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Introduction
Governments increasingly utilise sporting programmes and initiatives to realise an array of objectives in a range of policy sectors. These include: social inclusion, crime reduction, urban regeneration, raising school standards, reducing obesity and the achievement of international sporting success.

(Green 2005: 144, italics added)

Green (2005) refers to the common assumption among different levels of government that sport participation can facilitate social inclusion, while also contributing to community development and social cohesion (Coalter 2007). Recently, this principle has been transferred from sport participation more broadly to the organization of sport events in particular, resulting in the rise of the phenomenon of social event leveraging (O’Brien and Chalip 2008). The purpose of this chapter is to elaborate on social inclusion using the theoretical framework of social event leveraging. Socially including the individuals who are generally excluded from society through the organization of a sport event is posited as a community-based legacy, since some individuals in the community may be affected disproportionately more negatively by the event. We present case study evidence from two sport mega-events, namely the Vancouver 2010 Winter Games and the London 2012 Summer Games. This case study data contextualize the concept of social inclusion in a complex sport mega-event community setting. Although we do not suggest that smaller sport events are not being leveraged to benefit the local community, the media and tourism attention around sport mega-events provides a pressing incentive for host governments to allocate funding to policy areas that typically may not be prioritized. Research suggests that sport mega-event hosts increasingly leverage sport mega-events because this is an opportune time to invest in social improvements that may or may not relate to sport, and to highlight progress and
develop prestige in a global context. We will discuss community event stakeholders who are actors and beneficiaries in the process of social event leveraging. Finally, we will also reflect on social event leveraging for social inclusion in the case of smaller community events and conclude the chapter by providing practical implications for community stakeholders.

**Literature review**

**Leveraging legacies for the host community**

The host community typically refers to a city or region that contains the venues and houses the sport event competitions and other related programs, which can include opening and closing ceremonies and informal social events among competitors or spectators. Every sport event has an organizing committee that will need to address a spectrum of stakeholders and interest groups that can either positively or negatively affect the success of the event (e.g. Friedman and Miles 2002, Parent 2008, Parent and Smith-Swan 2013). Parent (2008: 136) explains that the organizing committee formally recognizes the various levels of government in the host country, event sponsors, sport organizations, international and national media, business and tourism associations and athletic and national delegations. Perhaps historically more fluid and less formal stakeholders include residents, schools, activists, local businesses and community groups who represent the host citizens (Emery 2002). Recently, however, the financial implications of hosting sport events have risen to the point where, although quite complex, engaging community stakeholders is seen as necessary. Therefore, it is useful to examine whether the presence of community-based coalitions dedicated to obtaining benefits for the host community have become a central property of sport mega-events, together with the deadlines, innovative decision making processes and unprecedented place promotion efforts that mark the sport mega-event phenomenon. Evidence of the growing relevance of stakeholder engagement within the community has been provided (e.g. Burbank et al. 2001, Darcy 2001, VanWynsberghe et al. 2011), which supports an empirically driven shift to leveraging sport events to ensure long-term social benefits or legacies for the host community.

Event legacies are conceptualized as part of a legacy cube which covers all ‘planned and unplanned, positive and negative, intangible and tangible structures created through a sport event that remain after the event’ (Gratton and Preuss 2008: 1924). Legacies are constructed – planned for – and not given (Girginov and Hills 2008), and they should be organized and funded in the same way as the sport mega-event (Mitchell et al. 2012). As Misener et al. argued, ‘Planning for legacy then is about developing enduring, long-term positive benefits usually on a regional or national scale because the funder is typically a government agency’ (2013: 329). Scholars have turned to event leveraging to compensate for the lack of an inherent or automatic social legacy, and to justify the use of scarce public resources to fund the organization of sport mega-events (Weed et al. 2009, Weed et al. 2012). Examples of social legacies that are being leveraged from sport events are the development of public spaces that are accessible for all, the development of skills via volunteering or employment initiatives, the improvement of transport links between parts of the city and the development of social housing schemes (Minnaert 2011).

Chalip (2004) introduced the concept of leveraging to the sport mega-event literature from an economic perspective, arguing that the sport event – or, when applicable, a portfolio of several events throughout the year – is a financial asset that sets apart a host community from its competitors, providing opportunities for economic growth through business and tourism processes. The scope attributed to the concept of sport mega-event leveraging has expanded considerably in a short time. Sport mega-events are no longer solely understood as leverageable resources for
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economic development; instead they are referred to as ‘seed capital’ – arguing that it is the responsibility of host communities to use this capital to realize sustainable long-term legacies (O’Brien 2006: 258). In other words, while the resources by which leveraging occurs remain largely economic, the meaning and purpose of event leveraging has been extended to include social benefits sought by community stakeholders.

Thus, rather than the traditional ‘build it and they [benefits] will come’ approach to sport events, the purpose of event leveraging is to be proactive in planning for the creation of specific event benefits for the host community, and taking strategic measures to make those events sustainable.

(O’Brien and Chalip 2008: 320, italics added)

Part of the rationale for scholars changing the scope of event leveraging to include social benefits is based on the burgeoning interest in sustainability and anti-corruption efforts in the Olympic movement. Another factor in this trend toward social responsibility and accountability, is host residents – existing and potential ones – who juxtapose the hosting of sport mega-events with budget cuts in areas such as housing, social support, recreation and public health with investments in world-class sport facilities (e.g. Lenskyj 2000a, Girginov and Hills, 2008, Bloyce and Smith 2010). The resident-inspired critique of sport mega-event hosts is that these jurisdictions use ‘bread and circuses’ in the process of building a world-class city, which is not intended to benefit the host community (e.g. Eisinger 2000). It is worth noting that the researchers cited here are not sport management experts alone and their studies document community stakeholders who have started to demand positive social value from event hosting. Currently, sport mega-event hosts are globally challenged – including by the International Olympic Committee – to use the apparent once-in-a-lifetime opportunity of hosting to produce social benefits in the host community, for example alleviating social issues that typically rate high in most mega-event hosts (e.g. crime, homelessness and social inclusion) (O’Brien and Chalip 2008).

Although social event leveraging is welcomed as a promising new development and research area, current gaps underscore a central problem, namely the manifold ways that a growing list of stakeholders – including those in the host community – are participating in the process. What is missing from the theoretical framework is any reference to stakeholders’ responsibilities regarding the process and outcomes of event leveraging, and more specifically, there is no discussion as to who is responsible for conducting the leverage and who should benefit from the leverage (O’Brien 2006, Tian and Johnston 2008). O’Brien and Chalip were too ambiguous when they noted that, ‘It is incumbent upon event stakeholders to become aware of (potentially) relevant issues [. . .] and then mount initiatives designed to address those issues’ (2008: 329, italics added), without elaborating upon the various event stakeholders involved in organizing sport events and those having a potential ‘stake’ in the social issues. Looking at the most recent effort to describe leveraging, it is explained that ‘there is no single entity for which event leverage is necessarily a natural assignment’ (Chalip and Heere 2014: 189).

The absence of this entity exacerbates the ambiguity of leveraging. The good news, however, is that bid and organizing committees have recognized and addressed the aforementioned critique by providing greater attention to non-economic benefits, at least in the early stages of event planning (e.g. Pentifallo and VanWynsberghe 2012). Nonetheless, in terms of social leveraging as it has been (barely) practiced, it has become clear that the organizing committees cannot handle the burden of addressing social issues, even minor ones, alone. Indeed leveraging is increasingly falling under the purview of various event stakeholders who make it possible for the host to transcend short-term, traditional event impacts and seek longer-term, sustainable event outcomes.
The groups actually invested in and responsible for delivering bid promises (e.g., government stakeholders) invoke largely unnamed organizations that are never fully recognized or theorized, some of whom may not exist until the prospect of a bid emerges. VanWyensberghe et al. (2011) use the term community-based coalitions to acknowledge the different levels of government, non-governmental organizations, community groups and others who are not part of the official organizing committee but who share the singular purpose of a community-based legacy. This expanded group of actors can increase social awareness that sport mega-events can reach out to the host’s most disadvantaged citizens (Hiller 2000, Carey et al. 2011, Minnaert 2011) and that these benefits can even be extended geographically beyond the community where the event takes place (Smith 2014).

**Leveraging social inclusion**

According to Chalip (2006), the essence of social event leveraging is a host population that generates ambitious and shared expectations for achieving something extraordinary. This accomplishment is made plausible by the transcendent qualities of mega-events, translating individual beliefs about the merits of hosting into the collective experience of the event and its context. Smith and Ingham explain this boundary between the individual and the collective in terms of the city: ‘Civic rituals (and specifically sporting events) are marketed as a “community event,” where the whole of a given city can unite in support of pursuing a common goal’ (2003: 259). The role of community engagement is often highlighted as a central factor in achieving a social legacy in the host community, and event portfolios with strong community links are particularly valuable in leveraging social benefits (Ziakas 2010). The question can be raised, however, to which extent complex mega-events are able to unite the whole of a city behind a common goal, and thus achieve a heightened level of social inclusion.

Leveraging for social inclusion invokes the idea that the sport event will benefit everyone in the host city, including the least fortunate, by creating a sense of community that has been lost (Ingham et al. 1987, Ingham and McDonald 2003, Smith and Ingham 2003). This sense of community is ‘a special experience during which individuals are able to rise above those structures that materially and normatively regulate their daily lives and that unite people across the boundaries of structure, rank, and socioeconomic status’ (Turner, as cited in Ingham and McDonald 2003: 26). The hosting of sport mega-events in particular has been described as a special experience creating a heightened sense of community:

*Certainly, the event itself is not the explanation.* If the occasion is a sporting event, the sport may be the catalyst, vehicle, or rationale for the felt sense of importance, but it is neither the object nor the cause. The sporting outcomes may matter to some, but there is a sense that something more important — something that transcends the sport — is going on. It feels as if new energy has been injected into the communal atmosphere — an energy that can be shared by all. Social rules and social distinctions seem less important, and are sometimes suspended altogether. There is a heightened sense of community among those who are present.

*(Chalip 2006: 110, italics added)*

This quote reads as if this heightened sense of community results automatically from hosting sport mega-events among all community stakeholders. While we do not share the extent of the claim, we support its key sentiment, which is the salience of the energy that appears to bring people closer together and perhaps promote social inclusion. Frisby and Ponic remain critical,
nonetheless, when they argue that, ‘While many citizens may have felt temporally included in the sense of community generated as the Olympic torch run took place across the country [. . .] many others were largely excluded from this international sport event’ (2013: 387). For now, we need to determine what exactly is meant by social inclusion, which cannot be done without reference to social exclusion.

The term social exclusion was originally coined in France in 1974, in a period where some groups of people were marginalized and limited to fully participate in society based on economic conditions. It was proposed as an alternative to the narrower term of poverty, to refer to those who were unprotected by social insurance and labelled as social problems, for example, people with disabilities, substance abusers, delinquents and single parents (Donnelly and Coakley 2002, Minnaert 2011). Until today, the economic foundation of social exclusion remains evident in different definitions of social inclusion. As an example, the UK Index of Multiple Deprivation defines social exclusion as disadvantage in terms of deficiencies in six dimensions, including: income, employment, health deprivation and disability, education and training, housing and geographical access to services (Miller 2003: 5). Also, the European Commission seeks active inclusion in all member states of the European Union by providing adequate income support, inclusive labour markets and access to quality services to ‘enable every citizen, notably the most disadvantaged, to fully participate in society, including having a job’ (European Commission n.d.: paragraph 1).

Social inclusion, emerging as a kind of mirror definition of exclusion, evolved to be about much more than reducing economic gaps between people; it ‘is about closing physical, social and economic distances separating people’ (Donnelly and Coakley 2002: ix). Social inclusion is also defined as ‘the right of individuals to be included, socially, intellectually, culturally and personally. [. . .] Inclusion allows the individual to be part of a community (communitas) and at the same time to be separate and autonomous’ (Bernstein, as cited in Arnot 2006: 146). Social inclusion, however, is not just about opening doors and providing access to those who are currently excluded from, for example, the sport system, to be included in the existing sporting community. It is about working collaboratively with those outside the system to make changes to policies and practices – creating a new and negotiated system together – so that more people can benefit and participate (Frisby and Ponic 2013: 381–382).

Governments across the world seem to agree that one way to achieve social inclusion is through sport participation as they become increasingly involved in developing and implementing sports policy, with inclusion being one of the key policy principles (Green 2005, Frisby and Ponic 2013). Furthermore, sport and recreation departments are generally well positioned in a community to start facilitating the social inclusion of persons who participate less in sport and physical activity through direct engagement with socially excluded groups (e.g. Frisby and Hoeber 2002, Reid et al. 2002). Not only is social inclusion linked to sport participation in general, it is increasingly linked to the hosting of sport mega-events, where it is described as a quasi-concept and neoliberal tactic that seeks consensus on the idea of broad-based engagement (VanWynsberghe et al. 2013). The context for its increasing attention in relation to social inclusion follows.

Findings and discussion

Modest efforts from the International Olympic Committee

The leading role in the Olympic Movement is played by the International Olympic Committee (IOC), an organization famously founded by Pierre de Coubertin and his friends in 1894. Although the IOC has a worldwide presence in sports and is regularly scrutinized by the media, it has remained a rather secretive organization about which relatively little has been published.
Horne and Whannel (2012) describe the IOC as an extraordinary association, a club based on the eighteenth-century aristocratic notions of membership associated with a gentlemen’s club. This involves procedures such as the self-selection of members, the potential blackballing of applicants who wish to become members (that is, non-selection on the basis of the objections raised by a few rather than by a majority) and ‘clubbability’ (that is, new members have to fit in socially) (Horne and Whannel 2012). The closed and elitist nature of the IOC has long attracted criticism. At present, there are 107 IOC members, who together form a group of businessmen, bureaucrats, politicians, diplomats, sport officials, former athletes and retired military men, among others. Before 1981, there were no female members, and prior to 1998, the IOC only included 7 women compared to 109 men. Members used to be elected for life but those elected after 1999 must retire at age 70, although there is always the possibility to continue to serve as Honorary or Honour Members (Lenskyj 2000b).

Chappelet and Kübler-Mabbott describe the responsibility of the IOC as ‘focused on the Olympic Games, to which it holds full legal rights, thanks to the worldwide registration of the numerous trademarks related thereto (interlaced rings, flag, flame etc.)’ (2008: 5). Over the past decades, those trademarks have generated considerable, exponentially growing income. ‘The Olympic brand is one of the most valuable pieces of intellectual property in the world. The IOC has dramatically increased the financial resources of the Olympic Movement by selling Olympic products to corporate sponsors, suppliers and television networks’ (Perrine 1999: 880). Because the IOC owns all the rights and data relating to the Olympic Games, ‘it has been managing a flourishing economic business even though its legal status remains that of a non-profit organization’ (Chappelet and Kübler-Mabbott 2008: 34). This is why Lenskyj (2000b) insists on calling it the ‘Olympic Industry’ rather than using the term Olympic Movement. So which role does the IOC play in the growing trend among organizing committees to broach multiple stakeholders in the formation of community-based legacies of social inclusion?

To begin, one must consider the role of the IOC in the development of community-based legacies, which, in turn, refers to the authoring of a series of sustainability-oriented policies and commissions, such as the Olympic Solidarity, Agenda 21 and Olympic Charter. Unfortunately, we contend that, while these policies do indicate a potential catalyst for sustainability (Holden et al. 2008), upon closer inspection, it transpires that these place rather little responsibility on the IOC to produce or even encourage community-based legacies.

- **Candidate City Manual:** In its 2012 Candidature Procedure and Questionnaire, the IOC highlights its commitment to sustainable development.

  The Olympic Movement is fully committed to sustainable development and endeavours to contribute to the protection of the natural environment. The IOC is concerned that the Olympic Games should be an exemplary event in this respect and that environmentally sound policies, programmes and practices be adopted. […] Environmental protection is an area where Candidate Cities often experience rigorous and extensive public scrutiny and opposition and it is essential that, from the earliest stages of planning, a dialogue of cooperation is established with the government and non-government organisations in this respect.

  *(International Olympic Committee 2004: 86)*

Sustainable development is meant to refer to environmental development and the efforts of public and non-profit organizations are acknowledged as being important. However, no reference to social sustainability is made. In addition, the notion of social inclusion seems...
to refer to cooperation with the host community at the non-governmental organization level. Host citizens, especially the vulnerable ones, are not mentioned.

- **Code of ethics:** The IOC Code of ethics was adopted by the IOC Executive Board in Beijing in 2007. The text aims to safeguard the dignity of the athlete, the integrity of the Olympic Parties and their representatives and the use of resources, among others. The issue of community-based legacies is not mentioned in this document.

- **Olympic Solidarity:** The main mission of the Olympic Solidarity Commission, which was set up in 1971 and restructured in 2011 under auspices of the IOC President Jacques Rogge, is to ‘create continental programmes to respond to the needs, priorities and interests in the NOCs [National Olympic Committees] and the particularities of their continents’ (Olympic Solidarity 2012: 6). The funding for the Olympic Solidarity program is derived from a share of the TV rights from the broadcasting of the Olympic Games.

  This income, which reaches several thousand US dollars every year even for smaller NOCs, is intended to cover normal operating costs and is granted in addition to the provision of courses to train NOC staff and the financing of (minimum) eight athletes and officials to take part in the Games.

  (Chappelet and Kübler-Mabbott 2008: 11)

  In 2012, 657 from the 1,264 scholarship holders in the Olympic Solidary program participated in the 2012 London Games, winning a total of 76 medals (Olympic Solidarity 2012). In addition to scholarships and support for athletes, Olympic Solidary also focuses on scholarships and courses for coaches, funds for NOC management and promotion of Olympic values. Within this last category, several programs seem to focus on community legacies at first glance: these include Women and Sport, Sport for All, Culture and Education and NOC Legacy. However, it must be noted that the funding is primarily available to pay for the participation of NOC delegates in congresses and conferences about these topics (Olympic Solidarity 2012). Although mention is made of national programs that can be set up by NOCs, no examples are provided of their scope or outcome. NOC Legacy in this context refers to ‘the preservation and promotion of their national Olympic and sporting history and heritage’ (Olympic Solidarity 2012: 52). No mention of social inclusion or community legacies is made in this section.

- **Agenda 21:** Although the Olympic Movement’s Agenda 21 document focuses mainly on environmental sustainability, it includes references to social sustainability in its aims and objectives. Table 12.1 provides a summary of these objectives. Agenda 21 pays particular attention to the fate of minorities and the most disadvantaged members of society. In accordance with this, the Olympic Movement has made it its goal to help combat social exclusion (International Olympic Committee 1999). ‘The Olympic Movement has shown by its history that it has an essential part to play in combating poverty by enabling individuals and groups to fight against social exclusion through participation in sport’ (International Olympic Committee 1999: 26). The IOC argues that sport federations, sport organizations and public institutions concerned with sport should promote sport activities among disadvantaged individuals. Also, the provision of sport infrastructure in marginalized regions should be a priority (International Olympic Committee 1999). However, over a decade later, there is little evidence that the IOC has indeed played an active role in the fight against social exclusion, and these resolutions are not integrated in the Candidate City Manual.
Table 12.1 Objectives of Agenda 21

| 1 Improving socio-economic conditions | - The values of Olympism and its action on behalf of sustainable development |
| - Stronger international cooperation for sustainable development |
| - Combating exclusion |
| - Changing consumer habits |
| - Health protection |
| - Human habitat and settlements |
| - Integrating the concept of sustainable development into sports policies |
| 2 Conservation and management of resources for sustainable development | - Methodology of environmental action for the Olympic Movement |
| - Protection of conservation areas and countryside |
| - Sports facilities |
| - Sports equipment |
| - Transport |
| - Energy |
| - Accommodation and catering at major sports events |
| - Water management |
| - Management of hazardous products, waste and pollution |
| - Quality of the biosphere and maintenance of biodiversity |
| 3 Strengthening the role of major groups | - Advancement of the role of women |
| - Promoting the role of young people |
| - Recognition and promotion of indigenous populations |

Source: International Olympic Committee 1999

- **Olympic Charter**: In the Olympic Charter, sports participation for all is mentioned as a key legacy goal. Inclusivity in sport is described as one of the fundamental principles of Olympism. ‘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’ (International Olympic Committee 2011: 10). This principle is repeated in the section on the mission and role of the IOC: mission 12 is ‘to encourage and support the development of sport for all’ (International Olympic Committee 2011: 15). The environmental impacts of the Olympic Games are mentioned separately in mission 13; this is not the case for social impacts. Other missions are ‘to promote a positive legacy from the Olympic Games to the host cities and host countries’ (although no benchmarks are identified) and ‘to encourage and support initiatives blending sport with culture and education’ (although no specific target groups for these initiatives are mentioned) (International Olympic Committee 2011: 15).

From the above official policies and commissions, it transpires that the IOC takes a rather soft stance on the delivery of community-based social legacies, including the achievement of social inclusion. Lenskyj (2008) argues the IOC fears to be perceived as intrusive and thus reduces the attractiveness of the Olympic Games to potential host cities – the Olympic Games are a sports competition and social issues may not appear to be part of the IOC’s jurisdiction. Indeed we would assert that the IOC’s stance may be contrary to public expectation as community legacies are often central in the bidding process for the Olympic Games. The socio-political issues at stake in connection with the Olympic Games are considerable today (Chappelet and Kübler-Mabbott 2008). It could be said that the Games have become a genuine public policy instrument aiming
The community’s perspective

to develop the city and its region, or even the country as a whole, for a period of around 10 years (if the bid phase is included) (Essex and Chalkley 1998, Chalkley and Essex 1999). Although economic and political rationales for hosting sport mega-events are considerable, Waite argues that ‘social implications of hosting a festival are considered as equally important for political authorities during an era of diverging life opportunities and rising trends of depression and anxiety’ (2008: 515). Although social outcomes might be considered important, legitimacy remains an issue as ‘return on investment from economic leverage can be readily expressed in dollars; however, the returns from social leverage typically are less tangible and, consequently, far less politically expedient’ (O’Brien and Chalip 2008: 326).

The question of delivering legacies informs Pentifallo and VanWynsberghe’s (2012) examination of the bids presented for Sydney’s ‘Green Games’ through Rio’s ‘Green Games for a Blue Planet’. Using the concept of isomorphism, they demonstrate how the coercion, mimeses and norms have motivated bid organizing committees to exceed the efforts of previous hosts. These scholars assert that the bid organizing committees have risen to a position of authority in promoting the sustainability cause. However, in the absence of the IOC’s enforcing such bid-level promises, they question the realization of these types of legacies, which are community-based and, on the social side, generally about social inclusion. Indeed, one of the problems is that the IOC provides no resources for ensuring that promises to create community-based legacies are met. As Minnaert (2011) has shown, even though social sustainability aims are often strongly emphasized at the bidding stage, for the Olympic Games from Atlanta (1996) to Beijing (2008) hardly any evidence exists of sports initiatives on a sizable scale that include disadvantaged groups in sports. VanWynsberghe et al. (2013) make a similar claim for the 2010 Olympic Games in Vancouver. Considering the ever-rising costs of hosting the Olympics, and the association of fairness and equality with Olympism, the question arises if the Games can really be ‘the greatest show on earth’ unless ways are found to harness the powerful imaginary of the Olympics into positive community legacies. The cases of social event leveraging around the Olympic Games in Vancouver and London offer some answers.

Inclusive commitments of Vancouver 2010

The bidding, planning and hosting of the 2010 Games in Vancouver offers an excellent example of how event leveraging included social priorities of social inclusion, social sustainability and health. Vancouver’s efforts to become the first sustainable Olympic Games resulted in a social trajectory that was quite different from previous Games, with a particular focus on the inner-city (Holden et al. 2008). Within Vancouver’s inner-city, the Downtown Eastside is an infamous neighbourhood, home to one of the lowest socio-economic status communities in the country. The health status of the population is influenced by a myriad of social issues such as inadequate housing, drug abuse, unemployment, lack of opportunities for education and training, crime and social exclusion. The area was officially declared a public health emergency in 1997 (Otgaar et al. 2011). Given these social problems in the downtown area, public support for the 2010 bid was successfully sought by incorporating a social inclusion mandate for the Olympic Games, resulting in Vancouver being the first candidate host where 64 percent of eligible voters answered yes to the question of whether or not they supported the Olympic bid (VanWynsberghe et al. 2013).

As a background, the Canadian Olympic Committee selected Vancouver and Whistler as candidate hosts for the 2010 Games in 1998. One year later the Vancouver-Whistler 2010 Bid Corporation was formed and its member partners were the federal government of Canada, the provincial government of British Columbia, the city of Vancouver, the resort municipality of Whistler and the Canadian Olympic Committee. Although most of the leaders in the city and
province were supportive of the bid, there was a need to convince the public and local community of the benefits derived from being an Olympic host because bid promoters were challenged by a visible opposition (e.g. No Games 2010). In 2001, several community organizations and advocacy groups formed the Impact of Olympics on Community Coalition to serve as a watchdog over the bid process. This coalition was a key community stakeholder that influenced the Bid Corporation to endorse the **Inner-City Inclusive Commitment Statement** (ICICS). As Hiller writes:

> There was no obvious and compelling reason why hosting the Olympics would improve the city or solve any of Vancouver’s problems. [...] Ultimately, the Inner-City Inclusive Commitment Statement was one attempt to show how the Olympics could help contribute to resolving the problems of homelessness and the issues of the Downtown Eastside.  

**(Hiller 2012: 48)**

Organized around the development of an ‘inclusive approach’ to planning for the Olympic Games, the ICICS sought to ‘create a strong foundation for sustainable socio-economic development in Vancouver’s inner-city neighbourhoods’ (City of Vancouver 2002: 1). The commitments contained 14 categories of 37 promises that ranged in their level of detail and scope, including affordable recreation and community sport, business development, cultural activities, employment and training, health and social services, housing and input to decision-making. The intention of the ICICS was to ‘maximise the opportunities and mitigate potential impacts in Vancouver’s inner-city neighbourhoods from hosting the 2010 Winter Games’ (City of Vancouver 2002: 1). Once Vancouver was awarded the 2010 Olympic Games, the responsibility for implementing the ICICS was shared between the Vancouver Organizing Committee and its member partners. The promises would be developed in the context of existing government activities.

In 2003, a report entitled **Community Assessment of 2010 Winter Olympic Games and Paralympic Games on Vancouver Inner-City Neighbourhoods** was prepared for the Bid Corporation and its member partners and further developed the ideas of the ICICS (Ference Weicker and Company 2003). In terms of the actors responsible for event leveraging, the report noted that:

> The focus of the strategies is not limited to the actions that could be taken by the Bid Corporation or the three levels of Government. In fact, a wide variety of organizations and individuals will need to contribute, play key roles and work together to ensure that the Winter Games contribute positively to the inner-city neighbourhoods.  

**(Ference Weicker and Company 2003: i, italics added)**

However, a further delineation of these organizations and individuals was not covered in the document.

In their critical analysis, VanWynsberghe _et al._ (2013) argued that the categories of business development and training were the only two categories of the ICICS that event organizers fully and consistently implemented through an initiative called Building Opportunities with Business. This initiative assumed that social inclusion in the form of a job would thereby address other social issues such as housing and drug abuse, and would build stronger and healthier communities. As such, local businesses were elevated to social policymakers with an emphasis on individual entrepreneurialism rather than mitigating the negative impacts of the 2010 Games or addressing the deep-rooted social problems in the inner-city. Residents themselves were responsible for achieving social inclusion by taking advantage of the training and employment opportunities that were offered (VanWynsberghe _et al._ 2013). Vancouver’s economic focus on social inclusion was echoed in London, as described in the following case.
Inclusive workforce of London 2012

Often coined as ‘the most inclusive Games ever,’ great political pressure was placed on social leveraging of the London 2012 Games for local communities. Social inclusion was exemplified by the introduction of the 2012 Equality and Diversity Forum, which brought together the main 2012 partners to monitor and champion equality and diversity in all aspects of the 2012 Games, seeking long-term legacies for a wide cross-section of the population (Greater London Authority 2010). This case study will consider one particular aspect of these inclusion efforts: employing and training an inclusive and diverse workforce. Just like in Vancouver, the organizing committee of the London Games viewed employment opportunities and skills development opportunities as central mechanisms for social inclusion: inclusion in society, in this view, is largely facilitated by the participation in paid work. The division of labour for mega-events however is not always equitable, and may tend to favour groups who are already in a stronger socio-economic position – both London and Vancouver aimed to address this with inclusionary measures.

A review of the literature shows that there are several ways in which policies can make access to employment and training opportunities more equitable (Minnaert 2013). A first way of achieving this is by prioritizing a local workforce. Evidence from previous Olympic Games shows that if the Games are held in a disadvantaged area of a city, where the workforce is likely to be less skilled, it is tempting for employers to recruit employees from further afield. This was the case in Sydney 2000 for example, where the Games were staged in the less affluent Western suburbs. Lenskyj highlights that ‘many Olympic contractors wanted people who were already employed, skilled, and having “the right attitude” to work, while a lot of the long-term unemployed and those from areas of high unemployment were not getting Olympic jobs’ (2000b: 115). A second way of making employment and training opportunities available to a greater number of candidates is to encourage a diverse workforce. Diversity refers to the inclusion of heterogeneous groups in the labour pool: ‘diversity initiatives seek to fully develop the potential of each employee and turn the different sets of skills that each employee brings into a business advantage’ (Gale and Davidson 2006: 1). A third approach that can be used is the encouragement of an inclusive workforce. Mor Barak defines an inclusive workplace as:

a work organisation that is not only accepting and using the diversity of its own workforce, but also is active in the community, participates in public sector programmes to include working poor people, and collaborates across cultural and national boundaries with a focus on global mutual interests.

(Mor Barak 2000: 339)

Inclusivity thus goes further than diversity, in that it accepts a social responsibility that outstrips the boundaries of the business and focusses on the role of the business in the community.

The development and implementation of the employment and skills development policies for London 2012 was executed by two main organizations: the Olympic Delivery Authority (ODA) and the London Organizing Committee of the Olympic Games (LOCOG). The ODA was the public body responsible for developing and building the new venues and infrastructure for the Games and their use after 2012; it was the main body in policies for the construction sector. The ODA worked closely with a consortium of first-tier delivery partners and second-tier contractors. LOCOG was a private company responsible for preparing and staging the London 2012 Games; it was the main body in policies for the non-construction sectors. It worked closely with catering, retail and security contractors, and employed a contractor for managing the volunteering effort. The Host Boroughs (Newham, Hackney, Waltham Forest,
Tower Hamlets, Greenwich and Barking and Dagenham) supported the implementation of the ODA and LOCOG policies with their local infrastructure, for example the ‘job brokerages’: public sector–run agencies that aim to get local, often lower-skilled people into work.

The Host Boroughs focussed strongly on developing a local workforce – this is unsurprising as the boroughs are elected by, and work in service of, the local communities. The targets for the boroughs concerned how many local people were in work – it was less important which profile they had. It is important to highlight that the criteria for who was defined ‘local’ tended to differ by borough: for some a longer length of stay was required than for others. Local employment was only part of the philosophy for LOCOG, where the objective was more to have a diverse workforce. The organization enforced a strict ‘equal opportunities’ policy for its own employees, and aimed to instil the same philosophy in its key contractors. LOCOG’s philosophy also included elements of an inclusive workforce, by removing barriers and offering opportunities for groups that are traditionally seen as harder-to-employ, previously unemployed people could also benefit. LOCOG provided a free service, tailored to employers, with the aim of encouraging them to include new types of employees in their workforce – the large number of temporary employees needed made it also attractive for employers to extend their usual recruitment reach. LOCOG insisted on making diversity and inclusion make business sense – which is in line with its own position as a private company.

The ODA also worked to the paradigms of diversity and inclusivity, but approached the employers less as a cost-saving mechanism: they were more focused on compliance. Diversity targets were made contractual with all contractors on the Olympic sites, and a strong emphasis was placed on procurement, safety and training. The compliance-driven approach is in line with its position as a public sector company. Through specialized Employment and Skills Managers working with specific target groups (women, ethnic minorities, apprentices) they also built an active outreach element – they engaged actively with local schools and community organizations to reach a wide cross-section of society (London Legacy Development Corporation 2012). At the ODA, the aim was thus to achieve a diverse and inclusive workforce, making use of local labour where possible.

What about smaller community events?

The examples of Vancouver and London show that social inclusion in the case of the Olympic Games is often limited to the economic sphere where employment and job training interventions are developed in conjunction with the event. Although there was great dedication to approach employment and skills development in a more equitable way, social inclusion is more than closing economic gaps between people, it is also about closing physical and social distances separating people (Donnelly and Coakley 2002), which appears to be difficult to leverage from sport mega-events. The question then can be raised whether smaller community events would yield more extensive social impacts and inclusionary benefits than mega-events. Taks (2013) for example suggests that, based on an extensive review of literature on various sport events, small and medium sized sport events can produce more durable positive social benefits for host communities when compared to mega-events. Actually measuring these benefits and legacies, however, is extremely complex and as a result, there is limited empirical research available that compares social legacies across different events. Nonetheless, while increased social polarization is a possibility when hosting sport mega-events, for example, it is unlikely to result from small or medium sized events (Taks 2013). It can be argued that smaller events cause fewer disruptions for local communities and it is also likely that their more limited budget and lower media exposure may reduce the capability for inclusionary efforts compared to the larger scale events that have been covered in this chapter thus far.
Frisby and Ponic (2013) describe promising strategies and practices for social inclusion through sport in which different levels of government have key leadership roles to play, and which appear to apply more easily to small community events than sport mega-events. The strategies and practices are the following: engaging socially excluded groups to surface issues requiring attention; developing new partnerships among community organizations to provide programs and remove barriers to those who are currently excluded; engaging community members in program planning and policy development to ensure that the sport system is more socially and culturally inclusive; making a commitment to change among governments and sport organizations by implementing social inclusion policies; and conducting an ongoing evaluation based on a participatory approach to identify areas of success and improvement. The authors of this chapter argue that social inclusion might be better achieved through special community events where participants themselves are not included in mainstream sport events but intentionally decide to participate in a different event as one community. The example that is discussed is that of the Homeless World Cup. This event has been shown to raise awareness and counter prejudices and stereotypes among spectators (Sherry et al. 2011), which might result in policy changes to accommodate the interests and needs of homeless people who are currently excluded from the sport system (Frisby and Ponic 2013).

The Homeless World Cup is an annual participatory football event that is open to individuals who are considered homeless, with 500 players from 62 nations participating in the 2013 edition, and is built upon the principles of social inclusion. It is the Homeless World Cup Foundation, a non-profit organization located in Scotland, which is responsible for developing the tournament and selecting the host city. Candidate hosts must select a local organizing committee and prepare a bid book in cooperation with local organizations. Among others, the following bid elements need to be covered:

- **Inclusion Guarantee**: The Homeless World Cup tournament is *all-inclusive*. We do not want teams banned from entering the country. We need some assurance in writing from your government that they will work closely with you in the run up to the event, stating that they will assist you in allowing team members from any country in the world into your country to participate in the Homeless World Cup.

- **Marketing and Communications**: Raising awareness of this world-class, annual, international football tournament and its positive global message is integral to fulfilling the global mission and impact. We would like to see topline marketing and communications suggestions that will *reach and engage the city*, nation and the rest of the globe across all media.

- **Legacy**: We would like the event to make a long lasting contribution towards tackling homelessness using football in the host nation and/or city as a minimum.

(Homeless World Cup Foundation 2008: 5–7, italics added)

The Homeless World Cup Foundation selects the host city based on its commitments and plans of action to achieve community-based legacies. Other important elements of consideration are location, accommodation, business/financial plan, event logistics and program and ceremonies (Homeless World Cup Foundation 2008). These elements highlight that the local organizing committee, in cooperation with various local organizations, is responsible for achieving community-based legacies of social inclusion. The Homeless World Cup, however, is much more than an annual sport event and 70 partner organizations work all year round to provide training sessions, tournaments and activities to achieve social inclusion and end homelessness in all participating nations.

What might be key to understanding social inclusion in the case of the Homeless World Cup is the fact that the event itself is only the climax of year-long training activities by homeless
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people in various communities world-wide. Within these communities, teams are supported by partnerships among non-profit, public and private sector organizations and their preparations for the event can be conceptualized as community sport. For these reasons, and as outlined in the introduction of this chapter, community sport might be better posited to address individual needs and collective expectations by returning social inclusion to sport participation in the community as opposed to sport events (e.g., Doherty and Cousens 2013, Frost et al. 2013, Inoue et al. 2013).

Conclusions

In this chapter, we examined the creation of community-based legacies of social inclusion from the perspective of the IOC and the two most recent Olympic host cities. We consider the ways in which community stakeholders can help events be successful in terms of social inclusion. Academic discussion of the socio-economic and other impacts of sport mega-events has exposed a divide between supporters and critics of the use of sport mega-events, the most well-known being the Olympic Games, to achieve social benefits and community-based legacies of social inclusion. There are those who propose that the Olympic Games, being primarily a sport event, should not be expected to yield social benefits – they consider the Olympics to be an event that places the host city in the international spotlight for a period of time, and this is the only benefit the host population can reasonably expect. Although the IOC seeks to combat social exclusion at the policy level, as highlighted in Agenda 21, tools on how the organization directly aids in its achievement are not provided. Indirectly of course, the IOC could include it as an important criterion for candidates, allowing these jurisdictions to mimic and outstrip one another in promising community-based social legacies. Recourse for hosts who decide not to implement these promises would however still be problematic. This leaves host cities, due to pressures from the host community resulting from commitments made at the bid stage, to develop and implement their own public policies.

The Olympic case studies have highlighted that achieving consensus across different organizations, particularly in a time-challenged context as the pre-Olympic phase, is vastly challenging. Although both Vancouver 2010 and London 2012 showed a commitment to leveraging certain social and community benefits – more, one could argue, than many host cities in the past – they can be seen as fragmented and relatively limited; employment and skills development being but one aspect of social inclusion. It is true that the benefits of sport mega-events are not always equitably spread, and may tend to favour groups who are already in a stronger socio-economic position. Although employment opportunities may thus be created, they may result in a relocation of experienced workers rather than in benefiting a local workforce that needs to be reskilled. The option to include previously unemployed people for the additional economic activity created by the Games is often seen as being unrealistic for a two-week event, which is often considered to be too short a time period to expect employers to hire and train new employees (Blake 2005: 19). One could argue that if the IOC placed an emphasis on the leveraging of social benefits, host communities would potentially be subject to even greater scrutiny.

Events leading up to the 2016 Olympic Games indicate that the case of Rio might be different. In June 2013, Brazilian protest formed over the opposition of high World Cup and Olympic spending, high taxes and poor social services. The prospect thus exists, that with the whole world watching Brazil and the IOC, public protest might threaten the Olympic brand and its value. The prospective development would certainly pressure for the IOC to develop a formal community legacy policy. Similar to initiatives and pressures at the local level on environmental sustainability which led to the environment’s being described at the third dimension of the Olympic Movement, social inclusion can become part of this third dimension, or it could even become
predominant enough to constitute a fourth dimension as suggested by Lenskyj (2008). However, at this stage it is hard to predict if the influence of recent events in Rio will be sufficient to create the disjuncture needed for the IOC to include community-based legacies of social inclusion as formal requirements in the bid documents of prospective host cities. Nonetheless, the relatively rapid introduction of an environmental policy highlights ‘the capacity of the IOC to modify its philosophical position diametrically and in a relatively short period of time’ and this ‘typifies the capacity of transnational organisations to respond to perceived (and actual) threats to their global reputation and operations’ (Cantelon and Letters 2000: 427).

The example of the Homeless World Cup, however, shows that sport events can have social inclusion as the core objective of hosting. The Homeless World Cup is organized annually and exists to end homelessness. The local organizing committee, in collaboration with local public, non-profit and private sector organizations, is required to plan for a social legacy when bidding to host the event. Candidate cities are thus selected based upon their planned legacies, among other things. Figure 12.1 presents an understanding of how, in theory, the development of a community-based legacy of social inclusion should be part of the event itself. Event rights holders should mandate planning for a social legacy when bidding to host an event. This means that local organizing committees should work closely with various community stakeholders – in particular local governments, community organizations that have a mandate for social inclusion and most importantly those who are currently being excluded from the sport and other systems – to select key social issues that need to be addressed and implement successful strategies. The full potential of these strategies and efforts can be reached when the communitas that is generated and present among host residents, spectators and participants activates a willingness to change the social issue that is highlighted through the event in the host community.

Following Taks’ suggestion, ‘There is reason to believe that small-to-medium sized sport events have much to offer to local communities if properly leveraged’ (2013: 137). These events are organized more frequently when compared to sport mega-events, and research on the benefits derived from these events at the community and regional level has the potential

---

**Communitas**

- Willingness to change social issues arising from the individual and collective

---

**Planned legacy**

- Supported by policies, programs, projects and pilots

---

*Figure 12.1  Community-based legacy of social inclusion*
to be applied across communities worldwide. As a result, future research on social event leveraging should focus on better understanding of the role of small community events in social inclusion and integration. Although several frameworks have been developed for evaluating the social impacts of events and festivals (e.g. Delamere et al. 2001, Fredline et al. 2003, Small et al. 2005, Small 2007), none of these explicitly address social inclusion of vulnerable groups in the host community. A scale including this element is necessary to examine whether smaller community events could yield more extensive social impacts and inclusionary benefits than mega-events. Future research could focus on small community events – perhaps even local and regional tournaments that are organized to select the nation’s representative team for the Homeless World Cup – to answer the following research question: what strategies and practices undertaken by the event rights holder, the local organizing committee and various community stakeholders can promote social inclusion among competitors, spectators and/or volunteers? Research methods that could be use are endless including document analyses, interviews and participant observation.

We conclude the chapter by making five practical suggestions for communities seeking to ensure a community-based social legacy when hosting a sport mega-event, while making the event more successful in terms of social inclusion.

1. When leveraging sport mega-events to achieve social objectives, it is necessary to integrate social issues as a core objective for hosting. Community stakeholders, including those who are currently excluded and are living at the margins of society, should be part of a community dialogue to select those issues.

2. After being selected to host the sport mega-event and during the transition from bid committee to organizing committee, the community must continue to claim community-based benefits and demand binding promises from mega-event organizers. It is here where community-based coalitions, that are not formally part of the organizing committee, play an important role.

3. Organizers must partner with a spectrum of stakeholders in united efforts to support those existing policies and networks that are oriented to the social issues selected for leveraging. These collaborations should be framed and circumscribed in careful detail, with a particular focus on continuing these efforts beyond the life expectancy of the mega-event.

4. The active involvement of the target group (e.g. those in the inner-city) must extend into the development of policies and initiatives to better address the barriers that these individuals are currently facing in the host community and to develop a sport system that is more inclusive.

5. Insist on recourse by event rights holders as an accountability measure for local organizers. For example, this could be a financial penalty imposed when commitments are not realized.

By doing so, the planned mega-event legacy and local communitas – as shown in Figure 12.1 – could be strategically merged through the hosting of the event to (start to) alleviate a specific social issue in the host community.
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