

University of Windsor

Scholarship at UWindsor

Human Kinetics Publications

Faculty of Human Kinetics

2013

Social sustainability of non-mega sport events in a global world

Marijke Taks

University of Windsor

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.uwindsor.ca/humankineticspub>



Part of the [Kinesiology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Taks, Marijke. (2013). Social sustainability of non-mega sport events in a global world. *European Journal for Sport and Society*, 10 (2), 121-141.

<https://scholar.uwindsor.ca/humankineticspub/27>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty of Human Kinetics at Scholarship at UWindsor. It has been accepted for inclusion in Human Kinetics Publications by an authorized administrator of Scholarship at UWindsor. For more information, please contact scholarship@uwindsor.ca.

Vol. 10/No. 2, 2013

ejss

*European Journal for
Sport and Society*

edited on behalf of the European Association
for Sociology of Sport (eass)

**Sport in globalised
societies – Changes
and challenges**

Special issue guest editors:

*Sandra Günter, Yvonne Weigelt-Schlesinger
& Torsten Schlesinger*

WAXMANN

Social sustainability of non-mega sport events in a global world¹

Marijke Taks^{1, 2}

¹University of Windsor, Canada

²Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, Belgium

Abstract: This contribution offers a theoretical perspective on the social impacts of sport events. Most research in this area has focused on global mega sport events (MSEs). However, given the fact that there are many more, smaller non-mega sport events (NMSEs) being organised in this global world, the paper calls for a reflection on how these smaller types of events can potentially contribute to benefit residents of local communities. The paper contrasts and compares social impacts and outcomes of both, MSEs and NMSEs, using four different perspectives: power relations, urban regeneration, socialisation, and human capital. There is reason to believe that NMSEs may be more relevant in creating durable benefits for host communities, as compared to MSEs. This is explained through the concept of social capital. Because NMSEs are omni-present, they may provide more lasting global benefits. The paper calls for a broader research agenda focussing on the true value of small and medium sized sport events for local communities.

Keywords: human capital, power relations, social capital, socialisation, urban regeneration

We live in an era where borders between countries are fading. Products and (most) people have the ability to move freely in this global world. Traveling and moving around the world changes ones understanding and perspective of the meaning of sport in society. In addition, a deeper understanding of the repercussions of the size of a country on sport delivery systems and opportunities for sport participation can be achieved. Large countries like Canada for example, have many remote areas, and the enormous distances require children to travel hundreds of kilometers to participate in sport competitions, even at the lower levels (e.g., the provincial level). Thus, the size of a country can have huge repercussions on the sport experience. It could well be the case that specific types of sport events may bring some unique opportunities to small and medium sized cities that are considered geographically isolated. Studying smaller and medium sized sport events is therefore an interesting avenue to increase our understanding of their potential meaning and function for local communities. We will address the theme of globalisation here by tackling the question whether small and medium sized types of sport events are more suited to developing positive outcomes for host communities compared to global mega sport events. To date mega

1 This paper is partially based on a keynote presentation delivered during the 2012 eass Conference in Berne, Switzerland.

sport events (MSEs) such as the Olympic Games or the Football World Cup, which are by definition global in size, scope and reach (e.g., Getz, 2012; Hayes & Karamichas, 2012; Horne & Manzenreiter, 2006), have received much more research attention compared to their smaller-sized, non-mega sport events (NMSEs), especially when it comes to sustainable benefits for host communities. In what follows, we will address the following research questions: What is it that makes NMSEs uniquely different from MSEs from a social impact perspective? And how do NMSEs contribute to social sustainability in the global world, despite the fact that many of them are hosted in smaller cities?

Various authors have mentioned a variety of impacts that sport events can have on local communities. Ritchie (1984), for example, proposed the following six dimensions of event impact: (a) economic; (b) tourism/commercial; (c) physical; (d) socio-cultural; (e) psychological; and, (f) political. Brown and Massey (2001) suggested a slightly different classification, including: (a) economic; (b) tourism; (c) legacy; (d) urban regeneration; (e) social; and, (f) sport participation and development. By 'legacy', Brown and Massey mean 'sport infrastructure legacy'; that together with urban regeneration falls under the 'physical' dimension of Ritchie's classification. Similarly, social and sport participation and development impacts of Brown and Massey fall under the socio-cultural dimension of Ritchie. Most of the event impact research has concentrated on the economic and tourism impact (e.g., Maennig & Zimbalist, 2012; Preuss, 2004; Thibault, 2009). Currently, there is a shift in interest towards addressing less tangible impacts of events, such as social impacts (e.g., Guo, Zhuo & Hou, 2012; Wicker, Hallman, Breuer & Feiler, 2012) or sport participation impacts (e.g., Girginov & Hall, 2008; Weed, Coren & Fiore, 2009). Again, however, it is the mega sport events that have been the focus of these studies. Studies on the social impact of smaller scale events were usually non-sporting events, such as community festivals (e.g., Fredline, Jago & Deery, 2003; Small, 2007/2008). In what follows, we attempt to contrast and compare social impacts of NMSEs with those of MSEs. While Ritchie (1984) considered local and/or national pride and community spirit that the hosting of events can create under the denominator of psychological impacts, and international recognition under the denominator of political impact, these phenomena are included here under the umbrella of social impact. In the same vein, we include urban regeneration impact (e.g., Brown & Massey, 2001), since that too can directly affect the quality of life of local residents. While sport participation impact can also be considered a form of social impact, it will not be addressed in this paper, because of space limitations. Noteworthy is the fact that "environmental impact" does not appear in the aforementioned lists of Ritchie (1984) or Massey and Brown (2001). While the 1994 Olympic Winter games in Lillehammer were the pioneers of the "Green Games" (Chappelet, 2008), Atlanta 1996 followed suit. In 2000 Sydney was the first Olympics to include a section on environmental protection in

their bid document (Toohey, 2008). While this is an important component with regard to impact and sustainability, and some progress has been made on environmental impact assessment (e.g., carbon footprints; Horne & Manzenreiter, 2006), it will not be addressed here.

The purpose of this paper is to reflect on, and where possible, provide examples of social impacts and outcomes of NMSEs and MSEs, both positive and negative, and discuss the ‘sustainability’ of some of these outcomes (if any) and their impact on residents of the host community. This overview will assist in determining whether or not NMSE may have greater potential to create sustainable social benefits for host communities locally, and subsequently globally. The primary focus is, however, on local residents of the host communities, since their quality of life is directly impacted by the staging of these events. Before contrasting and comparing potential social outcomes of events, we first briefly define what we mean by NMSE and MSE, impacts, outcomes, legacies, and sustainability.

Conceptual framework

Non-mega sport events (NMSEs) versus mega sport events (MSEs)

While there are no universal definitions of different types of events, for the purpose of this contribution, we focus on spectator sport events, as opposed to participant sport events. ‘Mega’ refers to the largest and most significant events, which by way of their size generate “very high levels of tourism, media coverage, prestige or economic impact for their host community” (Getz, 2012, 45). For the purpose of this paper we adapt Gratton and Taylor’s (2000) typology of events and consider MSEs as “Type A” events defined as “irregular, one-off, major international spectator events generating significant economic activity and media interest” (Gratton & Taylor, 190). While of short duration, their impact and meaning for the host city reaches far beyond the event (Ritchie, 1984). Formerly MSEs were also called “hallmark events” (Hiller, 2000). Any other type of event that is not of this magnitude could potentially be labeled a “non-mega” sport event. However, in line with Gratton and Taylor (2000), we define NMSEs as “Type C” events, namely, “irregular, one-off major international spectator/competitor events, generating limited economic activity” (Gratton & Taylor, 190)². Thus, NMSEs in the context of this paper, are not part of an annual cycle, and change locations each time they are being organised. Both types of events are “major” in the sense that they have a high profile, and provide exceptional spectacles. It is the global ‘share’ of the international audience (i.e., the number of people and their composition) that really separates the two. The development of communication

2 Type B events are defined as “Major spectator events generating significant economic activity, media interest and part of an annual cycle of sport events” (Gratton & Taylor, 2000, 190). Type D events are defined as: “Major competitor events generating limited economic activity and part of an annual cycle of sport events” (Gratton & Taylor, 2000, 190).

technology has strongly influenced the process of globalisation for MSEs (Horne & Manzenreiter 2006; Horne, 2007). Television corporations and multi-national companies have benefitted greatly from this global reach. However, NMSEs also attract media attention and sponsorship, be it more at the local, regional or national level. When it comes to spectators actually attending the event, it is not only their number (which is obviously higher for MSEs), but more so about “who” is attending. For instance, the overwhelming number of attendees at NMSEs are members of the local community (e.g., Taks, Chalip, Green, Kesenne & Martyn, 2009), while MSEs mainly attract non-local spectators who can afford to pay for the tickets (e.g., Smith, 2009). Another important difference is that MSEs generally require major infrastructure projects, while that is usually not the case for NMSEs. In short, NMSEs are generally smaller in size, scale, scope and reach than their mega counterparts (e.g., the Olympic Games, the World Cup, the Euro Cup, the Commonwealth Games). However, like mega events, they are one-off, discontinuous, of short duration and out of the ordinary.

Impacts, outcomes, legacies and sustainability

Both types of events, NMSEs and MSEs discussed in this paper are temporal and can trigger a variety of short- or long-term, positive or negative social impacts, which may lead to positive or negative social outcomes. If sustained, these outcomes become legacies. A legacy is what remains in the aftermath of an event. Preuss (2007) defines legacy as “all planned and unplanned positive and negative, intangible and tangible structures created by and for a sport event that remains for a longer time than the event itself” (Preuss, 2007, 86). Some ‘tangible’ legacies are economic and infrastructure; while ‘intangible’ legacies are transfer of knowledge, image, and reputation (e.g., Kaplanidou & Karadakis, 2010). Sport governing bodies responsible for staging mega-events have recognised the importance of long-term legacy planning, with the hope of changing the lives of local residents for the better (IOC as cited by Kaplanidou, 2012).

From 1984 onwards, there is clearly a shift from realising ‘impacts’ to producing ‘sustainable outcomes’ (e.g., Chalip, 2006). Current literature often refers to the triple bottom line approach in the context of sustainability, which posits that social, economic, and environmental issues are three intertwined components for sustained human development (e.g., McKenzie, 2004; O’Brien & Chalip, 2007). In fact, sustainable development refers to the needs of the present, without compromising the needs and desires of future generations (WCED, as cited by Gibson, Kaplanidou & Kang, 2012). While definitions of sustainability remain debatable, in the context of this presentation, they point towards the durability of outcomes in the time period beyond the actual event (e.g., O’Brien & Chalip, 2007). We focus specifically on outcomes that are: (a) created through the event; and, (b) maintained for a period

of time after the event. Thus, sustainable legacies become durable benefits for host communities. In other words, if positive outcomes are apparent, they should be able to transform into long-term benefits.

The focus of this contribution is on the residents of the host communities, since we know that events require investments of human, financial and physical resources from communities that stage them. These investments can be extremely large for MSEs (e.g., Horne & Manzenreiter, 2006; Preuss, 2007). After all, the local residents are the individuals who are directly impacted by the event, be it positive or negative. Residents are, and should be concerned with the impact that hosting major sport events has on their personal lives. This does not imply that there cannot be sustainable outcomes from NMSEs for other stakeholders in the local community such as businesses or public sector organisations, or even outside the host community. However, we will concentrate on sustainable outcomes for host communities by looking at the quality of life for local residents. Research into MSEs highlights issues of “globalization, increased commodification and growing inequality” (Horne & Manzenreiter, 2006, 17). We can learn from these analyses in order to avoid the mistakes that are made at the global level, by focussing on the strengths of the local level. Sport events are no longer about just ‘providing good sport’ (e.g., Green 2001), but have become a common tool for reaching other short- and/or long-term outcomes. Whether or not, and to what extent and in which direction these outcomes affect the local population requires further investigation.

Social impacts of NMSEs versus MSEs

The poor economic outcomes of mega events (e.g., Preuss, 2004; Taks, Kesenne, Chalip, Green & Martyn, 2011) have shifted attention to social impact and numerous studies have focussed on the social significance of MSEs. Social impact can be defined as the manner in which events “effect changes in the collective and individual value systems, behavior patterns, community structures, lifestyle and quality of life” (adapted from Hall as cited in Baldock, Maes & Buelens, 2011, 94). However, accurate social impact assessments of events are missing (Horne & Manzenreiter, 2006). The well-intended rhetoric detailing social outcomes are generally desired, as opposed to being planned for (e.g., Chalip, 2006; Foley, McGillivray & McPherson, 2012). Again, NMSEs have received limited attention when it comes to their social significance. Much of the evidence of the capacity of sport events to enhance social unity through feelings of euphoria, enhanced national pride, and unity is anecdotal (e.g., Smith, 2009). While there are numerous social components that can be discussed, we will only highlight a few of them here, using the following four perspectives as a framework: (a) power relations; (b) urban regeneration; (c) socialisation; and, (d) human capital (see table 1).

Power relations

It is usually a dominant group of business elites, the so called 'urban regimes', that initiates the push for hosting events, whether it is a NMSE or a MSE (e.g., Hiller, 2000; Misener & Mason, 2006, 2008 & 2009; Smith, 2009). Urban Regime Theory focusses specifically on the relationship between the private and the public sector (i.e., private capital and public power) in their pursuit to fulfil their own research agendas, and often leads to the creation of specific structures. For example, The Melbourne Major Events Company was specifically set up to attract large scale events to the city (Misener & Mason, 2008). This process of urban regimes creates a feeling of circumvention of normal democratic processes, because this has implications for the degree of involvement of the residents in the decision-making process (Misener & Mason, 2006). MSEs are often imposed on the local residents, leaving the community to react to prepared plans, rather than being involved in creating them. Only recently have there been some attempts for more democratic planning approaches, soliciting community involvement and support. An example of this approach was the unsuccessful Toronto bid for the 1996 Summer Olympic Games (e.g., Gursoy & Kendall, 2006). The likelihood that local residents are actually engaged in the creation and staging of a NMSE is evidently much higher compared to a MSE. This may benefit the feeling of inclusiveness and ownership (Hiller, 2000), an important foundation for carrying positive outcomes. In some cases, the planning of smaller scale events in smaller communities, even starts at the community level, such as for example a local club taking the initiative to host a major event. Thus, the loss of local autonomy (Krippendorf in Fredline et al., 2003) is more likely to be present in the context of MSEs compared to NMSEs.

Hosting events shifts priorities from local governments, and consequently diverts funding away from other projects, such as social services and/or community youth programs (e.g., Smith, 2009). Given the huge costs that are associated with the staging of MSEs, it is very likely that this redistribution of funding is crowding out social programs. While redistribution of funds might also happen in the case of NMSEs, empirical evidence is lacking to substantiate this claim.

Urban regeneration

The hosting of MSEs is often part of a pro-growth strategy and 'urban regeneration' is usually an important, and sometimes, central component. MSEs have indeed the power to transform a city (e.g., Hiller, 2000). MSEs are viewed as catalysts or accelerators for urban transformations. NMSEs may require some upgrading of existing sport facilities, and sometimes the construction of a new sport facility, but usually do not require major urban infrastructure projects. In this section, we share some examples and thoughts as they relate to impacts of urban regeneration. The major questions to raise here are: "Who benefits from these major infrastructure projects?", and "Who is relocated or displaced for the purpose?".

Major infrastructure projects, such as highways or airports, usually do not benefit the needs of citizens from lower socio-economic backgrounds. The noble purpose to service underprivileged citizens with a legacy of Olympic facilities has seldom materialised in the way it was initially promised. For example, all 252 units of the Athletes village in Vancouver were supposed to be transformed into social housing, including housing for people with disabilities. Due to a combination of rising construction costs, the economic downturn and increased financial constraints, only half of the units became subsidised (Bula, 2010). In short, the housing improvements through MSEs generally serve only a few (e.g., Hiller 2000), and one can wonder if more could have been done in this regard if the event was not part of the political agenda. However, not all stories are negative. Cities like Manchester have successfully targeted urban regeneration by adapting an event portfolio. Their strategy consisted of hosting multiple events, including 'smaller' major sports events, such as the Commonwealth Games in 2002 (e.g., Misener & Mason, 2006). To this day, Athens benefits from the public transportation infrastructure that was accelerated because of the staging of the 2004 Olympic Games (OG); as well as from the highway that was constructed between Thessaloniki and Athens, which has contributed to increasing the country's productivity (e.g., Theodoraki, 2009). Melbourne Park was built in 1988 to host the Australian Open Tennis, and has become a place where people socialise to this day (Misener & Mason, 2008). The revitalisation of East London in the context of the 2012 OG is another example in which urban regeneration played a central role (Raco, 2004). How this will play out in the future, remains to be seen. In summary, we see both positive and negative outcomes of MSEs when it comes to urban regeneration. However, displacement of less powerful groups, forced evictions, loss of affordable housing (e.g., Smith, 2012), are well known in the context of MSEs, while highly unlikely for NMSEs. A recent example is the displacement of 1.5 million people out of the favelas in the build-up to the two sporting mega-events: the World Cup 2014, and the Olympic Games 2016 in Brazil. This eviction is imposed without any dialogue or negotiations (Green, 2011).

When focussing on sports infrastructure as a component of urban regeneration, the track records of MSEs and NMSEs are quite different. For instance, small scale events usually do not require the upgrading or construction of new sport facilities, but it can happen occasionally. If that is indeed the case, the upgrading or construction of facilities for NMSEs are often specifically built with the intention to meet the needs of local residents. This assures the long-term use by the community which is central for sustainable community development. For example, the reason to put in a bid for the 2005 Pan American Junior Athletic Championships hosted in Windsor, Ontario (a medium sized city), was first and foremost to build a much needed, new stadium for the university. The bid was successful, and the stadium was built. Evidence shows that the construction of this stadium has greatly contributed to the development of

track and field in the region (Taks, Chalip, Green & Misener, 2012). In the same vein, the city will host the International Children's Games in 2013. For this event, the city is building a new Olympic swimming pool, which would otherwise not have been built. While we may expect this to potentially have a positive impact on the development of water sports in the city and/or region, the construction of this swimming pool was not without controversy. For instance, it required the closing of four other community swimming pools, which may in fact, negatively impact accessibility opportunities in those dwelling areas. What the net outcome on swimming participation will be remains to be seen. In any case, these facilities need to meet the locals' needs, while serving the tournament and visitors. In contrast, MSEs almost always require the upgrading and construction of sport infrastructure. There are multiple examples of seriously under-utilised infrastructure, which carry high maintenance costs and huge debts (e.g., Mules & Dwyer, 2005). These facilities are also called "white elephants" (e.g., Horne & Manzenreiter, 2006, 21), referring to unused and/or closed facilities after the hosting of mega events. These facilities not only carry extravagant maintenance costs, but seldom meet the needs and desires of the local community. On some occasions, however, facilities for large events are particularly built with community use in mind after the event. That was, for instance, the case for the Richmond Oval built in the context of the 2010 Vancouver Winter Olympics. However, the costs for these transformations can cause civic outrage (e.g., Kidd, 2011).

Socialisation

Due to the global power of MSEs, concepts such as national identity and social capital have become part of the discourse (e.g., Horne & Manzenreiter, 2006; Horne, 2007). National pride and collective identity that accrue from hosting events are also referred to as 'psychic income' (Downward, Dawson & Dejonghe, 2009), which may contribute to social cohesion and social capital (e.g., Misener & Mason, 2006). Feelings of pride and identity may certainly overcome local residents in the contexts of both, NMSEs and MSEs. However, Smith (2009) argues that "rather than being an outcome, social capital is an important requisite that influences who benefits" (Smith, 2009, 113). A prime example of a large sport event strengthening national identity is the Rugby World Cup in 1995 in South Africa, where Nelson Mandela clearly used the event as a means to unify the Afrikaners and the Blacks (e.g., Chalip, 2006). Rugby, a traditional white sport, and the national team mascot, a springbok, clearly represented the white Afrikaners. The government promoted the theme: "one event, one nation". The South-African team won the Rugby World Cup, fostering national identity. However, support for winning and support for organizing an event should not be confused. As Walker et al. (2012) stated: "It remains unclear whether social cohesion could have been achieved simply by hosting the tournament, without the Springbok success." (Walker et al., 510). Interestingly enough, when South Africa hosted the 2010 FIFA World Cup, it could not capitalise on their sporting success,

since their national team, 'Bafana Bafana' did not pass the first round. Walker and colleagues conducted a pre- and post-event study related to the FIFA World Cup and concluded that first, national identity was only marginally influenced by the event (no significant demographic differences by race, gender or educational level); and, second, that national identity did not really contribute to social capital. In Germany, there is a general feeling that the hosting of the 2006 FIFA World Cup has affected the Germans' national identity (Ohmann, Jones & Wilkes, 2006). Even though Germany did not win the tournament (finishing third), the event created a winning feeling, and strengthened national identity and pride. This is an example where not so much the 'success', but the flawless organisation of a successful event created these positive feelings.

A similar feeling of pride can be present for NMSEs, be it more at a local or national level. For example, when key stakeholders involved in the 2005 Pan American Junior Athletic Championships, introduced above, were interviewed five years after the event was hosted, they still compared the event with the Olympic Games on several occasions. Reflecting on the "grandeur" of the event, one member of the local organizing committee literally stated: "[the] community came out and supported the event, ... it was their Olympics" (LOC member, personal communication, November 18, 2010). A feeling of empowerment for new directions of the city (e.g., Smith, 2009) is not unusual for both types of events. Social engagement, the feeling of a common good, shared experiences, and collective solidarity can be felt among local residents in the context of both types of events. Media support plays an essential role in creating these feelings; for MSEs through global coverage, for NMSEs through local media coverage.

The possibility for locals to actually attend the event itself is highly possible in the context of NMSEs. There are certainly more constraints for local residents to attend a MSE, both from a logistic and a price point perspective. For instance, ticket distribution is highly regulated for MSEs such as the Olympic Games or the Football World Cup (Bladen, Kennell, Abson & Wilde, 2012); the possibility for local residents to obtain tickets is therefore rather slim. In addition, ticket prices for MSEs are usually very high, which may prevent local residents from attending the event. Very limited empirical data is available on this topic, as the issue is somewhat controversial. Studies on mega events, usually sample a variety of people in and around the event, but exact numbers on the proportion of local residents and non-local visitors actually attending MSEs, are rarely reported. Kaplanidou (personal communication, December 14, 2012), for example, observed a 40% Greek versus 60% non-Greek people pattern around the stadia during the 2004 Athens Olympic Games. Data collected during the London Games, revealed that about 80% of spectators in the Olympic Park were British, but again, those numbers do not provide data about attending the actual sporting events. In contrast, a study on the Pan American Junior Athletic

Championships, a NMSE, estimated that 77% of the spectators were from the local area, 11% were visiting from other Canadian cities, 12% were international visitors, providing evidence for the assumption that NMSEs attract mainly local residents in the stands. Moreover, ticket prices for NMSEs are usually reasonable. This again has repercussions for the experience of the local residents, as an inexpensive ticket price may generate a higher “consumer surplus” (e.g., Taks et al., 2011). In addition, NMSEs are often hosted in smaller towns or cities, which probably have less competition from other entertainment activities. NMSEs therefore provide a unique entertainment opportunity for the local population. MSEs are usually hosted in larger cities with more competition from other entertainment opportunities, therefore levelling or decreasing the level of “consumer surplus” the event can generate for the residents (e.g., Taks et al., 2011). This would, however, also be the case for NMSEs hosted in larger cities. In addition, MSEs generally create more congestion, and disturb the daily life of local residents to a greater extent (e.g., Barget & Gougnet, 2007; see also below), again lowering the value of the event for local residents (e.g., “public good value”; Johnson & Whitehead, 2000). NMSEs do not impinge on locals’ life space in the same manner as MSE (Gursoy & Kendall, 2006). The fact that local residents are constrained to actually attend a MSEs, can potentially contribute to increasing social inequity (e.g., Smith, 2009).

Experiencing the peripheral activities, atmosphere, and social opportunities of the event (including spending time with family and friends) are possibilities for both types of events (e.g., Chalip, 2006; Kaplanidou, 2012). Chalip (2006) calls this the creation of liminality, which involves a sense of celebration and camaraderie. He also identified “enabling sociability, creating event related social events, facilitating informal social opportunities, producing ancillary events, and theming” (Chalip, 2006, 113) as potential strategies. While direct involvement of the local residents with MSEs is rather limited, community capacity can still be created through organised events related to the MSE (e.g., VanWynsberghe, Kwan & Van Luijk, 2011). Spaces for public viewing are well developed for MSEs for instance (e.g., Burnett & Wessels, 2012). Moreover, the support of residents creates the potential to convert each type of sport event into a festival (e.g., Chalip, 2006; Gursoy & Kendall, 2006). For example, Burnett and Wessels (2012) analysed the behaviour of attendants at fan parks and public viewing sites during the 2010 FIFA World Cup in South Africa, and concluded that “most respondents preferred public viewing areas due to the cost factor, accessibility, festive atmosphere and celebrating with other members of an identifiable subculture” (Burnett & Wessels, 151). Interestingly, all respondents held South African citizenship; 11.5% of those held a dual citizenship. O’Brien (2007) analysed community benefits from hosting a regional surf festival, however, the community benefits discussed were mainly focussed on local business opportunities (i.e., businesses, tourism and sponsorship) rather than benefits for local residents. The

only link made towards local residents was the festival's "feel good" factor created through spontaneous theming of local businesses in the main street; a place where local residents could meet and benefit from the "town's celebratory atmosphere" (O'Brien, 159). Obviously, people have the opportunity to meet new acquaintances in the context of both types of events (e.g., Chalip, 2006).

MSEs create opportunities for new social movements and opposition coalitions increasing social capital both locally and globally (e.g., Smith, 2009). While these phenomena are well documented for MSEs, there is limited empirical evidence for NMSEs. However, it can be assumed that NMSEs can also trigger these types of movements at a local level. Increased social polarisation, creating and/or reinforcing inequity (e.g., the 'Not in My Back Yard' mentality) is possible in the context of MSEs (e.g., Misener & Mason, 2006; Smith, 2009), but probably not for NMSEs since the latter are less intrusive and require none, or very limited infrastructure. Disrupting life because of factors such as increased stress, noise, denial of rights and civil liberties, traffic congestion, parking problems, reduced access to public spaces, and negative behaviour of event attendees (e.g., Fredline et al., 2003; Smith, 2009) can occur with both types of events, but are less likely to happen with NMSEs.

Human capital

Human capital refers to skills that people possess (Sweetland, 1996). Investing in those skills contributes to personal growth and development, and can also bring economic returns (e.g., Gratton & Taylor, 2000). Sport events provide opportunities for knowledge and skill development for local residents through school and other programs that are organised specifically in and around the event. These initiatives are, in essence, possible for both types of events (e.g., Koenig & Leopkey, 2009; Kaplanidou, 2012). However, opportunities for personal growth and skill development of local residents through volunteering, officiating, and organizing, are expected to be higher for local residents in the context of smaller events since chances that locals take part in the planning and management of small/medium sized events is far greater than in the context of large or mega events (e.g., Taks et al., 2011). Note that MSEs draw people with expertise from far away regions, thereby limiting opportunities for local people to execute the higher end tasks that contribute to personal growth. The large contingent of local volunteers that MSEs draw upon (e.g., Harris, 2012; Zhuang & Girginov, 2012) are often to execute the more common, lower-end tasks, which do not necessarily require specialised skills. MSEs' contributions for personal growth are therefore rather limited. This assumption requires more in-depth examination. Approximately 70,000 volunteers were selected for the 2012 Olympic Games in London. While there are no exact data at this moment to identify the ratio of "local" volunteers, Nichols (in press) expected the volunteers to come disproportionately from London based on the fact that no travel expenses were provided to cover at least

for trips to London for training, and no assistance was provided with finding accommodation in London. However, the city of London itself created its own volunteer programme called London Ambassadors. These volunteers assisted the public around London. These people are more likely to continue to volunteer for local events in London. This is a prime example of a sustainable outcome for the local community. It should also be noted that the potential lack for personal growth does not prevent local volunteers from gaining positive experiences through social interactions. The majority of volunteers for NMSEs are generally locals, and most cover all necessary tasks, including the more skilled ones. The 2007 World Artistic Gymnastics Championships, a NMSE hosted in Stuttgart (Germany) attracted volunteers from the immediate area of the city (20%), the surrounding state of Baden-Württemberg, as well as from the rest of Germany. Almost all volunteers (97%) were German citizens, while 3% came from other countries. Only 6% of the volunteers stayed in paid accommodation (Jarvis & Blank, 2011).

Discussion

So far, we have explored various social impacts and outcomes of MSEs and NMSEs, and provided examples where possible, whether they were positive or negative, or sustainable. The long-term benefits of the hosting and staging of mega-events are questioned and certainly unevenly shared (Horne & Manzenreiter, 2006); the long-term benefits of NMSEs are virtually unknown. Table 1 highlights the potential social impacts for local residents from hosting events; those highlighted in bold represent a higher tendency for positive outcomes.

The table reveals that NMSEs have potentially more positive social impacts on the quality of life of the residents in the host community compared to MSEs. The concept of social capital assists in explaining this phenomenon. Following Bourdieu's (1979) definition, social capital is described as a source of network-mediated benefits beyond the immediate family. For instance, community networks, relationships of trust and reciprocity, and social inclusion are central to the concept of social capital (Coleman as cited in Misener & Mason, 2006). Events are a means by which durable networks, mutual acquaintances and reciprocal relationships are formed. While both positive and negative social capital can be constructed through the hosting of events, NMSEs seem to have a higher potential for the creation or reinforcing of horizontal social capital (civic participation and high levels of social trust). This is due to the higher level of bonding and ownership in the case of NMSEs, as compared to MSEs. The latter rather reinforces a form of vertical or 'linking' social capital, which represents a form of inequality between and among citizens (Misener & Mason, 2006). Misener and Mason (2006) offer four propositions related to how events can offer meaningful sources of social capital: (a) community values should be central to all decision-making processes; (b) various stakeholders, particularly community interest

groups should be involved in strategic activities related to events; (c) collaborative actions should empower local communities to become agents of change; and, (d) open communication and mutual learning throughout strategic activities related to events must be maintained to minimise power brokering. All four propositions have a higher likelihood to succeed for NMSEs in smaller cities as opposed to MSEs in larger cities. For instance, the idea of creating coherent networks within communities seems more plausible for small and medium sized events, which are by default embedded in local communities.

Table 1: Social impact perspectives based on type of event: Non-mega sport events (NMSEs) versus mega sport events (MSEs)

	NMSEs(*)	MSEs(*)
<i>Power relations</i>		
1. Urban regime is driving force to stage event	Perhaps	Usually
2. Loss of local autonomy	Less likely	More likely
3. Redistribution of funding from social programs	Perhaps	Yes
<i>Urban regeneration</i>		
4. Urban regeneration	Unlikely	Usually yes
5. Displacement of less powerful groups, forced eviction, loss of affordable housing	Unlikely	Possibly
6. Sport infrastructure: upgrading and construction	Occasionally	Yes
<i>Socialisation</i>		
7. Enhancing identity and pride	Locally/Nationally	Locally/Nationally/ Globally
8. Feeling of empowerment for new direction of the city	Maybe	Probably
9. Social engagement, feeling of common good, shared experience, collective solidarity	Probably	Probably
10. Possibility of attending the core event	Yes	Not necessarily
11. Experiencing the peripheral activities, atmosphere and social opportunities of the event	Yes	Yes
12. Opportunities to meet new people	Yes	Yes
13. Opportunities for new social movements and opposition coalition increasing social capital	Maybe, locally	Yes, globally
14. Increased social polarisation, creating and/or reinforcing inequity	Unlikely	Possibly
15. Disrupting life of local residents	Unlikely	Very likely
<i>Human Capital</i>		
16. General knowledge and skill development	Yes	Maybe
17. Knowledge and skill development through association with the event	High	Low
Note. (*) Bold refers to higher positive impacts when comparing both types of events		

If Raco's (2004) argument is followed that the vision of a self-sustaining urban community is one where people play a key role in its planning, design and stewardship (i.e., bottom-up strategy), it is clear that this opportunity presents itself much more for NMSEs compared to MSEs. Smith (2009) emphasises that empowering citizens in this manner is equitable and ethical, and therefore socially sustainable.

While bids for mega events, such as the Olympic Games or the FIFA World Cup are required to demonstrate some types of meaningful social outcomes, their relative value of "social capital" remains uncertain. For example, the London 2012 Cultural Olympiad focuses on building social capital, but this is clearly a top-down strategy, 'enforcing' change in communities. Continuing on the example of the London 2012 OG, while being hosted in the city of London, they were promoted as the "UK Games", and thus the country's Games (Foley et al., 2012).

MSEs are primarily externally focused as cities are trying to gain a better market position in this global world. Their primary concern is not the people in the host community (e.g., Smith, 2009). However, even if MSEs are commercially oriented, the question remains as to whether global events can create 'connectedness' at the local level. The answer is, yes, MSEs can still contribute to creating forms of social identity at the local level (Coalter in Smith, 2009). Activities such as Olympic Torch relays, for example, boost pride and identity (e.g., Chalip, 2006; Hiller, 2000). However, they need to do more than serve commercial needs and develop support for 'Olympism', or significant questions will remain over the longevity of positive outcomes of these initiatives.

Another example of the creation of new public environments to engineer social sustainability (e.g., Smith, 2009) is the Centennial Olympic Park in Atlanta, which to this day is a place for special events and social gatherings (Kaplanidou, 2012). This is an example where intangible outcomes, such as social experiences and a sense of belonging can be created through the use of a tangible legacy (i.e., the Olympic Parks).

As is the case for sport clubs and other contexts, sport events have the power of bringing groups together and creating relationships. Chalip (2006) posits that sport events are indeed more than only entertainment, and that they allow for the addition of a social value to the event. Chalip offered a theoretical framework for studying the social utility of events and argued that the event may be merely a catalyst, in the sense that factors that transcend sport may be at play, and is referred to as liminality. A related sense of community that is created is referred to as *communitas*. Liminality and *communitas* both tend to foster social capital. Celebration and social camaraderie are the basic ingredients required to create liminality, and can be fostered through both NMSEs and MSEs, as previously illustrated.

Overall, it seems more likely for NMSEs to improve the quality of community life as opposed to MSEs. Small/medium sized events have more potential to develop 'social infrastructure' in communities (Misener & Mason, 2006), defined as formal or

informal supporting social structures “enabling interaction among community members and neighbourhood networks” (40).

While both types of events allow local communities to create meaningful partnerships which have the potential to remain in existence long after the event is gone. Long-term sustainability requires meaningful involvement of citizens at every stage. Again, this appears more plausible to succeed in the context of smaller events. What is at stake here is that the structures created for a one-off event do not disappear once the event is over; the lines of communication and collaboration are sustained and maybe even strengthened after the event. In this context, a strategy of event portfolios might be considered (e.g., Ziakas & Costa, 2011). However, in order for sport events to fulfill a local community’s needs, these needs first have to be identified, and that too is probably easier in the context of NMSEs. Subsequently, specific tactics and strategies can be put into place.

While the potential ‘power’ to create positive social impacts of small and medium sized events is recognised here, previous research has indicated that desirable outcomes (including limiting negative ones) should be leveraged. That is, event outcomes need to be specifically planned and strategically implemented before, during and after the event (e.g., Chalip & Leyns, 2002; Chalip, 2006, O’Brien, 2007; O’Brien & Chalip 2007). However, in order to sustain positive outcomes, a second round of leveraging may be necessary. More efforts and planning will have to be focussed on the longer term application and promotion of legacy programs.

A major question to be raised here is: “Who is going to be responsible, and who will take ownership of taking on these tasks?”. One example is the Olympic Games Impact study (OGI), an initiative mandated by the IOC for the Olympic winter Games in Vancouver, to gather economic, environmental, and social impact data to evaluate changes in the host region produced by the Games. The OGI has a 12-year reporting period, starting 2 years before awarding of the bid, and ending 3 years after the event, which is 2013 for the Vancouver Winter Olympics (VanWynsberghe, Derom & Maurer, 2012). Unfortunately, no examples can be provided for NMSEs.

It should be noted that the way we defined NMSEs is somewhat narrow. We considered it as the smaller version of the MSE, thus as a one-off, discontinuous spectator event, that is of short duration and out of the ordinary. It is evident that there are many other forms of NMSEs, such as world or national championships that are part of an annual cycle or participant events, which social impacts and outcomes also warrant further investigation. Obviously, the size of the city also plays an important role in the extent of the social impact and outcomes of sport events. The potential ability of NMSEs to create sustainable social outcomes in smaller cities may completely be lost when similar events are being hosted in larger cities due to the looser social network that exist in larger cities. This too, is an interesting avenue for further investigation.

Conclusion

While events can have a variety of impacts (i.e., economic, tourism, physical, social, and sport participation), the focus of this contribution was on social impacts and positive and negative outcomes that sport events can have on residents in host communities. Most of the research so far has been focussing on large scale events, or mega sport events (MSEs), such as the Olympic Games or the Football World Cup, while smaller and medium sized sport events, or non-mega sport events (NMSEs) are under-researched in this area. Therefore, this contribution is more of an “exploration” when it comes to identifying sustainable social outcomes of smaller and medium sized sport events, which are predominantly hosted in smaller and medium sized cities. It was not the intention of this contribution to be solely a criticism on social impacts of MSEs.

Social impacts of NMSEs and MSEs were contrasted and compared from four different social perspectives, namely, power relations, urban regeneration, socialisation and human capital. Overall, NMSEs appear to provide more positive social impact and outcome opportunities for local residents compared to MSEs. However, accurately measuring impacts of events is extremely complex. Starting to understand *how these social impacts vary* according to the types of events and the types of communities that host these events, is a first step in increasing an understanding of what each type of event actually means for local residents who are directly affected by these events. Trying to explain *why these social impacts vary* and why NMSEs appear to provide more sustainable social opportunities for local communities requires further investigation in areas such as community theory, social exchange theory, bottom-up strategy, processes of community cohesiveness and the creation of social capital, collaboration theory and partnership building (e.g., Schulenkorf, 2012; Ziakas & Costa, 2011). For instance, the nature of MSE planning does not start at the community level. The community reacts to plans presented to them (top-down-strategy), rather than being involved in creating them and taking part in each step of the process (bottom-up strategy). This bottom-up strategy installs a sense of ownership (Hiller, 2000), a solid foundation for carrying positive outcomes. In summary, MSEs have a tremendous global reach with both global and local impacts. The negative social outcomes of MSEs for local residents are more prominent than the positive ones, as they hold a high level of risk. Small and medium sized events, on the other hand, do not have this global reach, but their positive social outcomes for local residents surpasses the negative ones, and because there are many more of them, NMSEs may be more relevant as a means for creating durable benefits for host communities. Moreover, at the aggregate level, their impact may provide more lasting global benefits, as opposed to MSEs.

Given that there is not much empirical evidence yet on the social impacts and outcomes of small or medium scale events compared to the larger global events,

many of the arguments provided here are based on assumptions. A broader research agenda on the true value of small and medium sized events is therefore warranted, and collecting appropriate empirical data is definitely the next step. To paraphrase it with Horne's (2007) saying, it is the territory of "the unknown, unknown" that requires more digging. This will require longitudinal work. There is reason to believe that small-to-medium sized sport events have much to offer to local communities if properly leveraged. Based on the above, they have the capacity to be 'big fish in many small ponds', while mega sport events are rather 'small fish in a big pond', when it comes to their potential or capacity for leaving a positive and sustainable legacy in the global world.

References

- Balduck, A., Maes, M. & Buelens, M. (2011). The social impact of the Tour de France: Comparisons of residents' pre- and post-event perceptions. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 11(2), 91-113. doi:10.1080/16184742.2011.559134
- Barget, E. & Gouguet, J. J. (2007). The total economic value of sporting events: Theory and practice. *Journal of Sports Economics*, 8, 165-182.
- Bladen, C., Kennell, J., Abson, E. & Wilde, N. (2012). *Events management: An introduction*. London: Routledge.
- Bourdieu, P. (1979). *La Distinction: Critique sociale du jugement*. Paris: Minit.
- Brown, A. & Massey, J. (2001). *Literature review: The impact of major sporting events*. London: UK Sport.
- Bula, F. (2010, December 22). First tenants move into social housing at athletes' village. *The Globe and Mail*. Retrieved from: <http://www.theglobeandmail.com>
- Burnett, C. & Wessels, J. C. (2012). Profiling public viewing and South African viewers during the 2010 FIFA World Cup. *African Journal for Physical, Health Education, Recreation & Dance*, 18(1), 151-165.
- Chalip, L. (2006). Towards social leverage of sport events. *Journal of Sport Tourism*, 11(2), 109-127.
- Chalip, L. & Leyns, A. (2002). Local business leveraging of a sport event: Managing an event for economic benefit. *Journal of Sport Management*, 16, 132-158.
- Chappelet, J.-L. (2008). Olympic environmental concerns as a legacy of the Winter Games. *The International Journal of the History of Sport*, 25(14), 1884-1902.
- Downward, P., Dawson, A. & Dejonghe, T. (2009). *Sports economics: Theory, evidence and policy*. London: BH Elsevier.
- Foley, M., McGillivray, D. & McPherson, G. (2012). *Event policy: From theory to strategy*. London: Routledge.
- Fredline, L., Jago, L. & Deery, M. (2003). The development of a generic scale to measure the social impact of events. *Event Management*, 8, 23-37.
- Getz, D. (2012). *Event studies: Theory, research and policy for planned events*. London: Routledge.

- Gibson, H. J., Kaplanidou, K. & Kang, S. J. (2012). Small-scale event sport tourism: A case study in sustainable tourism. *Sport Management Review*, 15(2), 160-170. doi:10.1016/j.smr.2011.08.013
- Girginov, V. & Hall, L. (2008). A sustainable sports legacy: Creating a link between the London Olympics and sports participation. *The International Journal of the History of Sport*, 25(14), 2091-2116.
- Gratton, C. & Taylor, P. (2000). *Economics of sport and recreation*. London: Spon.
- Green, B. C. (2001). Leveraging subculture and identity to promote sport events. *Sport Management Review*, 4, 1-20.
- Green, S. (2011, July 30). Rio's favela dwellers to be displaced in the rush to be ready. The Independent. Retrieved from <http://www.independent.co.uk/sport/football/international/rios-favela-dwellers-to-be-displaced-in-the-rush-to-be-ready-2328464.html>.
- Guo, Y., Zhou, C. & Hou, Y. (2012). People's perception of the social impacts of the Beijing Olympic Games before and after 2008. In W. Maennig & A. Zimbalist. *International handbook on the economics of mega-sport events* (461-481). Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Gursoy, D. & Kendall, K. W. (2006). Hosting mega events: Modeling local's support. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 33(3), 603-623.
- Harris, M. (2012). London's Olympic Ambassadors: a legacy for public policy implementation? *Voluntary Sector Review*, 3(3), 417-424.
- Hayes, G. & Karamichas, J. (2012). *Olympic Games, mega-events and civil societies: Globalization, environment, resistance*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hiller, H. H. (2000). Mega-events, urban boosterism and growth strategies: An analysis of the objectives and legitimations of the Cape Town 2004 Olympic bid. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 24(2), 439-458. doi:10.1111/1468-2427.00256
- Horne, J. (2007). The four 'knowns' of sports mega-events. *Leisure Studies*, 26(1), 81-96. doi:10.1080/02614360500504628
- Horne, J. & Manzenreiter W. (2006). *Sports mega-events: Social scientific analyses of a global phenomenon*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Jarvis, N. & Blank, C. (2011). The importance of tourism motivations among sport event volunteers at the 2007 World Artistic Gymnastics Championships, Stuttgart, Germany. *Journal of Sport & Tourism*, 16(2), 129-147.
- Johnson, B. & Whitehead, J. (2000). Value of public goods from sports stadiums: The CVM approach. *Contemporary Economic Policy*, 18, 48-58.
- Kaplanidou, K. (2012). The importance of legacy outcomes for Olympic Games for summer host cities residents' quality of life: 1996-2008. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 12(4), 397-433.
- Kaplanidou, K. & Karadakis, K. (2010). Understanding the legacy components of a host Olympic city: The Case of the 2010 Vancouver Olympic Games. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 19(2), 110-117.

- Kidd, B. (2011). Sport Canada Research Initiative 5th Annual Conference: Keynote presentation. Gatineau, QC; November 3, 2011.
- Koenig, S. & Leopkey, B. (2009). *Canadian sporting events: an analysis of legacy and sports development*. Proceedings of the Administrative Sciences Association of Canada 2009 Conference. Niagara Falls: ON.
- Maennig, W. & Zimbalist, A. (2012). *International handbook on the economics of mega-sport events*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- McKenzie, S. (2004). Social sustainability: Towards some definitions (Working Paper No. 27). Magill: University of South Australia, Hawke Research Institute. Retrieved from <http://www.unisa.edu.au/hawkeinstitute/publications/downloads/wp27.pdf>
- Misener, L. & Mason, D. S. (2006). Creating community networks: Can sporting events offer meaningful sources of social capital? *Managing Leisure*, 11(1), 39-56. doi:10.1080/13606710500445676
- Misener, L. & Mason, D. S. (2008). Urban regimes and the sporting events agenda: A cross-national comparison of civic development strategies. *Journal Of Sport Management*, 22(5), 603-627.
- Misener, L. & Mason, D. S. (2009). Fostering community development through sporting events strategies: An examination of urban regime perceptions. *Journal Of Sport Management*, 23(6), 770-794.
- Mules, T. & Dwyer, L. (2005). Public sector support for sport tourism events: The role of cost benefit analysis. *Sport in Society*, 8, 338-355.
- Nichols, G. (in press). Volunteering for the Games. In V. Girginov (Ed.), *Handbook of the London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games: Volume Two – Celebrating the Games*. London: Routledge.
- O'Brien, D. (2007). Points of leverage: Maximizing host community benefit from a regional surfing festival. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 7, 141-165. doi:10.1080/16184740701353315
- O'Brien, D. & Chalip, L. (2007). Sport events and strategic leveraging: Pushing towards the triple bottom line. In A. G. Woodside & D. Martin (Eds.), *Tourism management: Analysis, behavior, and strategy* (318-338). Cambridge: CABI.
- Ohmann, S., Jones, I. & Wilkes, K. (2006). The perceived social impacts of the 2006 Football World Cup on Munich residents. *Journal of Sport & Tourism*, 11, 129-152.
- Preuss, H. (2004). *The economics of staging the Olympics: A comparison of the Games 1972-2008*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Preuss, H. (2007). FIFA World Cup 2006 and its legacy on tourism. In R. Conrady & M. Buck (Eds.), *Trends and issues in global tourism 2007* (83-102). Berlin/Heidelberg: Springer.
- Raco, M. (2004). Whose gold rush? The social legacy of a London Olympic. In A. Vigor, M. Mean & C. Tims (Eds.), *After the gold rush: A sustainable Olympics for London* (31-50). London: Institute for Public Policy Research.

- Ritchie, B. J. R. (1984). Assessing the impact of hallmark events: Conceptual and research issues. *Journal of Travel Research*, 23, 2-11. doi:10.1177/004728758402300101
- Schulenkorf, N. (2012). Sustainable community development through sport and events: A conceptual framework for sport-for-development projects. *Sport Management Review*, 15(1), 1-12. doi:10.1016/j.smr.2011.06.001
- Small, K. (2007/2008). Social dimensions of community festivals: An application of factor analysis in the development of the social impact perception (SIP) scale. *Event Management*, 11, 45-55.
- Smith, A. (2009). Theorising the relationship between major sport events and social sustainability. *Journal of Sport Tourism*, 14(2/3), 109-120.
- Smith, H. (2012, May 9). Athens 2004 Olympics: What happened after the athletes went home? *The Guardian*. Retrieved from: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/sport/2012/may/09/athens-2004-olympics-athletes-home>
- Sweetland, S. R. (1996). Human capital theory: Foundations of a field of enquiry. *Review of Educational Research*, 66, 341-359.
- Taks, M., Chalip, L., Green, B. C., Kesenne, S. & Martyn, S. (2009). Factors affecting repeat visitation and flow-on tourism as sources of event strategy sustainability. *Journal of Sport and Tourism*, 14 (2/3), 121-142.
- Taks, M., Chalip, L., Green, B. C. & Misener, L. (2012). Exploring the impact of sport events on sustainable sport participation outcomes in local communities. In *Sport between business and civil society* (Abstract book of the 20th EASM conference; 144). Aalborg: EASM/UCN.
- Taks, M., Kesenne, S., Chalip, L., Green, B. C. & Martyn, S. (2011). Economic impact study versus cost-benefit analysis: an empirical example of a medium sized international sporting event. *International Journal of Sport Finances*, 6(3), 187-203.
- Theodoraki, E. (2009). Organisational communication on the intended and achieved impacts of the Athens 2004 Olympic Games. *Journal of Policy Research in Tourism, Hospitality and Events* (2), 141-155.
- Thibault, L. (2009). Globalization of sport: An inconvenient truth. *JSM*, 23, 1-20.
- Toohy, K. (2008). The Sydney Olympics: Striving for legacies – Overcoming short-term disappointments and long-term deficiencies. *The International Journal of the History of Sport* 25(14), 1953-1971.
- VanWynsberghe, R., Derom, I. & Maurer, E. (2012). Social leveraging of the 2010 Olympic Games: 'Sustainability' in a City of Vancouver initiative. *Journal of Policy Research in Tourism, Leisure & Events*, 1-21. doi: 10.1080/19407963.2012.662618
- VanWynsberghe, R., Kwan, B. & Van Luijk, N. (2011). Community capacity and the 2010 winter Olympic Games. *Sport in Society*, 14(3), 370-385.
- Walker, M., Heere, B., Gibson, H., Thapa, B., Geldenhuys, S. & Coetzee, W. (2012). The power of sport to unite a nation: The social value of the 2010 South African World Cup. In *Book of abstracts* (27th Annual conference of the North American Society for Sport Management 2012) (510-511). Seattle, WA: NASSM.

- Weed, M., Coren, E. & Fiore, J. (2009). *A systematic review of the evidence base for developing a physical activity and health legacy from the London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games*. Canterbury: Canterbury Christ Church University.
- Wicker, P., Hallman, K., Breuer, C. & Feiler, S. (2012). The value of Olympic success and the intangible effects of sport events – a contingent valuation approach in Germany. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 12(4), 337-355.
- Zhuang, J. & Girginov, V. (2012). Volunteer selection and social, human and political capital: a case study of the Beijing 2008 Olympic Games. *Managing Leisure*, 17(2/3), 239-256.
- Ziakas, V. & Costa, C. A. (2011). Event portfolio and multi-purpose development: Establishing the conceptual grounds. *Sport Management Review*, 14(4), 409-423. doi:10.1016/j.smr.2010.09.003

Marijke Taks is Full Professor of Sport Management with the Department of Kinesiology at the University of Windsor (Ontario, Canada) and Adjunct Professor with the Department of Kinesiology at the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven. She teaches courses in socio-economic aspects of sports, global issues in sport management and sport marketing. Her research interest relates to impacts, outcomes and leveraging of sport events. University of Windsor, Faculty of Human Kinetics, Department of Kinesiology, 401 Sunset Avenue, Windsor Ontario, Canada N9B 3P4
E-mail: mtaks@uwindsor.ca