused exclusively upon general statements as opposed to specific programmes in which these sentiments were translated into practice. This section is therefore intended to address this by focussing specifically upon one area of CSR, which was the organisation of schemes that were based around participation in either sport or physical activity. The next sub-section provides a brief overview of the six organisations used for this analysis.

6.4.1 Overview of Sponsor-led CSR Schemes based around Sport and Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Coca-Cola</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tier</td>
<td>TOP Worldwide Partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pledge</td>
<td>“Coca-Cola is using its sponsorship of the London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games to encourage consumers to lead more active, healthy and sustainable lifestyles”. (Coca-Cola, 2013, para. 1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background</td>
<td>Coca-Cola published four ‘London 2012 Priorities’, of which one was to “promote health and wellness” (Coca-Cola, 2012, p. 9). This priority was the basis for four separate sport, health or activity promotion activations. Of these, StreetGames is the closest fit with the criteria for the current study – as this focuses on sport participation in the UK context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport, health and activity based programmes</td>
<td>Move to the Beat – aimed to “inspire young people to get closer to sport through a fusion of sport and music” (Coca-Cola, 2012, p. 16). Future Flames – aimed to “champion young people...”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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who have made a positive contribution to their local communities and the environment’ (Coca-Cola, 2012, p. 18).

**Support of StreetGames** – aimed to “provide sporting opportunities to young people from disadvantaged communities across the country” (Coca-Cola, 2012, p. 20).

Support of **Special Olympics GB** – aimed to “provide year-round sporting opportunities to people with intellectual disabilities across the country” (Coca-Cola, 2012, p. 21).

Focus: Sport, Health or Activity?  |  Sport, Health and Activity.
--- | ---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>GE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tier</td>
<td>TOP Worldwide Partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport, health and activity based programmes</td>
<td><strong>Design My Break</strong> – competition for school students “with the intention of improving the school lunch break and making it a healthier experience physically and emotionally” (GE, 2011, p. 2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus: Sport, Health or Activity?</td>
<td>Health and Activity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>McDonald’s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tier</td>
<td>TOP Worldwide Partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport, health and activity based programmes</td>
<td><strong>Champions of Play</strong> – ‘McDonald’s Champions of Play will bring kids from around the world together for a unique experience in London. The new global program will encourage a balanced approach to nutrition and activity for children’ (McDonald’s, 2011, para. 2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus: Sport, Health or Activity?</td>
<td>Health and Activity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>adidas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tier</td>
<td>Official Olympic Partner (Tier 1 Domestic)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Sport, health and activity based programmes | **adiStar Young Ambassadors** – Delivered in partnership with the Youth Sport Trust.  
**adiZones** – Free to use outdoor gym/sport areas which were linked to a commitment to bring “groups of young people together to get involved in a variety of activities” (McDonald’s, 2011, para. 3). |

---
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6.5 Thematic and Theoretical Analysis

6.5.1 Communities: ‘The Brave Decision to Invest in People’

The most prominent theme among the discourse examined for this stage concerned the notion of the community – although this was constructed in varying ways and with differing implications for the promotion of either sport or activity. The significance of this focus upon communities was so pronounced that it featured heavily in the ways sponsors justified their overall approach to their sponsorship of the Games. For example, Nick Bunker (Cadbury, 2011), President of Kraft Foods for UK and Ireland, outlined Cadbury’s activity as follows:

London 2012 will be the largest public event the UK has seen in our lifetime and in the run up to the Olympic Games and Paralympic Games, people will be naturally thinking about coming
together to show their support and wanting to get involved. The spirit of the Games is all about participation and inclusivity. Kraft Foods, through our Cadbury brand as the Official Treat Provider, hopes to spread the magic far and wide and share the benefits with our consumers, business partners, employees and communities (Bunker, cited in Cadbury, 2012b, para. 7).

Here it can be seen that the idea of ‘communities’ is invoked as a way of expressing a desire to spread the benefits of the Games around the UK. This approach is also evident in the vision of Lloyds TSB, as outlined by Sally Hancock, Director of London 2012 Sponsorship at Lloyds TSB, (Inside the Games, 2012d):

Signing the contract in 2007, which established Lloyds TSB as the first partner of the London 2012 Olympic Games, seems like a lifetime ago now that we are in 2012. Although our programme has evolved with each passing year, what remains constant is our commitment to local communities across England, Wales and also Scotland since Lloyds Banking Group added Bank of Scotland to its portfolio in 2009 (Hancock, cited in Inside the Games, 2012d, para. 1-2).

It should be stressed that both of the previous two quotations demonstrate the prominence of such a focus on community to the overall sponsorship programme but without any specific reference to sport or activity promotion. However, Nick Craggs (106 Jack, 2010), then Director of Marketing at adidas Area North, demonstrated how the notion of community was linked to the sport participation legacy of the Games:

As a London 2012 sponsor, adidas believes it is vitally important that free sporting facilities are made available and accessible if we are truly going to get the nation participating in sport.

To date the installation of adiZones has brought groups of young people together to get involved in a variety of sports and improved community relations, echoing the legacy that the London 2012 Games hopes to achieve (Craggs, cited in 106 Jack, 2010, para. 6-7).

On a broader note, Craggs’ statement encompasses the two overarching ways in which community was articulated in the discourse analysed here. The first of these is more geographically based, and concerns the idea of attempting to share the benefits of the Games around the host nation – as demonstrated above in the cases of Cadbury and Lloyds TSB. The second way concerns those instances in which sponsor activity aims to contribute towards some form of social change or development in specific local communities – and the above description of adiZones provides one example of how this was approached. However, it should be noted that although these two constructions of community appear distinct, it should not be assumed that either is exclusive to the activity of certain sponsors, and it would be safer to assume that elements of each may be evident in the discourse of different organisations. However, it is still possible to identify cases in which a certain sponsor constructs the impact of their activity for communities in specific ways. For example, Lloyds
TSB could be identified as the brand that committed most explicitly to spreading the influence of the Games around the host nation. For example; Sally Hancock, Director of Olympic Marketing, (Inside the Games, 2012) explained how this could be linked to Lloyds TSB’s status as a bank:

Right from the off, we knew that our sponsorship activity had to be inclusive, to resonate with a customer base that covers every part of the population. A bank is at the heart of the local community, and with a branch on almost every high street, we knew we were better placed than any other partner to take the Games to communities everywhere. So our strategy has always reflected this – it’s about taking a global programme local and making it tangible for communities (Hancock, cited in Inside the Games, 2012d, para. 3).

In terms of their activity around sport and activity promotion, this was linked to the delivery of National School Sport Week (NSSW).

When we became the first partner of London 2012 our goal was to bring the Games closer to communities across the country. NSSW has enabled us to do just this, reaching 89% of schools across the UK over the four years we have supported it (Lloyds TSB, 2012, para. 6).

With more than four million young people taking part, we are ensuring that children everywhere can experience the excitement of hosting the Games on home soil (Hancock, cited in Sport Industry Group, 2011, para. 12).

Overall, it can be seen that NSSW fitted neatly within Lloyds TSB’s overall strategy – which sought to reach as much of the UK’s population as was possible. However, a distinction can be made between Hancock’s articulation of Lloyds TSB’s focus upon communities as encompassing “every part of the population” and the approach of other sponsors who expressed a particular emphasis upon communities defined as ‘deprived’ or ‘disadvantaged’. It can therefore be seen that while Lloyds TSB’s use of sport participation (through NSSW) was based upon satisfying the objectives of their sponsorship strategy, the approaches of organisations such as adidas, Cadbury and Coca-Cola represented more explicit attempts to change or benefit specific local ‘communities’ in positive ways. For example, the basis for Cadbury’s Spots v Stripes initiative was outlined by Norman Brodie, General Manager of Cadbury London 2012 at Kraft Foods, as follows:

The Cadbury brand has embraced its commitment to bring the London 2012 Games to the whole nation. As a business we have used the opportunity to try new, bold approaches, and through our Cadbury Spots v Stripes Community Programme we have used game playing to bring people together and build stronger communities in areas that need it the most (Brodie, cited in Sweet Retailing, 2012, para. 9)

In terms of sport and activity, it is apparent here that Brodie does not mention any explicitly, but instead draws upon the notion of ‘play’ as a way to ‘build stronger communities’. Furthermore, this focus upon specific areas of need resonates with Coca-Cola’s rationale for their relationship with sports charity StreetGames:
We have a long history of using the power of our brands to help people become more physically active, and we wanted to harness this experience in the context of London 2012 to make a difference to the lives of young people in the most deprived parts of the UK (Coca-Cola, 2012, p. 20).

Here, Coca-Cola’s logic is based upon using their profile both as an organisation and an Olympic sponsor to encourage young people into sport. On a related note, adidas (London Borough of Hackney, 2011) articulated their adiZone initiative in similar terms, but with specific reference to certain barriers to sport participation:

Two of the major barriers to taking up sports that people cite are cost and lack of access to facilities. Today we have been able to bring one of the world’s finest Olympians to Hackney to demonstrate that adiZones are clearly overcoming these hurdles and engaging the whole community in sport (Craggs, cited in London Borough of Hackney, 2011, para. 9).

Taken together, these three quotations demonstrate an approach to Olympic sponsorship that actively seeks to have a beneficial effect upon specific parts of society. These examples are consistent with Levermore’s (2010) suggestion that “sport might be a useful vehicle” for the deployment of CSR in contexts such as “communities where development schemes tend not to reach” (p. 238), although this perspective contrasts with Morrow’s (2012) assertion that despite the positive rhetoric around sport’s capacity to achieve this, the evidence behind this is unconvincing.

Indeed, The fact that these three sponsors expressed an explicit emphasis upon those described as ‘in need’, ‘disadvantaged’ or ‘deprived’ reveals the level of social engagement that these sponsors wished to demonstrate. Indeed, the strength of this emphasis could be seen to lie in the way that despite each of these three activation schemes involving participation in sport or activity, community development can be seen to supersede this in terms of its prominence in the content examined here. At a fundamental level, the links between this level of social commitment and the articulations of both CSR and the Olympic Values related in the previous section are readily apparent. In light of this, the specific activations organised by the sponsors examined here could be understood as governmental programmes in relation to overarching rationalities about sport, the Olympic Games and their role in society. The process of translating a governmental rationality into a particular programme is described by Rose and Miller (1992) as follows:

The relation between political rationalities and such programmes of government is not one of derivation or determination but of translation – both a movement from one space to another, and an expression of a particular concern in another modality (1992, p. 181)

In the earlier discussions of the overarching rationality around sport and its relationship with Olympism, it was established that a significant feature of this was the broader social impact that each can bring.
This is consistent with how the CSR programmes can be seen to show ‘communities’ as their main concern despite the fact that the explicit feature of each is some form of participation in either sport or activity. It is in this respect that the use of sport or activity could be understood more as a vehicle for social goals such as ‘building stronger communities’ in the case of Cadbury or ‘engaging disaffected youth’ in that of adidas. Indeed, it is worth noting that adidas could still be seen to note a commitment to ‘inspiring a participation legacy’ (London Borough of Hackney, 2011) from the Games in May 2011 – some two months after the official mass participation legacy targets were abandoned (Gibson, 2011).

It is also worth noting that each of the three organisations mentioned here delivered these community-based activities in cooperation with charity organisations; Cadbury with Groundwork UK, Coca-Cola with StreetGames and adidas with the Youth Sport Trust and the Great Outdoor Gym Company. Indeed, Cadbury (2011) paid tribute to the extent to which they benefitted from their particular partnership:

Through our partnership with Groundwork, we’ve increased our knowledge, experience and capability of working with community organisations. We’ve also engaged with more communities and community groups geographically than ever before, not only those communities near to our factory and other sites.

For Groundwork the Cadbury Spots v Stripes Community Programme has helped ‘open doors’ and establish new relationships with organisations that they hope to build on in the future.

With the help of our employees, the Cadbury Foundation and Groundwork, we have helped improve open community spaces near to our sites for game playing (Cadbury, 2011, p. 13-14).

Both the acknowledgement that Cadbury’s ‘capability’ in working with charities has increased - and that the relationship has enabled Groundwork to ‘open doors’ for future cooperative work – suggest that Cadbury intend for community-based partnerships of this nature to continue beyond London 2012. Indeed, a similar approach is evident in adidas’ adiZone initiative, which is described as being delivered alongside the “Department for Education, Partnerships for Schools, The Great Outdoor Gym Company, the Youth Sport Trust” (The Great Outdoor Gym Company, 2010, p. 1) plus other local authority partners. As one of their delivery partners, The Great Outdoor Gym Company (2010) produced the majority of the published discourse around the potential social benefits of adiZones, which included the statement that:

adiZones are not only an amazing free facility for the whole community but also how they have been a tool for councils, schools, the NHS, PCTS, the police and youth workers in engaging disaffected youths, [enabling] communities to host events, engaging communities in the Olympics and driving up participation in sport and physical activity (The Great Outdoor Gym Company, 2010 p. 2).

In addition to this, adiZones were also claimed to “break down barriers to participation in sport” and to “actively increase sports participation and community to sports clubs links”, which was specifically
linked to the “challenging economic climate” (The Great Outdoor Gym Company, 2010, p. 20) in which their delivery was announced. The fact that the proclaimed benefits of adiZones are extended to broader social issues such as ‘engaging disaffected youths’ and ‘breaking down barriers’ to sport participation demonstrates how – as with Cadbury – adidas’s initiative can be seen to be attempting to achieve more than the promotion of sport or activity alone. However, while both of the two organisations may share this focus upon society or ‘community’ goals, there is a notable difference in how these are pursued. While for adidas these are assumed to follow from the use of their adiZone facilities, Cadbury can be seen to have expressed a greater focus upon the individual, as explained by Norman Brodie, General Manager for London 2012 (Murray, 2012):

If you are rejuvenating a park, you have a date for the bulldozers to come in, a date for the work to be done and for the mayor to cut the ribbon. The brave decision is to invest in people when you don’t have a timetable of results in the same way.

But when you go to [Spots v Stripes] events, you can see the difference it makes. I saw a young Sikh lad sitting down with an old man playing draughts, and they would never have been brought together but for something like this. Making these connections and bringing people together is very powerful (Brodie, cited in Murray, 2012, para. 11).

This rationale contains a number of significant points about the broader role of corporations in communities. For example, Brodie’s acknowledgement that investing ‘in people’ represents a braver initiative than investing in more tangible projects further shows one way in which the nature of community programmes is changing and may continue to do so. This fits with Gratton and Preuss’s (2008) ‘legacy cube’, and specifically its recognition of tangible and intangible legacies in addition to whether these are positive and negative. In these terms, Brodie’s articulation of Spots v Stripes could be seen as a case for an ‘intangible’ legacy which has a ‘positive’ effect on local communities.

On a theoretical level, the fact that sponsors expressed such a need to pursue these in communities identified as being in particular need is particularly significant. For example, Cadbury expressed a desire to focus on those that ‘need it most’ while Coca-Cola highlighted StreetGames’ aptitude for delivering sport in ‘disadvantaged’ areas. These statements betray an underlying assumption that as corporations, Olympic sponsors perceived a degree of obligation towards social activity of this nature. These CSR activities can be understood in relation to Rose and Miller’s (1992) account of governmental programmes:

Government is a problematizing activity: it poses the obligations of rulers in terms of the problems they seek to address. The ideals of government are intrinsically linked to the problems around which it circulates, the failings it seeks to rectify, the ills it seeks to cure...
The articulation of government has been bound to the constant identification of the difficulties and failures of government. It is around these difficulties and failures that programmes of government have been elaborated (p. 181).

This logic could be applied to the way that the sponsors examined here – in cooperation with charity organisations - were shown to be classifying certain communities as being ‘deprived’ and therefore in need of assistance – as this must be seen to be premised upon a broader recognition of the private sector’s capability to make decisions of this nature. Indeed, given both the level of community intervention evident in the present analysis and the UK Government’s enthusiastic portrayal of Olympic sponsor CSR activity as a template for the future (DCMS, 2010) – it is difficult to ascertain how far this responsibility should extend. However, Rose and Miller’s (1992) framework shows how these particular instances of CSR around the Olympics can be understood in relation to overarching rationalities around the social implications of both sport and the Olympic Games, which are also evident in the consistency of sentiment between sponsor articulations of both CSR and the Olympic Values in the previous section. Overall, it can therefore be suggested that although the programmes could be seen as clear examples of sponsors ‘governing’ – there is a danger of extrapolating this to CSR activity more broadly without acknowledging the influential role of specific discourses around sport and particularly the Olympic Games in shaping this here.

6.5.2 Play, Sport and their Effects on the Individual
The previous section demonstrated that although the sponsors analysed here were selected because of their focus on participation in either sport or physical activity (and particularly where this was geared towards health promotion), there were a number of different ways in which this was constructed in the discourse produced by sponsors in promoting their initiatives. Furthermore, it was also apparent that the nature of physical activity promoted had significant implications for the specific effects which these initiatives were claimed to have upon the individuals who would take part. This section demonstrates how although all six of the sponsors studied delivered programmes involving participation in sport or physical activity, the ways in which these were promoted and their proclaimed benefits varied significantly. Furthermore, although the discourse examined in Chapter 5 could be seen to advocate a clear link between all forms of exercise and health, this was less prominent here as sponsors sought to articulate the benefits of their activities in broader and occasionally more complex terms. Perhaps the starkest contrast in this regard was that between those who could be seen to be promoting sport participation and those who characterised activity more as ‘play’ or ‘fun’ with the potential for increasing individual happiness or well-being – with the majority of the six sponsors studied focussing more
towards the latter extreme. In order to better illustrate how this was constructed, McDonald’s and Cadbury represent two organisations whose advocacy of (physical) activity was premised upon encouraging ‘play’:

McDonald’s Champions of Play will bring kids from around the world together for a unique experience in London. The new global program will encourage a balanced approach to nutrition and activity for children (McDonald’s, 2013, para. 9).

Cadbury has created Spots v Stripes, the biggest, most funnest game ever to celebrate their role as Official Treat Provider to the London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games...

...We want to get the nation in the mood for London 2012 by splitting everyone into two sides Spots and Stripes, and play against each other in our big game (Cadbury, 2012a, paras. 1 & 3).

In addition to McDonald’s and Cadbury, it is also worth noting that GE’s Design My Break initiative, while not advocating ‘play’ so prominently, can still be seen to have promoted a form of physical activity that would most accurately be characterised as informal – given that its specific focus was upon promoting health in the context of break times during the school day of 11-14 year olds. On the other hand, Lloyds TSB and adidas were two organisations whose explicit focus concerned sport participation:

We [Lloyds TSB] have played a key role in encouraging increased sports participation in schools across the country through NSSW (City A.M., 2011, para. 18).

adidas created the adiZones as part of our pledge to inspire participation in sport and create a legacy from the London 2012 Games (Craggs, cited in London Borough of Hackney, 2011, para. 9).

It should also be noted that Coca-Cola – through their partnership with StreetGames – also expressed an intention to “provide sporting opportunities to young people from disadvantaged communities across the country” (Coca-Cola, 2012, p. 20), and could therefore be listed alongside adidas and Lloyds TSB in this regard. Overall, it can therefore be seen that although all six organisations promoted physical activity, only half stated that this would take the form of sport participation. Furthermore, two of these three sponsors who did promote sport participation focussed exclusively upon young people (Lloyds TSB through NSWW and Coca-Cola through StreetGames), which means that these could not be classified as mass participation initiatives. Indeed, on this note it is worth noting that the above statement from adidas regarding participation and a possible legacy from the Games was made in May 2011, over one month after the UK Government had admitted that the official sport and activity participation legacy targets announced in 2008 had been abandoned (Gibson, 2011). On a practical level it should be noted that the official government target concerned a participation increase before the Games, whereas this particular statement from adidas is less specific. The inconsistency between this
announcement and adidas’ continued support of participation legacy goals provides a snapshot of how although corporate partners may seek to associate themselves with official legacy promises, it can be seen that this is an association that corporate partners can emphasise in more vague terms than the event’s organisers are able to.

Beyond this discussion of the overarching aims of each sponsor’s activations, it was also apparent that advocacy of competitive or uncompetitive physical activity was accompanied by a particular rationale – which extended to include the broader effects of each upon the lives of the individuals who took part in them. In the case of competitive sport, it can first be seen that Lloyds TSB approached this primarily upon the basis of increasing participation and educating schoolchildren about the role and values of sport:

The aim of Lloyds TSB NSSW, delivered in partnership with Youth Sport Trust, is to get more young people in Britain doing more sport.

In 2012 nearly 4.3 million young people took part in NSSW biggest celebration of sport. Schools staged their own Games and welcomed the world’s athletes and cultures on London 2012 World Sport Day. We inspired young people through the Torch Relay and shared the values of the Olympic and Paralympic Games. More than 11,000 schools took part which saw 64% of pupils wanting to play more sport afterwards as a result (Lloyds TSB, 2013a, para. 1-2).

During NSSW 2013, young people will be able to take part in more sport, try new sports and learn about the values and ethos of sport (Lloyds TSB, 2013a, para. 5).

Elsewhere (Lloyds TSB, 2013b), National School Sport Week was described as “using the Olympic and Paralympic Games as an inspiration to encourage pupils of all ages to get involved in a week of physical activity, competition and fun” (2013b, para. 1-2). Overall, it can therefore be seen that while the event was primarily advertised as an attempt to increase participation in sport and its associated ethos, the previous quote demonstrates how this focus was expanded to include less competitive forms of exercise. On a similar note, the proclaimed effects of adidas’ adiZones were also described in such a broadened sense:

adiZones provide communities with a unique platform to access the Olympics, try out new sports, train and come into contact with sports clubs and coaches. With NGB involvement, adiZones could be the market place for sport in every community across England where sporting pathways begin.

adiZones are a proven concept. They break down barriers to sport. They have been proven to get new people into sport and exercise and sustain levels. They have proven to be popular with a wide demographic of people. They are excellent value for money. They can be rolled out pre Games and provide a launching pad for other initiatives going on in communities (The Great Outdoor Gym Company, 2011, p. 2).
Although it can again be seen that adiZones are initially presented as community-based sports participation initiatives, the fact that they are also stated to encourage ‘new people’ into ‘exercise’ demonstrates how this is not their sole focus. Also, the reference to the role of ‘NGB involvement’ resonates with the suggestion that the sporting legacy of London 2012 should take the form of a broader effort (DH, 2009), in which the role of sport organisations is particularly significant (Coalter, 2004). However, while adidas can be seen to express a clear commitment towards this here, the extent to which this is co-ordinated with state bodies is less apparent. Furthermore, the way that both sport and exercise are interwoven into the discourse of both adidas and Lloyds TSB shows the extent to which these terms may overlap (as described in Chapter 5) – and therefore the difficulty of assessing whether initial objectives have been met. In addition to this, it can also be seen that just as ‘exercise’ was woven into discourse around primarily sport-based programmes, the opposite phenomenon was also evident.

For example, although Cadbury’s Spots v Stripes has been shown to have been premised upon encouraging ‘fun’ and ‘play’-based activity, minor but significant attempts were made to link it to sport. Specifically, Cadbury (2011) describe how “66% of volunteers have increased the number of times they play games” and that “44% have increased the number of times they participate in sport”, with the added statement that ultimately, “volunteers play more sport” (Cadbury, 2011, p. 12). This demonstrates the complexity of the relationships between that which may be defined as ‘sport’, ‘activity’ or in the present example, ‘play’, as while the vast majority of Cadbury’s promotional discourse constructs Spots v Stripes exclusively in terms of enjoyment and activity participation, the fact that their evaluative comments about its success refer to its effects upon sporting activity should not be ignored.

Given the problematic variance in how sport was constructed, it is also worth considering the discourse around those sponsor campaigns linked to ‘play’ or informal activity in the same terms. One feature of discourse relating to ‘play’-focused programmes was the articulation of its importance in modern society:

"With today's busy lifestyles, making play a priority has never been more important and we are committed to being part of the solution," McDonald's Global Chief Brand Officer Kevin Newell said in a statement. "The McDonald's Champions of Play program will be the largest kids and family outreach in our Olympic history, designed to connect millions of kids to the Games and inspire the power of play in communities around the world" (York, 2012, para. 5).

At the launch today, David Coleman commented “As we become adults, taking time to play feels like a guilty pleasure – a distraction from “real work” and life. But playing games actually helps us to become more socially and emotionally competent humans, and equips us to cope with a changing world with flexibility and optimism (Cadbury Ireland, 2010, para. 13).
Perhaps the most striking aspect of these quotations is the way that the benefits of ‘play’ are conceived in psychological or emotional rather than physical terms. In the first example this is done with reference to how it can be an antidote to the stress of contemporary working life, while in the second the focus is upon how it can help prepare people to ‘cope’ in a rapidly ‘changing world’. Taken together, these show that rather than promoting health in physical or medical terms, the focus is instead more psychological and upon what could better be understood as ‘well-being’, and this could be seen to represent a broader definition of health than those set out in relation to both the Olympic legacy (Weed, 2010) and to the role of sponsors in contributing to CSR through sport (Smith & Westerbeek, 2007) – in which the emphasis is largely upon physical health benefits that are assumed to accrue from sport or activity participation.

This complexity can be seen as symptomatic of how although an overarching rationality about sport – in this instance – can be accepted by both public and private sector actors, the ways in which this is translated into specific programmes may vary. For Miller and Rose (1990), the establishment of such governmental programmes is inherently complex:

> It is in language that programmes of government are elaborated, and through which a consonance is established between the broadly specified ethical, epistemological and ontological appeals of political discourse – to the nation, to virtue, to what is or is not possible or desirable – and the plans, schemes and objectives that seek to address specific problematisations within social, economic or personal existence (Miller and Rose, 1990, p. 6).

The importance given to language here can be applied to the current evidence, as this is ultimately the means through which sponsors can be seen to have outlined the precise social benefits of particular CSR schemes. This is perhaps most evident in terms of their proclaimed effects upon health, which were related to activations in differing ways – such as Cadbury’s and GE’s attempts to link it to ‘play’ and ‘overall well-being’ respectively. Indeed, these more indirect approaches to health were the strongest statements around its promotion in the discourse examined, and were most apparent among sponsors concerned with activity promotion as opposed to sport – in which cases health was not cited as a headline benefit.

Indeed, while it is not possible to make conclusions about the basis of these indirect references to health on the basis of the evidence examined here alone, Petersen (1997) shows how it may be conceived of in broader terms:

> Contemporary health promotion encompasses such areas as community development, personal skills development, the control of advertising ‘unhealthy’ and dangerous products, the regulation of urban space, intervention in workplaces and the monitoring and periodic screening of sub-populations (Petersen, 1997, p.195).
This is consistent with Osborne’s (1997) assertion that governments – in the official sense of the term – can “at best provide the conditions” (p. 173) for health, but ultimately cannot guarantee it. In addition to this, the way that the CSR programmes examined here emphasised the encouragement of ‘play’ in relation to truisms such as ‘busy lifestyles’ and a ‘changing world’ can be understood in relation to Osborne’s account of how governmentality “always tends to problematize – to put into question - the relation between those who are governed and those who govern” (p. 175) and is typically concerned with practices that “relate to a zone or space of governmental intervention” (p. 176). In the present example, this view of governmentality can be squared with these constructions of the place of ‘play’ as integral in modern society and therefore in need of encouragement. This in turn resonates with the previous section’s identification of how certain local communities were defined by sponsors as ‘deprived’ and warranting assistance. While each of these specific claims could be argued to be accurate in specific micro level instances, they can also be regarded as products of a wider macro level assumption that it is the place of ‘governors’ – and in this case corporations – to publish them at all.

This analysis of sponsors who sought to promote ‘heath’ or ‘well-being’ provides further evidence for how the roles and responsibilities of business in public life can be seen to have expanded, given how in both cases the sponsor can be seen to be attempting to ensure that individuals are better suited for survival in modern life. On further examination of the discourse around how this may be achieved, it was apparent that central to these ‘play’-focussed Olympic Partners was their potential to inspire ‘happiness’ in the individuals who would take part in them.

McDonald’s Corporation, a Worldwide Olympic Partner and Official Restaurant of the Olympic Games, today announced its sponsorship plans for London 2012 that will focus on championing happy, active kids (McDonald’s, 2011, para. 1).

Young people from across the UK came together in Design My Break’s first year to enter a competition to re-shape their mid-day break, making sure it is a healthy and happy time (GE, 2012, para. 1).

Our ability to play throughout life is one of the most important factors in determining our success and happiness. It is a biological urge, as integral to our health as sleep or nutrition (Cadbury Ireland, 2010, para. 5).

Here it is apparent that this focus on ‘play’ and the happiness it can bring was primarily justified in terms of its capacity to benefit health as opposed to participation in physical activity. The implication is that the benefits of play extend far beyond this, as reflected in McDonald’s (2011) claim that Champions of Play was aimed at making “a positive difference in the lives of children and families” through the inspiration of “happy and active kids” (2011, para. 8). Indeed, this can be seen to illustrate the extent of the sponsors’ intentions here, as the notion of a long term ‘positive difference’ represents a clear
statement of how the aim is to improve individuals’ lives on a permanent basis. The link between these play-based initiatives and happiness was also expressed in broader terms. For example, Cadbury and Coca-Cola both articulated how their sponsorship programmes involved an emphasis upon ‘joy’ and ‘happiness’:

London 2012 is about more than a hard return on investment. It’s the intangible spirit of joy and inspiration that Cadbury’s events have brought to people and communities in every corner of Britain which has made the real impact.” (Sweet Retailing, 2012, para. 9).

As Presenting Partner of the Torch Relay, this was our chance to show our commitment to young people, to local communities, and to inspiring moments of happiness. We developed Future Flames as a way to fuel and channel the excitement of this event in a positive way (Coca-Cola, 2012, p. 18).

This emphasis upon ‘moments of happiness’ and ‘intangible spirit’ can be seen as further examples of how CSR strategies around London 2012 involved the public pursuit of social objectives that could be regarded as intangible or unquantifiable. In terms of the current focus upon sponsor activity based around sport, activity and health promotion, it can therefore be seen that although evidence of each of these exists, each can be seen to have been articulated in broader terms – as the focus upon individuals’ long term happiness examined here demonstrates. Indeed, the broad-ranging nature of the proclaimed benefits of both sport and activity-based initiatives can also be seen to have extended even further, such as in GE’s promotion of Design My Break:

The Design My Break initiative is designed to help improve the lifestyle of young people and provide a positive legacy for the future (GE, 2010, para. 6).

Specifically, it should be noted here that this wider focus upon the ‘lifestyle’ of young people suggests a greater effect that goes broader than health or well-being alone, and again demonstrates the extent of the effects upon individuals to which sponsor activity could be seen to be focussing. Similarly, Cadbury’s (2011) report on the benefits felt by Spots v Stripes programme were said to include “confidence & self-esteem improving”, an “enhanced satisfaction with life” and “improved employability skills” (Cadbury, 2011, p. 3) – which was also the focus of a programme run in association with StreetGames.

Overall, this discussion of the proclaimed benefits and effects of sport/activity participation-based CSR programmes resonates with the preceding section in terms of how it is intangible benefits that are emphasised. This is demonstrated by how rather than focussing on the promotion of (physical) ‘health’, greater attention is given to the use of ‘play’ and the fostering of individual ‘well-being’ and ‘happiness’, and can be linked to Agha et al.’s (2012) description of how a lack of accountability means that OCOGs can publish broad legacy claims without any risk of repercussion for the failure to meet them. Indeed,
while the sponsors analysed here do not represent official ‘organisers’ of the Games, the applicability of this example lies in how sponsor CSR activity could be linked to an even greater lack of accountability.

However, lest this be read as a lamentation of corporate dominance, the perspectives of Petersen (1997) and Osborne (1997) can be applied to both the present chapter in terms of the abovementioned focus on play and enjoyment and the previous section’s discussion of community development in another sense. Specifically, both of these themes may be understood as efforts to develop certain factors behind physical health (deprivation and well-being) as opposed to more explicit attempts to promote it. This is also consistent with the idea of ‘nudging’ (Vallgårda, 2012), or ‘steering’ (Vallentin & Murillo, 2011) individuals towards certain behaviours where they cannot be encouraged directly. This impossibility of direct action upon the individual could therefore be seen to run contrary to what Ferguson (2009) describes as the portrayal of neo-liberal governmentality as “an evil essence or an automatic unity” (p. 183). In terms of the framework of governmental rationalities, programmes and technologies in which this analysis is framed (Vallentin & Murillo, 2011), the difficulty of coercing individuals into becoming healthy (Rich & Ashby, 2013) – and the inconsistency between the rationality of sport and the content of the programmes examined here - represents another example of how translation across these levels may be impeded. On a broader note, the fact that these CSR schemes were all delivered alongside the cultural phenomenon represented by the Olympic Games should not be forgotten, as the event’s unique macro level rhetoric (as explored in Chapter 5) must not be disregarded in considering the context it represents for CSR. While these first two sections of analysis have addressed the two foremost themes uncovered in the present analysis, it is important to consider these in relation to the unique status of the event- and this will be addressed next.

6.5.3 The Olympic Games and the Olympic Values

It has already been noted that, closely related to the overarching rationality of sport, the notion of Olympism or the Olympic Values represents an important factor in shaping the Games as a context for the delivery of CSR – and the third theme identified here concerned how the unique nature of the Olympic Games was constructed by the sponsors analysed. Indeed, its significance has been identified in each of the preceding sections of the current chapter, as the unique nature of the Games has been associated with both a focus upon communities and attempts to increase individual well-being. However, it was apparent that both Olympism and the Olympic Values these were used in varying ways – with certain sponsors basing initiatives around them in explicit fashion and others doing so in more abstract ways. As an example of the former, Lloyds TSB’s NSSW involved a particular focus upon using the Olympic Values in relation to participation in sport:
Between 27 June and 1 July 2011, schools across the country will take part in Britain’s biggest school sporting event, helping young people achieve their personal best and live the values of the Olympic and Paralympic Games (Lloyds TSB, 2011, p. 8).

Three children from each primary were presented with a ‘Values Medal’. This medal was given to the pupils who demonstrated the Olympic and Paralympic Values during the week (Lloyds TSB, 2013c, para. 3).

These quotations demonstrate how although NSSW was primarily aimed at encouraging schoolchildren to take part in sport, the application of the Olympic Values to it can be seen to have run much broader than sport alone. In a similar vein, GE’s Design My Break was also based explicitly upon the Olympic Values:

Linking with the Olympic and Paralympic values, young people are motivated to set goals, build self-belief and create their own improvement plans to ensure a healthy, active and happy future.

GE has created two Design My Break workshops around the Design My Break themes of physical and mental well-being.

Both workshops are underpinned by the Olympic and Paralympic values of: respect, excellence, friendship, courage, determination, inspiration and equality (GE, 2012, para. 4-6).

The acknowledgement that these workshops were ‘underpinned’ by the Olympic Values demonstrates how although they were associated with Design My Break, to articulate a clear causal link between the values listed and the stated intention to enhance physical and mental well-being would be difficult. Rather, the impression given is more one of how these aspects of well-being can be linked to the values in a more abstract fashion. Along with these cases of sponsors referring to the specific Olympic Values listed by the IOC (2013), there was also evidence of such references being made less specifically. For example, Cadbury’s (2011) Spots v Stripes campaign was premised upon the view that “the spirit of the Games is all about participation and inclusivity” (2011, p. 1), and Cadbury aimed to link this ‘spirit’ to its decision to focus upon game playing:

In 2008 Cadbury became the Official Treat Provider to the London 2012 Olympic Games. As a result of this sponsorship, Cadbury sought to develop a programme which reflected the true spirit of the Olympics and game-playing itself, and thus the concept of Spots v Stripes was born, as a means of re-igniting the spirit of play in everyone, a big game that the whole country can play (Cadbury, 2010, para. 2).

The ‘true spirit’ of the Olympics is therefore portrayed as relating directly to both game-playing in which everyone can take part. However, this can be seen to contrast with the way the ideals of the Olympics were constructed by McDonald’s in 2012:
From a priority standpoint, we're looking to deliver great messages around the quality of our food, children's well-being, as well as our people. ... We think about the ideal of the Olympics as well as the Olympic athletes, and we look at how those ideals align with McDonald's. And quite frankly, they really align quite well with our most fundamental principal -- and that is every day in our restaurants around the world, with every customer visit, our goal is to be excellent (Morrison, 2012, para.6).

The differing ways in which the Olympic Values – or what has also been referred to as its ‘ideals’ or ‘spirit’ – can be seen to have been applied to activity based around sport and activity promotion demonstrate the flexibility of the concept in a manner which is consistent with that examined in the first stage of the present chapter. However, two other important points are also apparent. Firstly, the way that the Olympic Values were applied by Lloyds TSB and GE in a way that extended far beyond the headline ambitions of their sponsorship activity provides further evidence of the extent of the official Values upon the individuals who would be involved. Secondly, the contrast between Cadbury’s articulation of the Olympic ‘spirit’ in relation to games that ‘everyone can play’ and McDonald’s reference to how its ‘ideals’ are consistent with ‘excellence’ in general again demonstrates the flexible nature of ‘Olympism’ as set out by Parry (2006) and DaCosta (2006), and is in accordance with Chatziefstathiou’s (2011) recognition of its contradictory nature.

The complexity of such a range of interpretations is further magnified by the different ways the Games were constructed in the official legacy actor discourse examined in Chapter 5. Overall, it can be observed that while the vast majority of organisations studied here accepted the Olympic Games and its associated philosophy as a force for social good, the variance in how it was interpreted and implemented into different programmes is consistent with the position of Miller and Rose (1990), for whom:

As well as establishing the place of certain objects and problems within the legitimate obligations and powers of rulers, and enabling them to be formulated programmatically, it is through language that governmental fields are composed, rendered thinkable and manageable (Miller & Rose, 1990, p. 7).

In other words, it is impossible to ignore the role of language in seeking to establish how a particular topic is ultimately understood and translated into a manageable domain. In terms of the Olympic Values and their application to sport/activity-based CSR schemes, the fact that different sponsors cited their influence upon particular programmes in contrasting ways demonstrates the complex context in which these were devised. Indeed, this issue of complexity has recurred throughout the current study, and while academic work on the delivery of CSR in sport has given some consideration to wider environmental factors (e.g. Sèguin et al., 2010), the present research’s backdrop of the Olympic Games represents a greater challenge – as while the political and cultural character of the host nation must be
considered, the event’s advocacy of Olympism and global nature mean that these approaches would be insufficient.

Beyond the more abstract nature of concepts such as Olympism and the Olympic Values, the unique nature of the Olympic Games was also articulated in relation to both sport and physical activity promotion. For example, the relationship between adidas and the Games was cited as one factor that would help in their utilisation of both ‘sport and exercise:

The branding on adiZones is made possible by the rights adidas own by being a Tier One 2012 Olympic sponsor. adiZones could not be reproduced by anyone else for this reason. The unique community sports facility brings to life the 2012 logo through sport and exercise.

The adiZones are totally unique in their design through their incorporation of the 2012 logo and the five Olympic rings (the rights to which are held by adidas). TGO jointly own the rights to the IPR and design concept of the adiZones (The Great Outdoor Gym Company, 2010, p. 20).

On a similar note, Coca-Cola’s (2012) Move to the Beat was claimed to use the ‘spirit’ of the Olympics to attract people to both sport and physical activity:

We designed our global campaign for London 2012, Move to the Beat, with the aim of using the power of music and the inspiration of our brands to bring young people closer to the spirit of the Games and to sport and physical activity in general (Coca-Cola, 2012, p. 16).

In terms of the sporting legacy, Lloyds TSB (2011) made the most specific references to how London 2012 would help to encourage greater participation in sport. This was articulated both in terms of using the “excitement and anticipation of London 2012 to inspire 5 million children to try more sport” (p. 8) and using “the power of the London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games to inspire more young people across Britain to do more sport” (Lloyds TSB, 2009a, para. 2). As in the examples of adidas and Coca-Cola described above, once again the message given is one of how the unique characteristics of the Games will make a contribution towards an increase in sport participation that could be argued to set it apart from other sporting events.

Overall, this analysis has demonstrated that the Olympic Values (or Olympism more broadly) were interpreted and deployed in programme content in a range of different ways. While this is consistent with the inherent subjectivity that has been identified by academics (Chatziefstathiou, 2011; Parry, 2006; DaCosta, 2006), it can be seen that the context of CSR represents a unique context in which their influence is apparent. In addition, their deployment in the context of CSR can be reconciled with the perception that sport represents a special context in which this can be geared towards a range of objectives (Walters, 2009; Smith & Westerbeek, 2007).
6.6 Chapter Conclusion

In line with the aims of the project’s second stage of data collection, this chapter aimed to establish how CSR activity around the London 2012 Olympic legacy was justified and rationalised by (corporate) sponsors and to investigate how specific CSR programmes involving sport and activity participation were articulated and promoted. Accordingly, the chapter is structured into three main sections. The first of these addressed the broader ways in which sponsors articulated their CSR activity, and two main themes were presented: the relationships between the values of sport, business and the Olympics, and the ways that sponsors could be widely observed to be expressing commitments to go beyond ‘business’ activity alone and contribute to society in more proactive ways – such as CSR. Next, the second section presented an overview of the sport and activity-based CSR schemes of six selected sponsors: Coca-Cola, GE, McDonald’s, adidas, Lloyds TSB and Cadbury. Finally, the third main section of the project addressed three recurring themes in the material produced by these sponsors that was analysed here: communities, the promotion of ‘play’ and ‘happiness’ as well as sport, and how far the Olympic Games and the Olympic Values shaped the event as a context for the delivery of CSR. Summaries of the empirical and theoretical contributions ensuing from this thematic analysis are presented in the following two sub-sections.

6.6.1 Empirical Summary

In terms of their overall attitudes, the data examined here showed that although sponsors could be seen to interpret the values and status of the Olympic Games in a variety of ways there was a general appreciation that London 2012 – and its legacy represented a significant moment in the delivery of CSR via sport. However, while scholars of Olympism have recognised the conflicting ways in which its values have been interpreted (Chatziefstathiou, 2011; DaCosta, 2006), this evidence highlights a need for academic considerations of CSR and sport more broadly to move away from considering sport’s values in a static and unchanging fashion (e.g. Smith & Westerbeek, 2007). In terms of the specific CSR schemes around sport and activity participation that were examined, two general points can be made. Firstly, these tended to emphasise more intangible goals such as community (development) and the promotion of ‘play’ and individual happiness and well-being as opposed to specific attempts to increase (mass) participation in competitive sport or physical activity, and no references were made to the formal legacy targets around these. Secondly, the objectives published in relation to these schemes could also be seen as ambitious in their stated intentions to significantly improve either specific ‘deprived’ communities – in line with Levermore’s (2010) recognition of sport’s perceived capacity to access grassroots communities - or the everyday lives of individuals. Overall, the ambitious nature of these
schemes is consistent with Breitbarth and Harris’s (2008) identification of opportunity-driven as opposed to problem-driven CSR, although this should not be viewed in detachment from the way the special status of the Olympic Games was hailed by sponsors as being particularly conducive to the delivery of CSR.

6.6.2 Theoretical Summary

Two separate but related consistencies can be identified in the theoretical analysis presented in this chapter. The first of these concerns the way that the overall framework of governmental rationalities, programmes and technologies used in this study can help to illustrate the ways that corporate sponsors analysed here could be described as ‘governing’ in the way that has previously been restricted too exclusively to state organisations (Roy, 1997). This is most evident here in the way that sponsors could be observed to echo the sentiments of ‘official legacy actors’ regarding the rationality of sport, and on this basis it could therefore be seen that the CSR schemes examined here could be understood – albeit metaphorically – as examples of governmental programmes within this. On a related note, the second of these consistencies relates to the way that each of the sport and activity-based initiatives examined here could be seen as evidence of sponsors ‘governing’ in this way. This is most evident in the ways that – in line with Osborne (1997), sponsors could be seen to ‘problematize’ certain areas of social life and define them as being in need of governance. In the first theme this concerned the identification of ‘deprived’ communities and in the second this was manifest in how representatives of sponsors rationalised the importance of ‘play’ in terms of its place in contemporary (working) life. However, in line with the approach advocated by Ferguson (2009), this observation that sponsors could be conceived as ‘governing’ should not be seen as inherently negative. For example, the absence of any explicit efforts to use programmes to improve ‘health’ – with the corporate focus instead falling more upon ‘play’ and well-being can be seen as evidence of how ‘governors’ cannot guarantee their every desire. This is consistent with the observations made in Chapter 5 regarding how the sport and activity participation legacy goals were abandoned despite the discursive dominance of the presumed links between sport, the Olympics and health at the macro level. With this issue of translation between levels of society readily apparent, the next chapter turns to examine how the Games and CSR were perceived and experienced by individuals who worked within this area at what is understood in this study as the meso level.

Overall, this chapter builds upon the broader analysis presented in Chapter 5 by examining both how CSR activity was articulated by sponsors both at a broad level and in terms of six specific organisations who focussed explicitly on CSR schemes involving participation in sport and activity. In order to analyse the development and delivery of CSR in greater detail, the focus of Chapter 7 is upon individuals who
were actively involved in the design and delivery of CSR programmes involving sport and activity in relation to London 2012.
Chapter 7: ‘It wasn’t a sponsorship deal, it was a Corporate Social Responsibility deal’: CSR According to the Professionals

7.1 Chapter Introduction

This chapter presents an analysis of the data generated in the third and final stage of the project, which took the form of a series of seven semi-structured interviews with individuals who were actively involved in the design and delivery of CSR programmes involving sport and activity in relation to London 2012. Following the macro level discourse that was examined in Chapters 5 and 6, the purpose of this stage was to understand more about the dynamics of how sponsor-led CSR activity was organised in relation to the roles of other organisations and how individuals involved in this process at the meso level articulated both the wider role of business in society and the London 2012 Olympics as a particular context. Each of the seven individuals interviewed had been directly involved in the delivery of CSR – relating to sport or activity participation – organised by three different sponsors: Coca-Cola, Lloyds TSB and Cadbury. A summary of these interviewees is provided in Tables 7.1, 7.2 and 7.3.

Table 7.1 – Coca-Cola

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delivery Partners</th>
<th>Coca-Cola (TOP Worldwide Partner) and StreetGames</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initiative</td>
<td>StreetGames</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>StreetGames is a sports charity that delivers sport to young people in disadvantaged communities across the UK. In 2009, Coca-Cola and StreetGames commenced an initial three-year partnership in which Coca-Cola provided financial support and to StreetGames. This partnership was then renewed in 2012.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewees</td>
<td>Senior Coca-Cola Representative (CSR) Senior StreetGames Representative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.2 – Lloyds TSB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delivery Partners</th>
<th>Lloyds TSB (Official Olympic Partner) and Youth Sport Trust</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initiative</td>
<td>National School Sport Week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>The aim of National School Sport Week, which began in 2008, is to “encourage young people to be more active and take part in more PE and school sport” (Youth Sport Trust, 2014, para. 1). In 2009, Lloyds TSB announced their support (Lloyds TSB, 2009b).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewees</td>
<td>Lloyds TSB London 2012 Sponsorship Manager Youth Sport Trust Representative LOCOG Client Services Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tables 7.1, 7.2 and 7.3 demonstrate how the seven individuals interviewed for this stage can be organised into three distinct groups that relate to the CSR activity of three specific sponsors of London 2012 respectively. In each case, these groups include one representative of the sponsor concerned and one of a charity organisation who helped to deliver a specific sport or activity-based programme. In the case of Lloyds TSB, an additional interview with a representative of LOCOG who worked specifically on this brand’s partnership with the Games is also included. This chapter is comprised of three sections, of which the first provides an introduction to this stage of the project. The second then presents a thematic analysis of the data collected – which is in turn situated within the study’s overall theoretical framework. Finally, the third section summarises the chapter’s main empirical and theoretical contributions.

7.2.1 Cooperation between Sponsors and Other Bodies in the Design and Development of CSR
The design and delivery of sponsor-led CSR programmes was co-ordinated with a number of public, private and charity organisations. Within this, this first thematic sub-section addresses how CSR activity was developed in relation to both LOCOG and other sponsors, before turning to a broader legacy of cooperation that one interviewee suggested might ensue from the Games. In accordance with Moss’s (1980) description of governmentality as “a style of political reasoning more than a specific institution or practice” (p. 179-180), the evidence presented here provides further evidence of how the activity of corporate sponsors around the design and delivery of CSR programmes around London 2012 could be construed as ‘governing’. However, this behaviour must be understood in relation to the broader context of the overarching rationalities of sport and business established in Chapter 5 and their influence upon both the Olympic Games and CSR in 2012.

In Chapter 5, content published by LOCOG (formerly the London 2012 Bid Team) was examined in order to better understand how the sport and activity participation legacy of London 2012 was developed over time, and how the role of corporate partners was articulated. With this basis, the data
collected for the current stage offered further insight into LOCOG’s role in the delivery of CSR at a more practical level. To begin with, it is worth considering how the CSR schemes examined here were said to have been influenced by the legacy visions published by LOCOG. On this note, a senior Coca-Cola representative stated that:

Our strategy for the Olympics was to help LOCOG deliver the best Games but also to deliver their legacy strategies. So one of those was around grassroots participation in sport - obviously for us that was a very important thing, we’ve always had a history as I said before of supporting grassroots sport even though obviously we’re the longest standing Olympic sponsor.

This acknowledgement of Coca-Cola’s role in delivering the legacy of the Games alongside LOCOG fits with Chappelet and Kübler-Mabbott’s (2008) description of sponsors as ‘new actors’ in the Olympic system. This interviewee also specified that of these legacy strategies, that concerning sport participation and the “next generation” was “the whole premise of their [London’s] bid”, which meant that helping with the delivery of ‘grassroots sport’ took on particular importance. While this demonstrates Coca-Cola’s acceptance of LOCOG’s overall visions, it also shows how this legacy-based activation was initiated by the sponsor and approved by LOCOG, as opposed to being directed or demanded by the OCOG. This is consistent with a Lloyds TSB London 2012 Sponsorship Manager’s account of Lloyds TSB’s rationale for National School Sports Week (NSSW):

Lloyds TSB’s vision for the Games was about inspiring and supporting young people, communities and businesses across the UK, so NSSW really hit the mark in terms of that strand of young people, and the organising committee were very supportive of the creation of that, but I don’t think they really played a huge part in actually delivering it.

This interviewee also described how upon their confirmation as a partner of the Games, Lloyds TSB “signed up to their vision about children and about young people” but then “very much built our own vision around that”. Alongside the evidence provided by Coca-Cola above, this illustrates how while corporate partners must express a commitment to the ideals of the IOC (if international) or the OCOG (if domestic), the design and delivery of specific CSR schemes is primarily their own responsibility. In terms of the need to commit to the visions of a specific OCOG, this representative of Lloyds TSB was particularly emphatic about the unprecedented extent of LOCOG’s focus upon both youth and physical activity:

I’m not saying these Games would be any more impactful than any other Games, but I do think from having that mission statement about children back in Singapore, to carrying that right through, will have made a much bigger impact. Never has inspiring children and getting people active been such a focus of the Games – so I’d be optimistic, but I think it’s a job for all of us really to keep pushing it.
This demonstrates how while an OCOG may not play an active role in the delivery of sponsor-led CSR, their published legacy visions can be seen as significant factors in its design. For example, while London 2012’s emphasis upon sport and youth forms a logical basis for the CSR activity examined here, an OCOG with different overarching visions may therefore encourage partners to develop different types of CSR. In terms of the potential of any Games – or major sporting event – to increase sport or activity participation, the significance of the OCOG’s role should therefore not be ignored.

As opposed to Coca-Cola and Lloyds TSB’s more explicit references to official statements about sport and youth, a Cadbury London 2012 Community Manager described how Cadbury’s CSR activity in broader terms:

> What we really wanted to do was take the Games to people who would not expect to have any association with them, so that we would enable people who have got disabilities, who live in disadvantaged areas, people who are not normally interested in sport, to feel part of the programme and to be connected in some way.

In line with the material published by Cadbury examined in Chapter 6, it should be acknowledged that although Cadbury’s ‘Spots v Stripes’ programme was based around ‘activity’, this was phrased primarily in terms of community development rather than sport and activity participation. On this note, this interviewee clarified that:

> The whole point behind the programme was to show people that being active can be fun, so we started with lots of different games, and encouraging people to play chess or to play flipping fish or foam javelin, so people who would normally be put off by very focused sporting activities – who’d think oh that’s not for me, I’m not that sporty – actually began to think that being active can be fun and having a bit of a competitive element and having young people playing against old people in games of chess et cetera. So we used those nine community fairs to build a relationship with Tesco, with Groundwork, with consumers, again really raising the profile of how being active can be fun, sports can be fun and the Olympics is something that is here for everybody, not just sports-mad people who live in Central London.

This account of Cadbury’s activity demonstrates that its emphasis was primarily upon using sport and activity to facilitate intangible qualities such as enjoyment and inclusion – in line with its headline focus on communities – as opposed to the ‘very focussed sporting activities’ described here. Along with the repeated references to ‘fun’ evident here, this rationale differs from the way Coca-Cola and Lloyds TSB linked their programmes to London 2012’s official legacy visions more explicitly. Despite this, each of the three examples can be seen as manifestations of the proclaimed social legacy of the Games. Furthermore, this can also be linked to Séguin et al.’s (2010) assertion that in order to attract sponsors, major sporting events “must be sold as a social cause” with organisers selling “the idea of corporate social responsibility, of doing it for the greater good” (p. 210-11). These authors also acknowledge that contextual factors such as time, culture and contemporary issues also affect the capacity of organisers
to do this. In terms of the present analysis, the positioning of the Games as a ‘social cause’ is demonstrated in both the discourse of the organisers and the ways this has been acknowledged by sponsors here. However, while the sentiments expressed here show the influence of LOCOG’s legacy visions upon sponsor CSR activity, it has been shown here that the design and delivery of this was primarily the responsibility of the sponsor.

Indeed, this can be reconciled with the insight provided by a LOCOG Client Services Manager, who described how from a LOCOG perspective, the objective was to ‘align’ the legacy objectives of the Games with those of a given sponsor:

What we had to do was make sure you can align everyone’s objectives to get to mutually beneficial results...the key thing was tying in what LOCOG was trying to accomplish with the legacy and community involvement along with what Lloyds need to do as a bank. So it totally differed in that sometimes it totally aligned and we were good to go right out of the box and other times we had to customise programmes and priorities to make sure everyone was happy. But overall Lloyds in particular – they did a lot of things that aligned very nicely with for example our education programme, our sustainability programme and some of our community legacy programmes so from the Lloyds perspective it was pretty good.

This interviewee also specified that in the case of a programme such as NSSW, Lloyds TSB would have been in contact with relevant LOCOG departments from the outset, which meant that “everyone was ingrained in the planning process of these activations” and that otherwise the coordination would have been more difficult. This shows how although sponsor-led programmes – such as NSSW – were primarily delivered by sponsors, this was overseen throughout by LOCOG, and this is reflected by this interviewee’s description of a process of ‘alignment’. One example of how LOCOG can be seen to have moderated the delivery of CSR is provided by a senior StreetGames representative, who worked with Coca-Cola towards their grassroots sport legacy goals:

We worked with LOCOG quite a lot, and again because we had the Inspire Mark, that endorsed us, the work that we were doing and we sat under their brand and we agreed to all of the things that were laid out in the Olympic Charter and same for Coca-Cola because they were a Tier 1 sponsor, exactly the same, they were coming under LOCOG’s vision really for what they were trying to achieve with the 2012 Games.

Because we’d worked closely with them and because we built the confidence of Coca-Cola and LOCOG that we would stick to the rules, we were given opportunities – unbelievable opportunities really – to get in on the action.

This demonstrates the flexibility of the relationship between LOCOG and the delivery of sponsor-led CSR activations, as the above reference to ‘building the confidence’ of the organisers suggests that this was not granted automatically. On a broader level, this resonates with Chappelet and Kübler-Mabbott’s (2008) account of how the remit of OCOG’s could be seen to have expanded in relation to the way that
the event has “become a genuine public policy” that aims to develop the host city or country and therefore falls “within a given territory’s problematic of sustainable development” (p. 91). The social responsibilities this entails mean that the role of an OCOG could be seen to have become increasingly political, and the social legacy of London 2012 should therefore be regarded in relation to the wider social and political context of the UK as outlined in Chapter 5.

Alongside this relationship between sponsors and LOCOG, it is also worth considering how the delivery of CSR was influenced by that of other sponsors. For example, a Lloyds TSB London 2012 Sponsorship Manager outlined how:

> We [Olympic sponsors] speak, we share ideas, I think we very much took the community space – in that, you know, BP took sustainability and various things like that and then Sainsbury’s came on board so that was slightly different, a Paralympic-only sponsor, and crossed over into some of the same areas [youth sport] but yeah, I think there’s some discussion between communities to ensure that there’s not too much of a crossover.

The impression given here is that each of the domestic sponsors attempted to define a specific area of legacy-based CSR in which they could focus, and that this was determined in communication with one another. It was in a similar vein that the same interviewee stated that Lloyds TSB’s commitment to youth sport beyond 2012 depended to some extent upon “the environment and how cluttered it becomes” in relation to both government activity as well as that of Sainsbury’s. However, this contrasts with a LOCOG Client Services Manager’s assertion that “yes, they [sponsors] talk, but I would say that they often talk to do common things, not to avoid overlapping”. While it is understandable that a LOCOG representative would respond in such terms, the Lloyds TSB representative quoted above further articulated how the nature of Olympic sponsorship demanded a more pragmatic approach:

> I think we always knew that – especially with Olympic sponsorship – it’s different to so many other sponsorships, there are so many restrictions, it’s so crowded, that you have to do something different to make your partnership real.

Given that Lloyds TSB was one of seven different sponsors at the top tier of domestic sponsorship alone, the need to stand out by ‘making your partnership real’ is difficult to dispute. While this could be seen to justify the dialogue between sponsors described earlier, the presence of over 40 sponsors across all tiers suggests that only a limited number would be likely to achieve this in practice. Indeed, this can be understood in relation to Séguin et al.’s (2010) discussion of ‘corporate peer pressure’ and Dowling et al.’s (2013) references to ‘corporate capital’. In Séguin et al.’s (2010) study of the 2005 FINA World Aquatics Championships, the authors suggested that a “snowball effect” (p. 214) saw corporations seek to emulate their ‘peers’ or rivals by sponsoring the event, while Dowling et al. (2013) observed that “legitimacy was sought among the corporate organisations themselves” (p. 283). The
present evidence shows how these issues could be applied to the context of CSR delivery at London 2012, given the above description of how sponsors sought to define a particular ‘space’ in which they could do so. However, as opposed to approaching this in terms of the estimation in which one corporation is held by others, the need to emphasise one’s sponsorship in the crowded context of Olympic sponsorship is also apparent here. Overall, this demonstrates that alongside the working relationship between sponsors and LOCOG, the CSR schemes that were ultimately delivered can also be seen as the products of co-operation and co-ordination among different sponsors.

This section provides three clear examples of how the corporations studied here could be understood as ‘legitimate’ governing organisations (McNay, 1994) in the organisation of London 2012. Firstly, and most broadly, it can be seen that sponsors were largely free to design CSR schemes independently, with LOCOG not taking any active role in the process and primarily seeking to ensure that this remained consistent with the overall vision for the event and its legacy. Secondly, it has also been shown that in designing CSR programmes relating to the promotion of sport and physical activity participation, sponsors also sought to define these terms for themselves, as is evident in Cadbury’s attempts to expand the notion of ‘sport’ to include a greater focus upon ‘fun’ and ‘community-based’ activities. Thirdly, and finally, the case of sponsors seeking to specify particular areas of CSR in order to avoid ‘crossing over’ into areas those prioritised by others resonates with Vallentin and Murillo’s (2011) description of how governmental programmes are required to “define a governable space and thus to render visible – and approachable – the space over which government is to be exercised” (p. 14). However, certain aspects of the present context should be seen to distinguish it from the more general terms in which these authors were concerned. For example, while Vallentin and Murillo (2011) describe how governmental programmes seek “to reconfigure and reform specific locales and relations in ways that are thought desirable from a governmental point of view” (p. 13), the activity of the private sector organisations analysed here must also be seen as the product of a need to ensure the visibility of their Olympic sponsorship by setting their activations apart from those of others. It can therefore be seen that while this need to avoid ‘crossing over’ into each other’s chosen area of CSR can be squared with Vallentin and Murillo’s (2011) account of how governmental programmes seek to define a clear space of governance, it can also be attributed to the commercial objectives of Olympic sponsorship.

Furthermore, although the three examples listed above demonstrate ways in which the behaviour of corporate sponsors could be seen as ‘governmental’, specific aspects of the particular context examined here can be understood to have moderated this to some degree. For example, as noted both in the present section and in Chapter 5, domestic sponsors are required to formally accept the OCOG’s legacy visions and to express a commitment to work towards them. Beyond this, it can also be seen
that specific technologies such as the LOCOG Inspire Mark represent ways in which the OCOG was able to monitor moderate sponsor activity, as demonstrated here by a senior StreetGames representative’s acknowledgement that “sticking to the rules” had offered greater “opportunities to get in on the action”.

Indeed, beyond these relationships between specific organisations, it was also suggested that the hosting of the Games represented a stimulus for cooperation between bodies that would not otherwise have attempted to co-operate. For example, a senior Coca-Cola representative reflected that:

We had a big stakeholder debrief after the Games, you know, beginning of October to say what we’d done, what we’d achieved, what our immediate results were. You know things like that, discussing how we could go forward. We had one of those on grassroots sport - on physical activity – it was a really fantastic meeting. People around the table – there was the Department of Health, there was StreetGames, Special Olympics, Youth Sport Trust, there was the GLA, there was Sport England, and it was just a case of talking about what the Games did and what we were going to do and what we should do going forward which was very, very interesting – and they’d actually said that they had never sat down together, all round a table, until that time, and they thought that that was one of the legacies of the Olympics, was that those organisations were – possibly – facilitated to talk more freely to one another about what their plans are, what their strategies were, what their ambitions were and so on because of the Games.

This resonates with the literature examined in Chapter 3 in two important ways. Firstly, the legacy of communication described here is consistent with Levermore’s (2010) claim that “sports programmes and events provide a natural and non-political arena where partners can meet up and therefore strengthen the interaction of business, NGOs, civil society and political institutions” (p. 229), although it should be acknowledged that the sheer scale – and social magnitude - of the Olympic Games must be seen as a factor that may either facilitate this more easily or deter certain organisations from becoming involved. Secondly, the tone of this interviewee here suggests that this could be construed as an ‘unplanned’ (Gratton & Preuss, 2008) and not a formalised legacy of the event, as shown by how it is only really described in reflective terms here, although it is worth acknowledging that sport sponsorship has previously been discussed in terms of its relationship to business-to-business relationships (e.g. Clark, Lachowetz, Irwin & Schimmel, 2003).

In terms of this thematic sub-section as a whole, these issues of legacy and co-operation between a number of organisations are two examples of a multitude of factors that must be acknowledged when analysing the Olympic Games as a site for the delivery of CSR. In relation to this, it is worth considering Séguin et al.’s (2010) conclusion that:
The unique situational factors associated with the event, while difficult to predict or control, proved to be important in the sponsorship outcomes. As a result, organising committee members and city leaders must have a good understanding of the external environment, as any situational factor could become an obstacle and hinder their attempts to achieve corporate support (2010, p. 217).

This conclusion can be built upon in two ways here. Firstly, any such ‘unique situational factors’ associated with a sporting event can be seen to be more pronounced in relation to the Olympic Games because of its sheer scale. Perhaps the most significant aspect of this here is the concept of ‘legacy’, which is coordinated by a number of organisations across the host nation as a whole. Secondly, whereas the focus of these authors is more upon how event organisers can attract sponsors, the evidence presented here shows how – in the case of the Olympics – sponsors themselves can be seen to take an active role in co-ordinating (with both organisers and other sponsors), defining and delivering the social benefits that are proclaimed to ensue from the event. More broadly, this is consistent with the concept of co-creation (Ferrand, Chappellet and Séguin, 2012), through which a range of actors in the Olympic system (e.g. IOC, OCOGs and NOCs) can gain value by partnering with one another.

Overall, the current section demonstrates that while – as suggested in Chapters 5 and 6 – sound arguments can be made for the need to consider private sector corporations as ‘governors’ in the fashion most commonly associated with the state, the broader context in which these do so must be acknowledged to play a considerable role. For example, although the sponsors analysed here were given the freedom to define and design CSR activations by themselves – with LOCOG primarily overseeing this process – statements made by both the current UK Prime Minister (Cameron, 2011) and the department with chief responsibility for the Olympic Games (DCMS, 2012; 2008) demonstrate how this was facilitated by an overwhelmingly positive attitude to the value of business as a contributor to social as well as commercial causes.

On a broader level, the evidence presented here can also be used to suggest that the view that governmentality should not be regarded as exclusive to state organisations could logically be expanded – beyond even the public-private debate – to encompass all organisations that endeavour to play an influential role in public life. This is most lucidly demonstrated here by the final quotation presented here, in which a range of state, private, sport and charity organisations were said to have come together in order to discuss how best to ensure a legacy from the Games. Indeed, the role of charity organisations in particular was particularly significant here, with each of the sponsor-led CSR activations analysed being delivered in partnership with one. The next section therefore explores these working relationships in greater detail.
7.2.2 Cooperation between Sponsors and Charities: A Legacy of the Games?
The previous thematic analytical sub-section focused upon how CSR activity was developed in coordination with both LOCOG and other sponsors, before turning to a possible legacy of broader cooperation between different sectors. On a similar note, several interviewees also spoke of partnerships between sponsors and charity organisations in the delivery of CSR represented a further legacy of the event. This sub-section explores these partnerships – and their potential continuation – in more detail.

Just as the theoretical analysis of the previous thematic section further explored the value of considering ‘governmentality’ in private as well as public institutions, the current section demonstrates how charity (or ‘third sector’) organisations could be understood using a similar lens. This is not to suggest that charities experience the same power of influence as public or private organisations, but that they can be seen to play a significant role in an increasingly complex governmental environment. Indeed, such an approach is faithful to Rose et al.’s (2006) articulation of governmentality’s comprehensive nature:

Instead of seeing any single body—such as the state—as responsible for managing the conduct of citizens, this perspective recognizes that a whole variety of authorities govern in different sites, in relation to different objectives (Rose et al., 2006, p. 85).

Once again, it should be noted that the involvement of charities in this particular instance must be understood in relation to the broader context of the London 2012 Olympic Games, and the overarching governmental rationalities of sport and business, as discussed in Chapters 5 and 6. More specifically, the Games – and particularly its participation legacy - can be seen to have been particularly conducive to charity activity given both the UK government’s recognition of its role in bringing this about (e.g. DCMS, 2010) and the fact that this was the first Games to be planned following the inclusion of legacy to the Olympic Charter in 2002 (IOC, 2013a).

Although each of the three CSR programmes examined here featured sport or activity in some form, it was common for interviewees to first emphasise their broader social benefits. For example, a senior representative of StreetGames – who delivered part of Coca-Cola’s grassroots sport strategy – stated that the partnership was “very much about a tangible link” for Coca-Cola into the Games, as well as “how they could have a legacy that impacted communities across the UK from the Olympics”. Indeed, for this interviewee, local communities were of paramount significance:
What this was about was giving back to, or investing into, local communities – and that’s very much the way that they saw it and very much the way that we saw it as well. So that common objective was ironed out right at the very start and the partnership was very much about health messages as well, about people having a balanced and active lifestyle, so for them this kind of work is helping to contribute to people being more active more often, so that’s a common objective for the two parties.

Here, references to ‘health’ and ‘active lifestyles’ are situated under the broader umbrella of concern for local communities, and a similar approach was described by representatives of Cadbury and Groundwork UK, who cooperated in the delivery of Cadbury’s Spots v Stripes programme, as shown by how a senior representative of Groundwork UK described this partnership as following a “long-lasting community change intervention approach”. Accordingly, a Cadbury London 2012 Community Manager justified the partnership in terms of Groundwork UK’s capacity to help implement this:

The absolute key thing to us was that Groundwork has got 30 years’ experience of working in the most deprived areas across the UK and their remit is to improve community wellbeing and community liaison in areas of disadvantage, so we look to them to share with us, which were the communities most in need and who would most likely feel neglected and forgotten by the Olympics.

The focus of both Coca-Cola and Cadbury upon communities – and especially those defined as ‘deprived’ – resonates with Levermore’s (2010) indication that sport “might be a useful vehicle” in extending development initiatives “to communities where traditional development schemes tend not to reach” (p. 238) as well as Smith and Westerbeek’s (2007) advocacy of its capacity to encourage social interaction and community engagement. While the present evidence does not confirm or refute these perspectives, it shows them to be consistent with those of individuals involved in the delivery of community-based CSR activities around London 2012. Furthermore, this community focus is consistent with Coalter’s (2004) suggestion that for a sustainable increase in sport or activity participation to ensue from the Games, a broader community-based effort would be required, although these CSR programmes were not officially part of the sporting legacy strategy overseen by the DCMS to which this author was primarily referring.

As established in the previous sub-section, Cadbury’s Spots v Stripes initiative presented a broader definition of sport and activity than may be followed in mainstream discourse (e.g. Coakley, 2007). The role of their charity delivery partner, Groundwork UK, can be seen as significant here, given how a Cadbury London 2012 Community Manager described that from the outset, there was a need to identify community sponsors who could help them to fulfil their social objectives, of which the most significant was to “take the Games to people who would not expect to have any association with them”, and to
encourage “people who are not normally interested in sport, to feel part of the programme and to be connected in some way”:

The whole point was that they were being active, they were having fun, they were maybe talking to different groups of people – as I said, and we had children going into some of these groups, so it was to make being active fun with the link that from activity you can be involved with sport.

While Cadbury’s partnership with Groundwork UK could be seen to have lent crucial credibility to their community activity, it is also apparent that this could be linked to the broader conceptualisation of sport and activity that was set out in interviews with representatives of both organisations. While this could primarily be attributed to the combination of Groundwork UK’s status as a non-sporting organisation and the nature of the Olympic Games, it provides further evidence of how ‘sport’ itself must be seen as a contested and constructed concept. This is consistent with Chapter 3’s discussion of how while academic writers such as Coakley (2007) have defined sport in relatively narrow terms, the United Nations’ (2013) acknowledgement of how it can take the form of “competitive sport, physical activity or play” (para. 1) resonates here. In terms of the above discussion of Levermore’s (2010) and Smith and Westerbeek’s (2007) advocacy of sport as a social vehicle, the range of ways in which sport can be understood, interpreted and defined adds a further layer of complexity to these debates around its suitability as a tool for social progress.

While the examples outlined above demonstrate how co-operation with charities represented a way for sponsors to emphasise their ‘community’ focus, it is worth considering the respective responsibilities of both the corporate and charity organisations within each of these cases. In the case of NSSW – some ambiguity was evident in the accounts of the Lloyds TSB and the Youth Sport Trust representatives interviewed here. For example, a Lloyds TSB London 2012 Sponsorship Manager described NSSW as “very much our own idea and our own programme” and explained the role of the Youth Sport Trust in the following terms:

The main partnership in delivery is with the Youth Sport Trust in England and Wales, and Sport Scotland in Scotland, so they’re our delivery partners for the programme, because obviously we are a bank, we don’t have that network, which is what they give us, so they have a network of ambassadors across the country in schools which helps us both with credibility and also, mainly, with recruitment of schools to take part in NSSW.

By contrast, a representative of the Youth Sport Trust described how:

Lloyds have sponsored NSSW since 2009, but the year before that it was sponsored by Aviva. So it’s our IP, it’s our product, we own it, and we – if you like- sell the sponsorship to whoever we see fit I suppose. With regards to why we chose Lloyds over Aviva, we really wanted that
link with London 2012 so that’s probably the biggest thing they brought to us because they were a presenting partner of the Games.

These statements demonstrate a number of the perceived benefits experienced by both sponsor and charity organisations in this context. While the sponsor benefits from the charity’s experience and credibility at a local level, its formal association with the Games is believed to increase the public profile of the charity. It can also be seen that both organisations claim ‘ownership’ of the initiative to some extent; as while the Youth Sport Trust representative highlights their status as its original creators, that of Lloyds TSB described it as the bank’s ‘own idea and programme’. However, it should be noted that this particular statement was made in response to a specific question about the respective contributions of Lloyds TSB and LOCOG to the design of NSSW as opposed to the Youth Sport Trust. Nevertheless, both quotations demonstrate the mutual benefits of the relationship, and it was in similar terms that a senior representative of Coca-Cola justified the grassroots sport partnership with StreetGames:

“We’re not the experts on delivering grassroots sport and engaging young people and communities – we’re soft drinks manufacturers – that’s absolutely their [StreetGames’] job. We wanted to view this very much as a partnership, it wasn’t just a case of us writing a cheque and going ‘there you go, that’ll help you’ – it was a case of us working on something together and thinking about who adds the most value doing what.

This is consistent with the perspective of a senior StreetGames representative, for whom:

They [Coca-Cola] recognise us as being the specialists, the specialist lead, so [allow us to] go and be the specialist and they recognise areas where they can add value so again in terms of their marketing and media clout, in terms of the specialisms around business support and market insight but yeah absolutely, they look to us as the specialists because otherwise they would just do it themselves.

Specific examples of Coca-Cola’s “marketing and media clout” included advertising exposure on billboards and television, the support of advertising agency M&C Saatchi and the recruitment of Olympians such as Amir Khan and Anthony Ogogo to attend StreetGames events and festivals. Indeed, the Olympic pedigree of these individuals highlights their suitability, and their involvement could be linked to Babiak and Wolfe’s (2009) description of how CSR can be based around individual athletes.

Perhaps the clearest illustration of how the charity organisations featured here could be understood to be ‘governing’ is provided by the way that several interviewees justified their partnerships with respective Olympic sponsors on the basis of their experience and knowledge of community development at a local level, and it was common for the credibility of the charity among local populations as an important factor here. On a broader level, this resonates with both McNay’s (1994) distinction between the “legitimate power of the prince and other “illegitimate” forms of power” (p. 116) and Miller and Rose’s (1990) account of how “the legitimate obligations and powers of rulers” (p. 7) are
constructed through language. In terms of the present evidence, this notion of ‘legitimacy’ can be seen to be particularly important, as by cooperating with charity organisations, the private sector organisations are able to add a level of both technical and moral legitimacy to their pursuit of social objectives through these CSR schemes. To be clear, technical legitimacy refers to the greater expertise and experience of the charity in working with communities at a local level, while moral legitimacy stems from the fact that their status as charity organisations grants them a level of credibility which a private sector corporation would be less likely to attain.

However, this discussion of legitimacy points to one possible disadvantage of governmentality in this situation. While each of the interviewees cited here were unanimously positive about the ultimate effects of these partnerships, the unproblematic nature of these statements would be challenged from more critical perspectives, such as those which would hold that “clothing an activity as socially responsible” (Holmqvist, 2009, p. 68) may represent a more subtle way of achieving other objectives. In the present case, this could encompass the example of corporations seeking to expand their reputation at both local and national levels by working alongside organisations such as charities. Indeed, while a debate of this magnitude would be difficult to solve here, it serves to highlight a significant flaw of the governmentality approach followed here, which is that it appears ill-equipped to address such debates around motivation which feature the possibility of vested interests. On a broader level, this resonates with Dowding’s (2006) criticism of Foucauldian theory’s tendency to consider all social relationships in “the same relativistic light” (2006, p. 136) and indeed his advocacy of Lukes’ (2005) Three-Dimensional Power on the basis of its recognition of the role played by hidden values and interests in decision making processes. The present example of corporate motives for charity partnerships could therefore be seen as one meso level issue that would benefit more from a theoretical approach of this nature.

The broader context of the Olympic Games must be seen to have had a significant influence upon these partnerships between charities and sponsors, and in the case of Cadbury’s cooperation with Groundwork UK, a Cadbury London 2012 Community Manager stated that:

Those partnerships [with Groundwork UK and other community delivery partners] had to be fluid because neither us as a business nor particularly Groundwork had ever had a partnership of that size, but that wasn’t to do with the uniqueness of the Games – well not really specifically – it was to do that those parties had never worked on such a broad scale with somebody from that different sort of organisation. We as a business – Cadbury – had never worked across the UK with a charity partner on such a wide and active scale, so that was new, and we did it because of the Olympics.
While the Olympic Games’ status as a context for the delivery of CSR will be addressed in more detail later, this statement, along with those relating to Coca-Cola’s support of StreetGames, illustrates how London 2012 stimulated corporate-charity partnerships of unprecedented scale. These relationships can be understood in terms of Giulianotti’s (2011) account of neo-liberal approaches to Sport for Development and Peace, and specifically that in which corporations have “co-opted” community-based organisations and can therefore benefit from positive publicity and place themselves in a strong position “to maximise marketing ‘yield’ from their sponsoring role and to influence the objectives, implementation and results-dissemination of SDP projects” (p. 764). This is applicable to the three examples studied here in differing ways, as while the cases of both Coca-Cola and Cadbury could be understood in similar terms, the relationship between Lloyds TSB and the Youth Sport Trust featured a less pronounced emphasis upon the sponsor’s support of the charity and a greater focus upon how it was contributing to a specific legacy goal.

A number of interviewees suggested that these co-operative partnerships between Olympic sponsors and charities could be seen as a specific legacy of London 2012. This could be understood both in terms of the wider notion of corporate-charity partnerships around a major sporting event and in the specific ways in which these were continued after the event. In the case of Coca-Cola, a senior representative reflected that the partnership with StreetGames had been a “great legacy for us”, and that this was reflected in the way it had been renewed following the expiry of the initial three-year contract between the two parties in 2012:

I know that the support that they’ve had from our business right from the top, from the very senior management, they’ve had visits from global senior leaders basically, from Coke into projects which has been fantastic. But it also then means that it garners the support internally for the partnership and it means that we were able – one of the things was that we were able to renew the partnership at the beginning of this year for another three years, so that in itself is the sort of legacy of 2012 and the fact that we’ve been able to drive the profile of the partnership both within the business and also externally as well.

This interviewee also described how discussions of a renewal were part of “a natural conversation” that took place shortly after the Games had finished, and along with the statement by a senior StreetGames representative that it came about because “we did a good job and they [Coca-Cola] believed in the value of what they were investing in”, it can be seen that this was not planned beforehand but rather a reaction to both the public engagement of the Games and the respective views of both parties on the success of their partnership. In a similar vein, the claim of a Lloyds TSB Sponsorship Manager that “we’d hope” their partnership with the Youth Sport Trust would continue beyond 2013 also demonstrates how these decisions were not planned at the outset of the agreement.
A senior representative of Groundwork UK spoke in similar terms about how their partnership with Cadbury had brought about similar ‘legacy’ benefits for the charity, including both the relationships developed with local level community organisations and the level of volunteering stimulated by the Games, which could be “built upon” in the future. This interviewee also stated that it would be possible to develop their relationship with Cadbury and that discussions about follow-up programmes were taking place at the time of the interview (March 2013). Overall, the notion that these corporate-charity partnerships represent a ‘legacy’ of the Games is problematic in relation to the framework through which Olympic legacy has been analysed here (Gratton & Preuss, 2008). While in terms of Gratton and Preuss’s (2008) legacy cube such legacies could safely be defined as unplanned, this provokes the deeper question of whether this construct of ‘planning’ should be regarded as the exclusive responsibility of ‘key’ legacy actors such as the host government and the OCOG. Indeed, the renewal of the partnerships examined here could not accurately be said to have been stimulated by any such body and can instead be seen as the responsibility of both sponsor and charity organisations alike.

A similar level of ambiguity can also be identified in the legacy cube’s description of positive and negative legacies, given the difficulty of proving how something deemed positive from one perspective can be viewed so universally. In terms of the present evidence, what is positive in a sponsor’s perspective may differ from that of the Games organisers. For example, Cadbury stated the following long term targets from their sponsorship:

To deepen our relationships with stakeholders and the community, use the association to strengthen our brand and corporate reputation, use the community activity to support our 2012 commercial programme – so how could we use community activity with partners such as Tesco to develop a closer relationship, to engage more people with the Cadbury brand and to make sure that after achieving all of those we left a very concrete and physical success factor behind, in the community legacy of 2012.

This statement outlines a number of the commercial objectives of Cadbury’s sponsorship, and the case of their ‘physical’ legacies provides a specific example of the continuation of their partnership with Groundwork UK. Here, both organisations worked to identify areas in which community facilities could be developed, such as a new cycling track at Chirk Castle in Wrexham. While such ‘physical’ legacies may overlap with broader visions for the event, these can also be seen to fulfil Cadbury’s wish to build relationships – and reputation - with local communities. As also shown by a senior StreetGames representative’s acknowledgement that “we’re doing this because it obviously benefits Coke as well”, the commercial interests involved in this part of the event’s legacy should not be disregarded.

While this issue of corporate motives for CSR activity should not be ignored, to pass judgment on this here would be to step beyond the scope of the data collected here. Rather, this analysis of corporate-
charity CSR partnerships is better understood as helping to build upon Levermore’s (2010) suggestion that sport may have a unique capacity to facilitate the delivery of CSR in communities that other development programmes may not access, as well as Dowling et al.’s (2013) conclusion that “CSR through sport initiatives does not have to benefit one organisation at the expense of another” (p. 289) – as demonstrated by how interviewees representing both types of organisation described the benefits theirs had witnessed. Furthermore, these relationships between corporations and charities around a major sporting event fulfil Dowling et al.’s (2013) call to examine different types of partnership arrangements in the delivery of CSR through sport. However, the descriptions of the partnerships examined here as potential (unplanned) ‘legacies’ (Gratton & Preuss, 2008) of the Games suggest a further dimension that should be considered in the delivery of CSR around major events – and one that is perhaps attributable to the sheer magnitude of the Games and its published need to leave a beneficial social legacy.

Overall, the governmentality perspective deployed here can be seen to help understand how partnerships between Olympic sponsors and charities can be understood within the broader social context – and associated “styles of thought” (Rose et al., 2006, p. 83) in which the Games took place. However, it can also be seen to be limited in its capacity to establish precisely how far these were influenced by the specific hidden interests and motives of both corporate and charity organisations alike. It could therefore be suggested that while governmentality represents a useful means of understanding CSR activity in relation to its wider political and ideological environment, it could therefore benefit from being deployed alongside theories better suited to uncovering the more practical roots of business decisions at the meso level.

7.2.3 Perspectives and Implications of CSR: The Right Thing?

While the previous two thematic sub-sections have focussed upon the working dynamics of CSR at London 2012, it is also important to consider how the practitioners interviewed understood this in a wider sense. This section therefore focuses upon how interviewees viewed the place of CSR in both modern business in general and their own organisations in particular.

Given the broader debates that have taken place around the philosophical basis and the practical context of CSR (Bratton & Watchter, 2008; Carroll, 1979; Friedman, 1970) it is worth considering how this was approached by the individuals interviewed. Sponsor representatives were unanimously positive about its role in modern business, as well as its implementation in their particular organisations. In response to the question of how this was understood by Coca-Cola, a senior Coca-Cola representative stated that:
We would say if we don’t have a healthy community, we don’t have a healthy business. We can’t sell our drinks – yes, we’re here to sell drinks, manufacture drinks and make profit for the shareholders as well but it’s not just all about that. We have to have a healthy community onto which we sell our drinks. We need people who are economically empowered, who are healthy in themselves and then they are able to buy our drinks. We need there to be enough water for everyone so we can manufacture our drinks simply because if there’s not enough water we don’t have a business, you know. So it’s absolutely a part and parcel of a business model now, it’s absolutely ingrained into all our business thinking and strategy right from the top. If you don’t have a healthy community in its broadest sense, you don’t have a healthy business.

Here it can be seen that CSR is primarily justified in relation to two differing applications of the concept of ‘health’ – namely that of a community and that of a business. This resonates with Marshall’s (1993) description of how “it can therefore be claimed that a successful business exists to serve the community as a whole” and that “those with a more high-minded view of ethics will claim that service of the community is really the primary aim of business” (p. 8). While this particular view may represent an idealistic extreme, it is consistent with the statement above in its emphasis upon how business and community are related to such an intimate degree that it is strategically essential for a business to consider the influence it can have upon the health of the communities that exist around it.

In a similar vein, a Cadbury London 2012 Community Manager asserted that “we as a business feel very strongly” about CSR, and also expressed this in relation to the health of the community:

> As you know Cadbury has a long heritage of supporting community activities through the Cadbury brothers, who were very active in making sure that their communities and the people who worked around them and for them had healthy lifestyles. They provided recreational facilities and educational facilities and encouragement to have healthy lifestyles. So it was very important to us, and the Cadbury name – which is synonymous with good community activity – to have some sort of clear objectives.

The need for business to be socially responsible is again linked first to the importance of community health – although here this can also be seen to be tied to the long term reputation of Cadbury as a brand. Indeed, the reference to ‘good community activity’ highlights the possibility of CSR as being born of nobler forces than business logic alone, a view that was reinforced by a Lloyds TSB sponsorship manager’s response to the same question:

> I think all big business, especially banks – we’re so big, we’re a massive employer, we’ve got presence all over the country on the high street, it very much is our responsibility and it’s about giving back in a way that people want us to and as you mentioned before, you know, we’ve got to focus on getting our house in order on our day-to-day business as well. So there’s always that balance, but absolutely it’s our place to use the resources that we have, whether that’s people, whether that’s ideas to really galvanise that sort of change.

> I think particularly for us in our industry as a bank, as a state-owned bank, it’s absolutely the right thing to do and the only way it could work.
As with the above statements about the intertwined nature of business and community health, this reference to CSR representing the ‘right thing to do’ resonates with rationales that have been presented in mainstream business literature regarding business’s role in the community (Walton, 1967; Bowen, 1953). However, while such consistency may be evident at an overarching philosophical level, the practical context of the present research – in which these businesses worked alongside charity partners - must also be considered.

Indeed, representatives of delivery partners highlighted the importance of their contributions to their organisations – both in terms of the particular CSR initiatives conducted around London 2012 and of the broader role of the private sector in supporting charity activity. For example, a senior representative of Groundwork UK stated that the support of high street brands has provided Groundwork with “vital” financial support, and that such partnerships are mutually beneficial as both organisations can “bring something to the table”. Likewise, a representative of the Youth Sport Trust highlighted that corporate partners also help in promoting an initiative because of the profile of their brand and they involvement of their employees. While these benefits are relatively straightforward, it is worth acknowledging a senior StreetGames representative’s views about relationships between business and charity organisations in the context of sport:

Is private sector investment important? Yeah, absolutely, absolutely and organisations like ours, any of the sports organisations need to understand how to cultivate those relationships with the private sector, understand what they’re trying to achieve and why, and how that fits with what they’re trying to achieve as an organisation and then do a great job of delivering. I think in some instances sport is delivered by – probably a lot of sport – is delivered by volunteers and there can often be a nervousness about professionalism and ownership when it is voluntary-led.

This shows that while the private sector can bring a number of overt, tangible benefits to sport organisations and sport events, this ‘nervousness’ suggests that these partnerships may still be viewed with suspicion by sport organisations, and that they must therefore be adeptly managed. Furthermore, this could be attributed to the fact that CSR in sport remains a relatively new phenomenon (Babiak & Wolfe, 2006; Crow & Bradish, 2002), and it is therefore unsurprising that charity organisations may be reluctant to embrace it fully. This in turn may help explain the ‘unplanned’ nature of corporate-charity partnerships described in the previous section, and it is feasible that these will become more formalised as CSR gains acceptance in relation to sport.

Indeed, the increasing formalisation of social responsibility in sport sponsorship was noted by interviewees. For example, a senior Coca-Cola representative stated that:

When I moved into this more corporate role from being in brand PR [approximately ‘seven or eight’ years before the 2013 interview], I guess probably around that time the business
imperative to be very clear around what it was doing to be a responsible, sustainable company wasn’t quite so overt.

We were still investing in physical activity programmes at grassroots level because that’s what we’ve always done ever since we started sponsoring the very high end tournaments and so on, but we probably weren’t pulling them together so specifically into a package of stories and overtly communicating them as corporate responsibility and sustainability, because I think that’s really developed over the last 10 years in terms of the rise on the agenda for businesses to be very clear about what they’re doing.

Indeed, this acknowledgement that the formal communication of CSR around sport has only developed in the last decade is consistent with the increased popularity it has witnessed in academia over this period (e.g. Walker & Kent, 2009; Smith & Westerbeek, 2007; Babiak & Wolfe, 2006). Further, this could be seen to mirror the development of CSR in the mainstream business literature, which can be seen to have moved from discussions about the underlying principles associated with CSR (e.g. Walton, 1967; Davis, 1960; Bowen, 1953) to more specific attempts to measure the social performance of corporations (e.g. Wood, 1991). In terms of the future, while a senior Coca-Cola representative stated that “you can’t go back” as there are now “expectations and disappointments if companies do just go in as badges and brands and it’s just the prawn sandwich brigade and that whole piece”, a Lloyds TSB London 2012 Sponsorship Manager pointed out that:

I think sponsorship has changed, I don’t think it’s necessarily going to stay the way it is forever, I think in another 5-10 years it might have gone back round again and it is all just about hospitality and badging branding everywhere.

I’d hope that what we’ve done is very defendable, because we have focussed on youngsters, on young athletes, on communities and you can use your sponsorship in a really positive way, whatever the general kind of feeling around your company and what you do is.

This question of how CSR will change in the future is too broad to address here, especially given the manifold ways in which it can be shaped by different contexts in sport alone (e.g. Sheth & Babiak, 2010). However, the present evidence suggests that the way it has developed in the more specific contexts of sport and the Olympic Games would appear to suggest that a degree of formalisation that would be difficult to change – although in keeping with both the complexity noted above and the previous quotation, it is difficult to anticipate how this process of formalisation will develop.

In a fashion evocative of Lagae’s (2005) call to “distinguish commercial sponsorship from corporate philanthropy” (p. 35) the starkest evidence of CSR’s growing status in sport sponsorship was provided by interviewees who sought to differentiate their ‘CSR’ deals from sponsorship. For example, a senior representative of StreetGames rationalised their partnership with Coca-Cola in the following terms:
They [Coca-Cola] invested in this programme, it wasn’t a sponsorship deal, it was a Corporate Social Responsibility deal that we did with them, so [it would be] slightly different if they wanted to go out and advertise a product like Coca-Cola then they would spend whatever they wanted to spend and go out and do that. What this was about was giving back to, or investing into, local communities – and that’s very much the way that they saw it and very much the way that we saw it as well.

Because as I say, if they wanted to, they really could’ve come in heavy-handed and say, you know, we want to really establish a brand identity for Coca-Cola within the programme that you’re delivering, you know, they could’ve come in and said all your festivals have to be headline sponsor, Coca-Cola, you know, they are now the Coca-Cola StreetGames festivals, but it wasn’t like that at all.

The emphasis placed upon ‘communities’ is evident once again, and this account was consistent with that of a senior Coca-Cola representative who was involved in managing the brand’s relationship with StreetGames:

This is not a piece of commercial marketing for us, so we’re not viewing it like that, it’s a partnership. We deliberately didn’t brand it with red Coca-Cola - it’s Coca-Cola Great Britain - so it’s our corporate branding rather than anything else that you’ll see at a festival. You will see it, but it is fairly low key, and certainly it’s not all red all over like – if you went to a big Coke event like a music festival where we were really going for it and activating it.

You know, we give them water if they’re playing sport and maybe a bit of Powerade, but we don’t give them our sugared drinks because that’s not appropriate, it’s not the right environment for that. So for us it’s just having that sensitivity of we’re not here to kind of stamp our brand around it, we’re here to add value as a partner. Yes, we’ll tell the people who attend in a fairly low key way that we’re there supporting it, but it’s also for us to be able to tell our stakeholders in a quieter way that this is what we’ve done, you know this is important to us but it’s not a piece of commercial marketing, we’re not trying to get people to buy more Coke.

In a similar vein, a Cadbury London 2012 Community Manager stated that “we didn’t do massive amounts of publicity” around community activity “because it was to give something back to the communities who needed it most” while a representative of the Youth Sport Trust representative explained that Lloyds TSB “were all about community, being the high street bank, [and] having a community feel”. Overall, each of these statements show how broader attitudes to CSR and the role of business can translate into more tangible working relationships between corporations and charities, which also represent a clear manifestation of the way that CSR activity has come to be regarded as ‘the right thing’ to do and part of ‘giving back’ to local communities. However, of particular significance here is the considerable extent to which interviewees can be seen to have defined their activities as examples of CSR instead of sponsorship or commercial activity. In a sense this is to assume a narrow perspective on precisely what constitutes sponsorship in comparison to Ferrand et al.’s (2007) definition of it as a “process that consists of obtaining something from someone in return for something else” (p. 2). Beyond this terminological debate, these claims can also be understood in terms of
Carroll’s (1979) four levels of social responsibility: economic, legal, ethical and philanthropic. Indeed, Carroll’s (1979) acknowledgement of the flexibility and overlapping nature of these levels can be seen in practice here, as the aforementioned attempts to portray these partnerships as CSR rather than sponsorship could be seen as an attempt to portray the ‘economic’ as ‘philanthropic’ – thereby conflating the first and fourth of Carroll’s (1979) levels.

In terms of this sub-section as a whole, these efforts to emphasise CSR ahead of sponsorship can be seen as a clear manifestation of the previous statements showing interviewees’ positive views of CSR and the way it has become increasingly formalised in recent years. While critics of CSR may dismiss these as attempts by corporations “to utilize the value and altruistic nature of sport to fulfil their own goals” (Carey et al., 2011, p. 259), the way that these community sport and activity events are distinguished from other commitments such as music festivals resonates with the claim that sport represents a unique setting for the delivery of CSR (e.g. Levermore, 2010; Smith & Westerbeek, 2007). However, there is a need for caution here in that while the Olympic Games could be understood in this way, to extend this assumption to sport in an entire sense is to do an injustice to the range of forms that it can take.

In seeking to understand these perspectives on CSR in relation to the analytical framework set out in the previous chapters, it is worth revisiting Vallentin and Murillo’s (2011) statement that:

In the eyes of government, CSR does not constitute a particular rationality in and by itself. Rather, it tends to be incorporated into existing policy areas and to be viewed through the lenses of already established governmental rationalities (2011, p. 10).

These authors write that the three “general rationalities that dominate governmental efforts in the field of CSR” could be termed “the economic, the social and the environmental” (2011, p. 12). Of these, the economic refers to the potential for CSR activity to increase corporate profit – and how governments can encourage this – while the social and environmental rationalities tend to become manifest in government-devised incentives and a proclaimed obligation of business to the public interest. However, the evidence presented both in the current chapter and those concerned with the macro level could be seen to demonstrate how Vallentin and Murillo’s (2011) list could be developed in the future. This can be illustrated by how each of the previous chapters featured proclamations about how Olympic sponsors were “going beyond conventional CSR activity” and “setting a template for enlightened business activity for the 21st century (DCMS, 2010, p. 10) as well as that “the world has changed and the world will change - capitalism is being redefined as the intersection between government and industry” (Immelt, cited in GE, 2008, para. 8). In other words, the impression given is that the Games represented a particular ‘moment’ at which a new level of corporate obligation became realised and
acted upon, and this sentiment is similarly evident in statements about how relationships between sponsors and charities were ‘not sponsorship’ but ‘CSR’ as discussed in the current section. In terms of the rationalities set out by Vallentin and Murillo (2011), which each approach CSR in terms of how it is encouraged or incentivised by governments, it could therefore be suggested that this acceptance of CSR will see those rationalities around it increasingly defined and initiated by the corporations themselves, although as noted above, the complex relationship between CSR and wider society means that this increasing acceptance should not be assumed to be inevitable or linear.

However, this statement could be seen to be undermined by the way it is based upon the observation of similar statements about CSR in evidence collected at the macro (Chapters 5 and 6) and meso levels. This is problematic in that the concept of governmentality does not appear well-suited to the consideration of how such attitudes may be communicated from one level of society to another. For example, in his first articulation of the term, Foucault (1994) outlined that:

In the art of government the task is to establish a continuity, in both an upward and a downward direction. Upward continuity means that a person who wishes to govern the state well must first learn how to govern himself, his goods and his patrimony, after which he will be successful in governing the state. On the other hand, we also have a downward continuity in the sense that, when a state is well run, the head of the family will know how to look after his family, his goods, and his patrimony, which means that individuals will, in turn, behave as they should. This downward line, which transmits to individual behaviour and the running of the family the same principles as the good government of the state, is just at this time beginning to be called “police” (1994, p. 206-207).

The chief limitation of this articulation of ‘continuity’ is that while the term can be seen to describe the relationship between different levels of society, it does not offer any means by which to analyse or to explain how they are constructed. In terms of the present chapter, where interviewees expressed a strong commitment to CSR in a fashion consistent with data collected at the macro level, the descriptive nature of the upward and downward ‘continuities’ set out by Foucault therefore renders it incapable of understanding both this relationship between macro and meso levels as well and the extent to which the consistency of sentiment was shaped by more complex external factors such as the unique nature of the Olympic Games.

Overall, it could therefore be argued that while this section offers some opportunities to develop the types of governmental rationalities that relate to CSR set out by Vallentin and Murillo (2011), a governmentality perspective appears incapable of satisfactorily explaining how and why – in this case - certain macro level attitudes to CSR became accepted at the meso level. In order to overcome this, future research of this nature may therefore benefit from the use of a theory that is better equipped to
do so, such as Lukes’ (2005) Three-Dimensional view of power or Crozier and Friedberg’s (1980) consideration of the role of individual actors in organisations and of organisations within systems.

### 7.2.4 Sport and the Olympic Games as a Context for CSR

Several interviewees could be seen to echo the pervasive view of sport’s potential as a vehicle for positive social change (e.g. UN, 2013; Walters, 2009; Smith & Westerbeek, 2007). For example, a LOCOG Client Services Manager emphasised its unique capacity for public engagement:

> Sport has the ability to unite people emotionally like very few things – very few other things can. Obviously there are other things that can – Royal Wedding for example, Diamond Jubilee, things like that obviously unite the country, but sport is uniquely positioned to do that.

While a LOCOG representative might reasonably be expected to hold such a positive view of sport, these sentiments were consistent with those expressed by those interviewed on behalf of certain corporate organisations. For example, a senior representative of Coca-Cola provided the following rationale for the brand’s activity within it:

> It’s [sport] a great common denominator isn’t it? It harks completely back also to what I said before as to why a brand like Coke, a huge brand like Coke, uses sport and music, the two big things that bring people together regardless of their background, regardless of their walks of life. You know they engage people, they make people feel passionate and alive, and that’s why we go in and talk to people at that time and use those - that’s why it works and people get in – get excited about sport and it gives them not only physical benefits but also mental benefits as well – of course, you know that – so yeah, it’s a huge enabler – incredible, incredible tool.

This recognition of sport as an ‘enabler’ and an ‘incredible tool’ is consistent with many common assumptions about sport’s role in society, and with the way it has been advocated as a potentially beneficial site for the delivery of CSR (Levermore, 2010; Walters, 2009; Smith & Westerbeek, 2007). However, this position should not be embraced uncritically, as although it was also endorsed by a senior representative of StreetGames, the following statement touches upon some of the inherent risks of doing so:

> We know that the evidence base for what sport can achieve is getting better and better all the time isn’t it. I think in the past it’s been quite anecdotal about the benefits of sport and so as we’re starting to prove the case, then there’s a reason for the corporate sector to invest in it.

While the evidence base for what sport can achieve is defended here, this represents a marked contrast with Morrow’s (2012) assertion that “the evidence available to back up some of the claims made for sport and hence for the impact of some of the community, social and development initiatives remains weak” (p. 104-5). Regardless of the respective merits of the two sides of this debate, such a divergence of opinion suggests a greater degree of complexity than the more enthusiastic advocates of
sport would readily admit. The following statement, made by a Lloyds TSB London 2012 Sponsorship Manager, demonstrates this further:

I think we need to be careful because sport doesn’t necessarily work like that for every young person and there are a lot of people at school who – you know – hated PE and hated that sort of thing. So I think it’s true to an extent but I wouldn’t ever want to focus solely on sport as a motivator. Saying that, I think that is what was great about the Olympic Games, because it’s not just like any other sporting event, it’s got this mass generational appeal – it appeals much more to women than a lot of other sporting events, it’s not like you know a football-or a whatever that’s very decisive. So I do believe that the Olympics with the values behind it do have that power, whereas sport on its own might not have.

Firstly, this shows that while individuals may accept the view of sport as an ideal means of communicating with broad audiences, there will be cases where individual experiences override this and a greater degree of complexity should be acknowledged – both in terms of one’s measurement of its social value and of what form or conception of sport this is applied to. Secondly – and significantly – the Olympic Games is identified here as a way of overcoming this on the basis of its appeal to a broader range of different demographic groups. Indeed, the question of how far the Olympic Games represent a unique manifestation of sport – however its social role is approached – recurred throughout the interviews and demands particular consideration.

In seeking to understand more about the Olympic Games as a site for the delivery of CSR, both the specific case of that concerning sport, activity and health promotion and the broader context of its impact and legacy as a whole merit consideration. Where the former was concerned, a senior representative of Coca-Cola stated that London 2012 gave the business “license to invest much more heavily in certain things” and could therefore represented a “catalysing effect” in that the Games represented “a huge boost for a lot of the things we would’ve done anyway, but would’ve done them much more slowly”. As an example of this, the Games was said to have offered an opportunity to focus upon social responsibility and activity participation:

It [the sport participation legacy] is really important, yes, and it was really important again to say this wasn’t just a flash in the pan, we didn’t just do this for the Olympics, actually for years we’ve supported grassroots sport but actually we’d traditionally spent a lot of our focus on football because football is obviously what came round [in the form of a World Cup or European Championships] every two years.

So I know that increasingly to have that sort of social responsibility, the piece that for us particularly is about getting people active would become even more important and would focus on the really big marketing moments that we have which is these big tournaments that come around – will be used to drive that because we have to – you know, it's an imperative for our business now.
Several references are made here to how the delivery of sport-based CSR is influenced by the nature of different major sporting events with which it may be associated. Indeed, this evidence can help to build upon Dowling et al.’s (2013) description of how previous work has “held relatively static conceptualisations of CSR through sport” (p. 270), which could be understood as one limitation of the existing literature on CSR in sport but is perhaps attributable to this area’s relative infancy. The evidence presented here helps to move beyond this in that it provides a more detailed account of how a ‘business imperative’ such as promoting activity can be delivered in relation to a one-off major sporting event. Indeed, this is closely related to the question of how far social advancements can be attributed to the hosting of the Games alone – a question that has been addressed repeatedly in literature concerning the sport and activity participation legacy of London 2012 (e.g. Wellings et al., 2011; Weed, 2010, Department for Health, 2009). In terms of how this particular issue factored into Coca-Cola’s sponsorship strategy, a senior representative stated that:

Having the Olympics in London as a home Olympics basically gives the business license to invest much more heavily in certain things. It’s like a catalysing effect, so having the Olympics here was just a huge boost for a lot of the things we would’ve done anyway, but would’ve done them much more slowly, we would’ve achieved our goals over a much longer time. Having the Olympics basically helped to get them done, make them happen in a very short timeframe because the business focuses on this market. The eyes of the world are on London for that window, it’s got to be blimmin’ good! So that is really the driver – I mean I’m sure it’s the same for a lot of other companies, you’ve got to get it right when there’s so much expectation around that relatively short amount of time.

If you can accelerate it, using a moment in time like a big World Cup or an Olympics, then great, those act as catalysing moments in a plan which remains true to its strategy but essentially just accelerates itself around those moments in time.

The message here is that the Olympics accelerate rather than stimulate certain business activity, although such specific effects on policy can be differentiated from the broader social benefits that may have been brought about by Games-related CSR. For example, a Cadbury London 2012 Community Manager reflected that:

If our programme hadn't happened, what would've happened if we didn't do our programme? It's not a life-changing experience, but what it did was, a lot of the community groups, a lot of the regional trusts from Groundwork, who used the equipment that we gave them to have fun activities, found it was such a brilliant icebreaker, so when they're going into areas where communities don't talk to each other...

...giving them something fun to do broke down people’s inhibitions, got people talking, made people from different backgrounds a lot less scary and really brought a very warm glow to these areas, and so they’re going to carry on using these games, these activities as a way of breaking down barriers and building positive relationships. I think that is really key, I could quote you stats and numbers and whatever about the programme, but the relationships in those communities have changed as a result of the Olympic-themed programme.
The sentiments expressed here resonate with Levermore’s (2010) account of how sport may have the capacity to “reach communities where communication by development institutions and politicians is regarded with suspicion” (p. 228). However, the suggestion above is that it was the association with the Olympic Games as opposed to wider ideas of sport that facilitated this here. This again demonstrates the need for more nuanced approaches to CSR and sport, as the effect of London 2012 upon this increased social interaction may be attributable to the specific way in which this particular incarnation of the Games was branded.

The evidence presented in this sub-section is consistent with the previous section to some extent in that the majority of interviewees could be seen to echo the views of both sport and the Olympic Games that were evident at the macro level. However, certain statements can also be seen to challenge macro level statements about how the Games represent a “power for good” (London 2012 Bid Company, 2004, p. 1) and how sport would be used to help “address some of the key issues our nation faces” (Jowell, cited in Davies, 2003, para. 3). Indeed, these contrast with the views of interviewees who, as noted above, expressed doubts about the social potential of sport as well as the unique effect of the Games. Indeed, this inconsistency with the sentiments published at the macro level contrasts with the previous section, where CSR was viewed favourably at both macro and meso levels.

Furthermore, and again in line with Rose et al.’s (2006) assertion that “a whole variety of authorities govern in different sites, in relation to different objectives” (p. 85), this thematic sub-section has illustrated how the Olympic Games represents a particular social context in which all ‘governing’ behaviour – such as the CSR programmes analysed here - is influenced by a range of external factors including the importance of legacy objectives and their associated complexities, the accompanying philosophy of Olympism and the timing and nature of the event. For example, in the case of Cadbury, it can be seen that despite Spots v Stripes ostensibly featuring ‘game-playing’ and ‘fun’, it can be seen to be rationalised above in terms of objectives such as ‘making people from other backgrounds less scary’, ‘breaking down social barriers’ and ‘changing relationships in communities’ – as opposed to more official legacy targets concerning participation in sport or exercise. Furthermore, the statements about the cyclical, one-off nature of the Games and the argument that this can be seen to undermine what have been described as “static conceptualisations of sport” (Dowling et al., 2013, p. 270) in the literature on sport and CSR can also be seen to have important implications for governmentality. Indeed, just as sport should not be seen as static or unchanging, a similar argument could be made at a theoretical level, in that the processes of governing addressed here would be better regarded as examples of governmentality at a particular stage in its development. Just as this chapter has argued
that governmentality should be extended to the analysis of actors such as corporations and charities, future scholarship should be expected to develop its usage in other ways.

The complex nature of the Games as a context for CSR is also evident in how its status as a one-off event means that those delivering CSR projects around it have no previous experience of doing so. It was on this note that a Lloyds TSB London 2012 Sponsorship Manager suggested what the brand may do if given another chance to sponsor the Games:

I think we’d talk about it [our sponsorship] more – and earlier, I mean it’s a difficult thing with public reaction, but we didn’t talk about things until quite late on and still I think a lot of people don’t know about NSSW and these great things that we’ve been doing so we’d shout about it a bit more, we had a lot of rights that we had bought when we signed up, and then we developed our own programmes [when] we didn’t necessarily need all that stuff, so we stuck to our vision and we delivered that but we had these additional things that we didn’t necessarily need so we just leveraged them in the simplest, easiest way, so I think with the Torch Relay you really don’t need any additional rights, just can deliver our own programmes and bring them to life during the relays, just keeping it really simple and focussed, we almost had too much.

This retrospective account further highlights the complexity of the Games as a context for the delivery of CSR. For example, the reference to ‘public reaction’ touches upon the issue of how both the Games – and all associated activity – would have been perceived by the public in the years beforehand. Indeed, it is worth remembering that London 2012 was viewed beforehand with cynicism by some (de Castella, 2012; Rohrer, 2005) even though by the time of the event it was repeatedly hailed as a resounding success in the mainstream media (e.g. Topping, 2012). Furthermore, a LOCOG Client Services manager reflected that awareness of the Games grows earlier in the host city before spreading around the nation as a whole, while a senior representative of StreetGames agreed that the Torch Relay could be pinpointed as the moment at which previously ‘slow burning’ interest in the Games transformed into a “phenomenal” sense of anticipation. While these developments are more clearly observed through the lens of hindsight, the difficulty of anticipating public perceptions beforehand can be seen to represent a further challenge posed by the unique nature of the event.

Beyond the complexity that can be linked to the sheer organisational scale of the Olympic Games, its accompanying philosophy of Olympism has also been claimed to distinguish it from other sporting events (IOC, 2013a; UN, 2008), although the difficulty of defining this clearly has been noted by academics (Chatziefstathiou, 2011; DaCosta, 2006; Parry, 2006). In order to understand more about the interpretation of Olympism in practice, the views of interviewees were sought in order to establish how it was understood by those working around London 2012. For a Lloyds TSB London 2012 Sponsorship Manager, this afforded the Games a special status:
I think that mythology and stuff around it is what makes it so special. The director of our team was out in Athens, in Greece, where the flame was lit on Mount Olympia and it's just – you know, that was a really special, emotional moment, and I think seeing the journey of the flame again, Britain is – we talked a lot to Canada, who did it [in 2010] and they were like everyone’ll be on the streets, and we were aware that the British are a bit more reserved, they’re not necessarily a cheering, happy-go-lucky crowd, but I think that they did get it and from day one in Cornwall for the torch relay they were out on the streets, so I think people do believe in that, and I think it’s really important.

This statement is consistent with both the notion of Olympism as distinguishing the Games from other sporting events and with the idea that hosting the event can have a positive effect upon national morale (Agha et al., 2011; Burgan & Mules, 1992). In line with this, Lloyds TSB’s design of NSSW provides an example of how a sponsor can translate this into a specific CSR initiative, as described by a representative of the Youth Sport Trust:

[For] NSSW – we designed a programme so that schools would embed the values – the Olympic and Paralympic values – so all our resources were around the Olympic Games. Everything around the programme was about the Olympic Games and now it’s more about the legacy and the ethos of sport in schools rather than the Olympic Games. So without it, I don’t think as many schools would be involved, we’ve had up to 22,000 schools register over the last four years for the programme – that’s massive. That’s nine million young people, so I don’t think it would have had quite the impact had the Olympic Games not been involved.

Although it can be seen that the special ethos of the Games is stated to have benefitted the delivery of NSSW and education across the curriculum, the Youth Sport Trust representative’s description of how this is now “more about the legacy and ethos of sport” instead of the Games points to another challenge faced by domestic Olympic sponsors. Specifically, the fact that the partnership between these organisations and the Games finishes at the end of the year of the event itself means that any associated CSR initiatives are therefore unable to retain the commercial rights to use Olympic marks and logos. In terms of the present example, this means that the focus of NSSW had to be widened from the Olympics to sport in general. Any perceived benefit resulting from its association with Olympism would therefore be lost, which in turn provokes the question of how far this truly separates the Games from mainstream sport. For a senior StreetGames representative, this distinction was difficult to specify:

I guess those two things, that and Olympism are kind of hand in glove really so I don’t know whether I would be able to say for our programme specifically whether you notice a tangible difference because we’re always trying to achieve that anyway, and whether the Olympics were here or not we always see those kinds of results with the young people we’re working with on a regular basis. Either we start having a little kick-around with them in one place in their lives and over the course of our engagement with them, that changes and develops – they get better at sport, they get better academically, they get healthier, they engage more with society, ultimately what we’re hoping for from them is that they’re a net contributor to society economically, so that they’re either volunteering or they’re working or they’re not a drain on state resources.
This statement blurs the distinction between sport and the purportedly unique philosophy of Olympism, and resonates with broader debates about the difficulty of attributing specific legacy effects to the Games (e.g. Wellings et al., 2011; Weed, 2010, Department for Health, 2009) as well as the broader assumption that sport participation can improve an individuals’ ability to function in society (McEvoy, 2010; Smith & Westerbeek, 2007).

Overall, this thematic sub-section has illustrated how the Olympic Games’ suitability as a context for the delivery of CSR is shaped by a number of factors, including wider assumptions about sport, its cyclical nature, the debate around legacy measurement and attribution and the accompanying philosophy of Olympism. Of these, only the event’s cyclical nature has received significant attention in research on CSR in sport:

Given the very cyclical nature of major sporting events, and congruent with the mega-event decision-making literature timing and context matters, with sport being inherently more attractive in the lead up to mega-events. This research shows that that there may be better times than others for sport organisations to seek CSR and partnership arrangements – a theoretical consideration that has yet to receive any scholarly attention (Dowling et al., 2013, p. 288).

Just as the Games’ cyclical nature was noted here as shaping the delivery of CSR around the Games, the other factors listed alongside this above can be taken together to demonstrate a level of complexity that significantly undermines the “static conceptualisations of sport” (Dowling et al., 2013, p. 270) that have characterised previous academic work on CSR in sport.

This chapter has suggested that one advantage of governmentality – in the terms set out by Miller and Rose (1990) and Vallentin and Murillo (2011) lies in its capacity to help understand business activity such as CSR in relation to its wider social context. However, as was apparent in the previous section, it is less clear as to how it can satisfactorily explain the ways that macro level rationalities are interpreted at the meso level and vice versa. Governmentality theory approaches these relationships between levels of society through the concept of continuity (Foucault, 1994), although as was expressed in the previous section, this appears more suited to description than explanation. This problem is even starker in the current section, given both the way that certain interviewees either doubted or rejected macro level constructions of sport and Olympism, as well as the ways in which these attitudes should be understood in relation to the other environmental factors associated with the Olympic Games that have been listed above.

Indeed, even though more recent writers have considered governmental continuity in relation to other social institutions, this same line of criticism is difficult to refute. For example, Spivakovsky (2006) links the concept to a range of social institutions:
Through the different mechanisms and technologies (economy) used at every social level (government – government institutions – non-government institutions – family- individual) a continuity can occur between the individual and the government. Moreover such continuity should be both upward in direction, where the individual manages themselves in such a way that they positively affect all that surrounds them, leading to a prosperous state; and also downward in direction, where the state manages itself in such a way that it allows new ways of being for the individual to consider for their own self-management, which are in line with both the state’s and the individual’s interests (2006, p. 4).

Here, Spivakovsky (2006) appears to imply a linear continuity between ‘government’ and the ‘individual’, with other social institutions placed in between but – as described in relation to Foucault (1994) previously - does not explain how the process takes place. Furthermore, this linearity could be seen to be excessively narrow in the sense that no consideration is given to how a ‘prosperous state’ is ensured among different entities at the same level of society. On a broader level, this lack of subtlety can be seen as symptomatic of the limitations of governmentality at the meso level that have been outlined in this chapter – a subtlety that is particularly evident given the roles of public, private and charity organisations in governing alongside each other as has been demonstrated here, and one that perhaps suggests a need to update the concept to suit the dynamic complexity of modern business..

The purpose of sponsorship itself. However, beyond this discussion of how corporations may ‘govern’ – and in accordance with its underpinning logic – the evidence presented here also demonstrates how this flexible understanding of governmentality can similarly be applied to the role of charity organisations that worked in partnership with sponsors. The role of LOCOG in overseeing and moderating sponsor activity could also be understood in similar terms, while also demonstrating how no one body could be construed as holding power over others to a dominant extent (Foucault, 1978b). It would therefore appear more accurate to regard ‘governing’ as a form of behaviour exhibited by any actor in a broader matrix of governance as opposed to the exclusive preserve of specific organisations. The second overarching point here concerns the way that while the governmentality perspective used here (Vallentin & Murillo, 2011; Miller & Rose, 1990) proved useful in understanding the relationships between the macro level discourse of ‘official legacy actors’ and corporate partners, it was less beneficial in seeking to understand how macro level attitudes to themes such as CSR and the status of sport and Olympism were interpreted at the meso level, with the notion of ‘continuity’ (Foucault, 1994) proving too descriptive and linear to achieve this. This was particularly apparent in its inability to help comprehend hidden interests that might have shaped the corporate attitudes to CSR expressed here, which could ultimately be seen as better approach with alternative theories – perhaps alongside Foucault- that would be more capable of achieving this at the meso level.
In terms of the project as a whole, the analysis presented in this chapter provides further – and more specific - insight into the broader discourses that were examined previously in Chapters 6 and 7. As the current chapter represents the last of three stages of data collection, the following chapter presents the conclusion to the project, in which the primary intention is to understand the analysis and findings presented in Chapters 5, 6 and 7 in relation to the theoretical, empirical and methodological frameworks established in Chapters 2, 3 and 4 – and to highlight both the empirical and theoretical contributions of the study.

7.3 Chapter Conclusion
The purpose of this chapter was to understand more about the dynamics of how sponsor-led CSR activity was organised in relation to the roles of other organisations and how individuals involved in this process articulated both the wider role of business in society and the London 2012 Olympics as a particular context. Drawing upon data from seven interviews involved in the design and delivery of CSR schemes organised by sponsors, four distinct themes were established. The first of these concerned the co-operation between sponsors and other organisations such as LOCOG and public sector bodies in the delivery of CSR. On a similar note, the second thematic section explored the ways that sponsors co-operated with charity organisations, and how far this could be seen to represent a particular legacy of the Games. The third of these sections addressed interviewees’ perspectives upon CSR and how far this is the ‘right thing’ to do, and the fourth focused upon how interviewees conceived of both sport and the Olympic Games as specific contexts for the delivery of CSR. Summaries of this chapter’s main empirical and theoretical contributions are provided in the following two sub-sections.

7.3.1 Empirical Summary
Firstly, the way that interviewees overwhelmingly echoed the emphatically positive statements about CSR’s place in contemporary business were consistent with the macro level public and private sector discourse examined in Chapters 5 and 6 – an emphasis that was most apparent here in the claim that the activations examined here represented ‘CSR’ rather than ‘sponsorship’. Secondly, the specific context of the London 2012 Olympics was shown to illustrate a number of factors that served to demonstrate how what Dowling et al. (2013) have described as a focus on “static conceptualisations of sport” in CSR and sport literature to be misplaced – despite the way that data primarily supported the view that sport represents a special vehicle for CSR to access deprived communities (Levermore, 2010; Smith & Westerbeek, 2007). The first of these concerned the working relationships between sponsors, LOCOG and other sponsors in the design and delivery of CSR, which was consistent with Séguin et al.’s (2010) assertion that sport event organisers must consider the role of specific situational factors in seeking to attract sponsors to an event. Second, the way that relationships between sponsors and
charity delivery partners of CSR initiatives were described as a potential (unplanned) legacy of the event (Gratton & Preuss, 2008) demonstrated both the complex nature of the event as a site for CSR and supported Dowling et al.’s (2013) call to consider CSR partnerships that benefit neither party at the other’s expense. Third, and lastly, both the cyclical nature of the Games and the issues of legacy and measurement associated with its legacy represent two examples of factors that must be acknowledged in considering the event as a site for CSR.

7.3.2 Theoretical Summary
Two key theoretical points can be made about this chapter as a whole. Firstly, the dynamics of CSR’s design and delivery examined here can be seen as consistent with the argument that corporate organisations should be regarded as ‘governing’ in the same sense that the state might be — in line with the understanding of governmentality proposed by Moss (1988). This was demonstrated here by how sponsors could be seen to be viewed as ‘legitimate’ (McNay, 1994) deliverers of social initiatives and as actively defining ‘governable spaces’ (Vallentin & Murillo, 2011) among each other in order to enable sponsorship to ‘stand out’ in a crowded environment, which could indeed be understood as the original purpose of sponsorship itself. However, beyond this discussion of how corporations may ‘govern’ — and in accordance with its underpinning logic — the evidence presented here also demonstrates how this flexible understanding of governmentality can similarly be applied to the role of charity organisations that worked in partnership with sponsors. The role of LOCOG in overseeing and moderating sponsor activity could also be understood in similar terms, while also demonstrating how no one body could be construed as holding power over others to a dominant extent (Foucault, 1978b). It would therefore appear more accurate to regard ‘governing’ as a form of behaviour exhibited by any actor in a broader matrix of governance as opposed to the exclusive preserve of specific organisations. The second overarching point here concerns the way that while the governmentality perspective used here (Vallentin & Murillo, 2011; Miller & Rose, 1990) proved useful in understanding the relationships between the macro level discourse of ‘official legacy actors’ and corporate partners, it was less beneficial in seeking to understand how macro level attitudes to themes such as CSR and the status of sport and Olympism were interpreted at the meso level, with the notion of ‘continuity’ (Foucault, 1994) proving too descriptive and linear to achieve this. This was particularly apparent in its inability to help comprehend hidden interests that might have shaped the corporate attitudes to CSR expressed here, which could ultimately be seen as better approach with alternative theories — perhaps alongside Foucault- that would be more capable of achieving this at the meso level.

In terms of the project as a whole, the analysis presented in this chapter provides further — and more specific - insight into the broader discourses that were examined previously in Chapters 6 and 7. As the
current chapter represents the last of three stages of data collection, the following chapter presents the conclusion to the project, in which the primary intention is to understand the analysis and findings presented in Chapters 5, 6 and 7 in relation to the theoretical, empirical and methodological frameworks established in Chapters 2, 3 and 4 – and to highlight both the empirical and theoretical contributions of the study.
Chapter 8: Conclusion

8.1 Overall Conclusions and Contributions to Knowledge

8.1.1 Background

Sport’s purported potential as a vehicle for the delivery of CSR has only begun to receive significant academic attention in the last decade (e.g. Babiak & Wolfe, 2013; Bradish & Cronin, 2009; Godfrey, 2009; Crow & Bradish, 2002). Much of its advocacy in this regard is premised upon an assumption, evident in both academic and popular discourse, that certain characteristics of sport pose it as a particularly powerful tool to achieve a range of social objectives (e.g. Smith & Westerbeek, 2007), although it has also been acknowledged that these positive characteristics stand alongside a number of others that are less desirable (Godfrey, 2009). However, despite this implicit relationship between sport’s practical value as a site for CSR and the underlying assumptions on which this is based, research around CSR and sport has tended to focus primarily upon specific issues such as relationships between CSR delivery and corporate financial performance (Inoue et al., 2011) and consumer attitudes to CSR (Walker and Kent, 2009). In line with calls to focus upon broader environmental influences on CSR (Séguin et al., 2010) and to move beyond “static conceptualisations of sport” (Dowling et al, 2013, p. 270), this study therefore sought to examine CSR in the specific social context of a major sporting event; the London 2012 Olympic Games. Following Crane et al. (2008), CSR is understood here as any corporate activity that could be seen as intended for the benefit of society – regardless of whether this is fulfilled or whether it is labelled as such. Indeed, London 2012 represented a particularly worthwhile setting for research of this orientation given the unparalleled public engagement of the Games (Henry, 2011) as well as its formalised desire to bring about a positive social legacy (IOC, 2013a), of which for London 2012 the “first priority” was to make the UK a “world-leading sporting nation” (DCMS, 2008, p. 3), with one strand of this priority being a target of two million people more active by the year of the Games. With this background, the overall aim of this study was to understand more about sport - and the Olympic Games - as a site for the delivery of CSR, using the specific social context of private sector sponsor-led CSR schemes based upon the sport and physical activity participation legacy of London 2012. On this note, it is worth clarifying that the study can best be understood as being primarily concerned with CSR – and therefore using both sport and the Olympic Games as a specific context in which to analyse this. Furthermore, in order to better understand the complex social context represented by the Games and its legacy a Foucauldian governmentality framework (Miller & Rose, 1990; Rose & Miller, 1992; Vallentin & Murillo, 2011) was also deployed. This overarching aim was approached in terms of three distinct but related objectives,
8.1.2 Research Objectives and Conclusions

The first aim of the research was to establish the broader social and political context in which London 2012 took place as a site for the delivery of CSR, based upon how the proclaimed sport and physical activity participation legacy was constructed by 'official legacy actors'. Four distinct themes were established among the documentary data examined here, which each contribute to a complex context for the delivery of CSR relating to this strand of the event’s legacy. The first of these concerned the inconsistency between the ways both sport and physical activity were defined and promoted over time by different organisations. The second theme centred upon the use of intangible qualities such as ‘power’ and ‘inspiration’ and how these were deployed – again inconsistently – in material advocating the potential effect of the Games upon sport and activity participation. Thirdly, the abandonment of the DCMS’s official participation goals in 2011 was shown to feature a range of contradictions around issues such as the measurement and definition of legacy, the debate around which demographics should be targeted and supply-side debates concerning provision for sport and activity participation. Finally, the fourth theme showed how, based upon broader statements of the UK Government around the role of business in public life, the bodies delivering the Games could be seen to be in favour of corporations contributing towards the event’s legacy to an extent not previously seen (DCMS, 2010).

Overall, these four themes can be taken together to illustrate a context that is discursively complex and inconsistent yet – owing to the attitudes published by official legacy actors – conducive to the extensive social contribution of business. This in turn supports the call of Séguin et al.’s call (2010) to consider the role of broader environmental factors in shaping an event as attractive for corporate activity.

With this broader social context established, the second aim of the project was to establish how CSR activity around the London 2012 Olympic legacy was justified and rationalised by private sector sponsors, and to investigate how programmes involving sport and activity participation were promoted. This was conducted in two stages, with the first focusing upon the wider ways in which sponsors rationalised CSR activity and the second narrowing its focus to how six selected sponsors articulated CSR programmes based around sport and activity. In the first stage, it was shown that although sponsors could be seen to interpret the values and status of the Olympic Games in a variety of ways, there was a general appreciation that London 2012 – and its legacy represented a significant moment in the delivery of CSR via sport. This was most evident in how sponsors could be seen to justify their activity around the legacy of the Games in terms of a need to do ‘the right thing’ and to ‘go beyond’ primary concerns of sponsorship such as financial profit and brand awareness. In the second stage,
discourse around the promotion of sport and activity-based CSR schemes was organised into three primary themes; a focus upon engineering positive social change in communities defined as ‘deprived or disadvantaged’, an emphasis upon the inducement of ‘play’, psychological well-being and enjoyment as opposed to physical health and fitness goals that might more commonly be associated with sport, and finally – but to a lesser extent – the use of the Olympic Values and how the Games represented a special opportunity for social advancement. Overall, this chapter therefore demonstrated that CSR activity was promoted primarily in intangible terms relating to constructs such as community development and individual happiness as opposed to more measurable outcomes of sport and activity participation such as health or fitness. Furthermore, the social extent of the CSR activity advocated by sponsors was consistent with the claims of official legacy actors about how the Games represented an unprecedented moment in the contribution of business to society.

Finally, the third aim of the project was to understand more about the dynamics of how sponsor-led CSR activity was organised in relation to the roles of other organisations and how individuals involved in this process articulated both the wider role of business in society and the London 2012 Olympics as a particular context for its delivery. Data collected at this stage was ultimately organised into four themes. Of these, the first concerned the working relationships between sponsors and other organisations involved in the delivery of CSR, including both LOCOG and other sponsors. In the case of LOCOG it was shown that the organisers took more of a supervisory role while where other sponsors were concerned it was established that sponsors would communicate among each other to best establish specific areas of focus for CSR in a crowded environment. The second theme related closely to this, and concerned the ways that CSR was delivered in partnerships between sponsors and charity organisations, and most significantly the claim that the possibility of these continuing into the future represented a potential legacy of the event. The third theme here concerned interviewees’ perceptions of CSR, and the overriding impression echoed those expressed in the previous two stages in that representatives of corporations and charities alike viewed the social contribution of business as essential in modern society, and that this had become increasingly formalised over time. The clearest example of this growth of CSR was found in how several interviewees sought to stress how the specific partnerships they had worked on were purely CSR and not sponsorship activities. Finally, the fourth theme concerned interviewees’ perceptions of both sport and the Olympic Games as a context for the delivery of CSR. The views expressed here were more varied than the emphatic statements examined at the macro level, with a range of external factors associated with the Games being cited as significant influences upon the design of CSR around the event. These included the measurement of legacy, the cyclical nature of the Games and the accompanying philosophy of Olympism. Overall, this chapter
shows how the sheer magnitude of the Games provides a clear example of the complex range of factors that can influence the design and delivery of CSR, while still supporting the macro level attitudes about its place in society.

8.1.3 Empirical Contributions
This study’s primary empirical contributions are to the literature on CSR and sport. Each of these can be linked to the overall way in which the project has demonstrated that CSR must be understood as a complex social phenomenon. Firstly, building upon Dowling et al. (2013), the findings of this research help to move beyond what have been described as the “static conceptualisations of sport” (p. 270) that have been said to have characterised studies of sport and CSR. This is most readily apparent in the way that the cyclical nature of the event was held to have shaped the delivery of CSR in ways that have not previously been recognised. Beyond this, this study also builds upon Dowling et al.’s (2013) suggestions that CSR partnerships should not be viewed in exclusively dyadic terms – given the number of different organisations shown to play a role here - and that there is the potential for both parties to benefit from CSR partnerships around the Games – as the views expressed by representatives of both corporations and charities here demonstrate. These complexities can also help to develop the characteristics of sport advanced by Smith and Westerbeek (2007), which were reflected in some of the data collected here but by no means universally, although the statements of both sponsor and charity representatives could be seen to confirm these authors’ contention that sport represents a unique setting for CSR. Beyond this, the research also supports Séguin et al.’s (2010) identification of the need for organisers of sports events to be aware of “unique situational factors”– such as the wider attitudes to CSR examined in Chapter 5 – as well as the need to position an event as “socially responsible” (p. 217) in order to attract sponsors, and builds upon this by attempting to understand the behaviour of the organisers of this particular event in its wider social context.

Aside from these specific contributions to the literature on CSR, the social complexity of this particular topic means that other related fields can benefit from the findings of the present study. Firstly, while sponsorship can still be regarded as an “exchange process between two parties” (Ferrand et al., 2007, p. 2), the findings presented here indicate that, in sport, this is a process in which the role of CSR has increased in extent, expectation and formality. Secondly, the future study of Olympic legacy could be strengthened from a greater consideration of the roles that private sector organisations can play in both bringing this about and discursively constructing what it represents, which is presently not recognised by models such as Gratton and Preuss’s (2008) legacy cube and work on how Olympic legacies are
discursively constructed (e.g. Leopkey & Parent, 2012b, MacAlloon, 2008). Thirdly, while the evidence presented here supports the view that Olympism can be interpreted in varying ways (Chatziefstathiou, 2011; DaCosta, 2006; Parry, 2006), it can be seen to add to this by offering new knowledge of how Olympism and the Olympic Values are both defined in relation to CSR by sponsors in documentary output and interpreted at the meso level by individuals involved in the design and delivery of CSR.

8.1.4 Theoretical Contributions

Foucault has always been a difficult writer to approach, not because his language is convoluted or his concepts elusive, but because of the anti-disciplinary structure of his work. His ideas do not map onto the conventional disciplinary structures – partly as a result of his interest in how those disciplinary modes of discourse were themselves created as systems of power relations. As a result, Foucault’s work has been an inviting source of concepts and ideas for sociologists, but one whose implications have been difficult to integrate (Hamilton, 1985, p. 9).

It is in keeping with the sentiments expressed by Hamilton (1985) here, and indeed the way Foucault’s work in general is said to be difficult to classify with any consistency (Andrews, 1993) that the theoretical contributions offered here can best be understood. This is because they could be seen in themselves as an attempt to move away from the ‘conventional structures’ that could metaphorically be argued to have characterised scholarship on governmentality. This is especially applicable to the first set of contributions, which represents an effort to move away from the prescriptive use of governmentality in two particular ways. The first of these concerns what Roy (1997) has described as the way that the business corporation has managed to “escape the sword of liberalizing egalitarianism” (p. 46) that has been primarily used for analyses of the state, as well as McNay’s (1994) observation that there is not necessarily a relationship between casual strategies of governance and “a centralized state power” (p. 118). That is, as demonstrated in Chapter 5 in the extent to which the DCMS (2010) can be seen to have emphasised the social role of business, in Chapter 6 in how sponsors justified the extent of this social contribution and in Chapter 7 in how not just sponsors but also charity organisations and LOCOG could be seen as different actors in a wider matrix of governance, governing is better regarded as a ‘behaviour’ that can be exhibited by any as opposed to belonging primarily to one centralised or dominant power. The second of these contributions – from a similar logical basis – proposes that rather than assuming that ‘governmentality’ represents an essentially negative mode of control (Hamann, 2009; Heynen et al., 2007; Bondi, 2005), it is better understood in accordance with Dean’s (1999) description of “any more or less calculated activity” (p. 18). This is most apparent in Chapter 5 in how sport participation can be phrased in terms of ‘reward’ as easily as ‘risk’ and in how the DCMS’s official sporting legacy targets were abandoned.
Beyond this, two further points can be made about the analytical framework of governmental rationalities, programmes and technologies (Miller & Rose, 1990; Rose & Miller, 1992; Vallentin & Murillo, 2011) that was adopted here. Firstly, this can be seen to have provided a useful means for helping to understand both how certain policies (programmes) may ultimately ‘fail’ despite enjoying discursive dominance at the level of rationalities. Secondly, it also helps illustrate how both private and public sector bodies can design programmes in relation to the same overarching rationality. However, in Chapter 7 it became apparent that while this framework may be helpful at the macro level, it is less capable of establishing how and why certain discourses become accepted or rejected at the meso level. It therefore appears fair to suggest that governmentality studies may benefit from drawing upon alternative theoretical approaches at the meso level.

Beyond these advancements to specific areas of theory and research, it is also intended that this research can contribute to the field of sport studies and sociology in broader ways. The first of these concerns the way that governmentality is deployed here not with the assumptions that modes of governing are inherently negative (Ferguson, 2009) or exclusive to state organisations (Roy, 1997) but instead with the recognition that ‘governing’ represents a complex set of behaviours that should not be approached with any such deterministic preconceptions. While this contribution applies most directly to studies drawing upon governmentality, this is by no means an exclusive application – and it appears reasonable to suggest that other theories that are commonly applied to social research on sport could be utilised in similar ways. Furthermore, the second more general contribution of this thesis can be seen to lie in its concluding call for the need for greater sophistication in appreciating the social complexity of CSR. While the specific contributions this can make to work on CSR in sport have been outlined above, it can also be suggested that the complexity identified in relation to CSR here could be similarly evident in related concepts in the sport management literature, and that this should therefore be considered more readily in future research. Indeed, it should also be recognised that this complexity was rendered easier to approach because of the governmentality perspective that was used. This could be seen to demonstrate both the applicability of governmentality to the social complexity of sport as well as the value of applying social theory to explicitly ‘managerial’ concepts such as CSR.

8.2 Limitations and Directions for Future Research

8.2.1 Methodological and Empirical

At a practical level, this study was primarily limited by the practical difficulty of arranging interviews with relevant individuals, in line with the problems of access described by Jarvis (2007). Although the roles of the individuals who were interviewed were all deemed to be satisfactory, this issue was most apparent in the cases of the UK Government and Sport England, of whom neither agreed to participate
in the project. The case of Sport England is particularly significant in that the organisation refused to take part after being made aware of the focus and nature of the research. This therefore lays bare the need for future research of this nature to ensure that all relevant individuals can be accessed and are approached in a way that informs prospective interviewees of the work being undertaken without deterring them from wanting to be interviewed.

On an empirical level, the project can also be seen to be limited in that no data collection was conducted at the micro level – which was primarily attributable to the increased temporal and financial commitments that this would have demanded in relation to the overall timescale of the research. The collection of micro level data could have strengthened the project overall by providing a more comprehensive account of how the CSR schemes examined were experienced at a local level. Future studies on CSR could therefore seek to overcome this by collecting data at all three levels in order to obtain a clearer picture of how the macro level discourses and trends that were shown to shape CSR here are ultimately interpreted by those individuals at whom such initiatives are targeted.

More broadly, there is also the important issue of how this study can be seen to apply to other major sporting events. Indeed, given this study's heavy emphasis upon the broader social context in which London 2012 was worked towards and delivered, it must accordingly be recognised that the CSR schemes examined here could not necessarily be approached in the same way in relation to a Games held a host nation with a significantly differing political and economic environment such as China– as consideration must be given to how these differences could shape the delivery of CSR. It is therefore important to regard this study as one of CSR within the specific social context of London 2012, and any comparisons to other incarnations of the Games should therefore be made with these considerations in mind.

Although the timescale of this project did not permit it, future research could also benefit from analysing the contribution of sponsors from a longer term perspective. This is particularly significant given Gratton and Preuss’s (2008) assertion that it takes “15-20 years to measure the true legacy of an event such as the Olympic Games” (p. 1933), and while this may be excessive in terms of CSR, lengthening the scope of the study like this would provide further insight into the effects of sponsor-led CSR initiatives over time. On a related note, the way that sponsors behave in relation to CSR initiatives they have organised following their termination of their partnership with the Games also merits attention. In the case of domestic sponsors of the Summer Games, the rights of association with the Games expire at the end of the year in which the event takes place. This poses obvious questions about how CSR activity is approached after this point, which could in turn be answered in future research.
8.2.2 Theoretical
This study’s use of one theoretical approach alone could be regarded as a limitation that is exposed by the fact that data collection took place at both the macro and meso levels. As noted in Chapter 7 as well as the present chapter, this was most apparent in attempting to understand how macro level discourses were interpreted by actors at the meso level. In line with the scales of observation set out by Desjeux (1996) it may therefore have been more insightful to have deployed two (or more) different theories at the two levels, with additional ones being selected either by virtue of their potential use at specific levels, or on the basis of their capacity to understand specific processes of translation between them – which relates to how this study was more specifically limited by the use of Foucault’s (1994) governmentality at the meso level. Although the use of a more suitable perspective for this level was impractical here given the extra time that would have been required, this can be seen as a clear way that future research of this nature could be strengthened.

8.2.3 A Final Caveat
Just as dominant ways of thinking in more established disciplines such as the natural sciences can be seen to have evolved considerably (e.g. Foucault, 1963) over time, and to such an extent that yesterday’s wisdom would invite ridicule today, the issue of CSR in sport should be seen in the same terms, especially given its relatively brief history. It is therefore intended that this study is understood as an account of CSR (in relation to sport) at one particular stage in its development as opposed to a set of claims around it that are intended to hold true in eternity.
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Appendix 1: Interview Guide

Background Information

What was your role in relation to CSR at London 2012?
What did this involve?
How long were you in this role for?
Are you still in the same role?

Dynamics of partnerships between sponsors and charities

What CSR initiatives were you involved in the delivery of?
Which other organisations did you communicate/cooperate with around the delivery of these initiatives?
Did these initiatives bring about the outcomes that you intended/expected them to or were there any that you had not previously considered?
If not – and possibly given the unique nature of the Olympic Games - was any adjustment required from your original vision?
If you were to deliver CSR around the Olympic Games again, would you do anything differently?
Are you continuing this/these legacy-based initiative(s) after the Games? How long do you intend/want this/these continue for?

Perceptions of CSR

Does business have a responsibility to the communities in which they operate?
How would you say that the CSR/the role of business have developed over time?
How can you see CSR developing in the future?

Perceptions of sport/Olympic Games as context for CSR

How do you regard sport as a vehicle for the delivery of CSR?
The Olympic Games is a unique event and is unlikely to take place in the UK again in the foreseeable future. Did the unique nature of the event have any effect upon your sponsorship of it?

Academics concerned with the Olympics often talk about ‘Olympism’ and the Olympic Values which refer to the ‘unique’ philosophy that accompanies the Games. Over the course of your experience working around the Games, have you seen any evidence of its influence in practice?
## Appendix 2: Summary of Documents used in Second Stage of Data Collection

### Printed Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Document Title</th>
<th>Year of Publication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>adidas (produced by The Great Outdoor Gym Company)</td>
<td>adiZones- leaving an Olympic legacy</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adidas (produced by The Great Outdoor Gym Company)</td>
<td>The adiZone programme: A team effort</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adidas (produced by Youth Sport Trust)</td>
<td>Young ambassadors: At their best presented by adidas</td>
<td>Not dated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BT</td>
<td>Towards a one planet Olympic and Paralympic Games</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadbury</td>
<td>Cadbury Spots v Stripes community impact report 2011</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coca-Cola</td>
<td>London 2012: Our sustainability legacy</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coca-Cola</td>
<td>The Coca-Cola Company: London 2012 sustainability policy</td>
<td>Not dated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coca-Cola</td>
<td>London 2012: The one planet centre</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deloitte</td>
<td>This is it: Our London 2012 story</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE</td>
<td>GE corporate citizenship</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE</td>
<td>GE and the Olympics back grounder</td>
<td>Not dated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lloyds TSB</td>
<td>Get involved in London 2012: A guide to how we’re bringing the Games closer to you</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDonald’s (produced by Marketing Society Awards for Excellence 2013)</td>
<td>We all make the Games</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDonald’s</td>
<td>McDonald’s Champions of Play</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Cook</td>
<td>The London 2012 Games: Our most amazing destination yet</td>
<td>Not dated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Primary Websites Used

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Website</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acer</td>
<td>acer-group.com</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coca-Cola</td>
<td><a href="http://www.coca-cola.co.uk">www.coca-cola.co.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dow</td>
<td>olympicpartnership.dow.com</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icountge.co.uk">http://www.icountge.co.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE</td>
<td><a href="http://www.genewscenter.com">www.genewscenter.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDonald's</td>
<td><a href="http://www.aboutmcdonalds.com">www.aboutmcdonalds.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDonald's</td>
<td>news.mcdonalds.com</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P&amp;G</td>
<td><a href="http://news.pg.com">http://news.pg.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMW</td>
<td>london2012.bmw.co.uk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP</td>
<td><a href="http://www.bp.com">www.bp.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BT</td>
<td><a href="http://www.btplc.com">www.btplc.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDF Energy</td>
<td><a href="http://www.edfenergy.com">www.edfenergy.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lloyds TSB</td>
<td><a href="http://www.lloydsbankinggroup.com">www.lloydsbankinggroup.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lloyds TSB</td>
<td><a href="http://www.lloydsbankwealthofideas.co.uk">http://www.lloydsbankwealthofideas.co.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lloyds TSB</td>
<td><a href="https://www.schoolsportweek.org">https://www.schoolsportweek.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adecco</td>
<td><a href="http://www.adecco.co.uk">www.adecco.co.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadbury</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cadbury.co.uk">www.cadbury.co.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cisco</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cisco.com">www.cisco.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deloitte</td>
<td><a href="http://www.deloitte.com">www.deloitte.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Around the Rings</td>
<td>aroundtherings.com</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inside the Games</td>
<td><a href="http://www.insidethegames.biz">www.insidethegames.biz</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing Week</td>
<td><a href="http://www.marketingweek.co.uk">www.marketingweek.co.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport Industry Group</td>
<td><a href="http://www.sportindustry.biz/">www.sportindustry.biz/</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>