

Written evidence submitted by Dr Verity Postlethwaite, Dr Geoffery Z. Kohe
and Dr Győző Molnár

Digital, Culture, Media and Sport Committee – Call for evidence: Major cultural and sporting events (Word count: 3527, including footnotes)

Submission from the following contributors¹

Dr Verity Postlethwaite - Early Career Researcher with interests are around how sport has been used in national and international contexts to govern society. PhD funded by the University of Worcester, titled: *Inspiring a Generation: A critical examination of governing actors, policy and legacy discourses*.

Dr Geoffery Z. Kohe, Lecturer in Sport Management and Policy in the School of Sport and Exercise Sciences at the University of Kent, with research strengths connected to socio-cultural, historical and political aspects of sport, the Olympic movement and legacies, national identity and public memory, the production and governance of sport museums/heritage, and sport and spatial politics.

Dr Győző Molnár, Principal Lecturer in Sport Studies (Sociology) in the School of Sport and Exercise at the University of Worcester, who is a critical sociologist with a research focus on migration, gender, identity politics and empowering marginalised populations.

N.B. This submission of evidence has not been funded by a particular organisation and there are no conflict of interests or sensitive data. All comments are based on a PhD study and publicly accessible primary sources. It builds on the three author's academic research, and Postlethwaite's two previous DCMS Committee Submissions in 2020 (co-authored with Dr Helen Symons and Mr James Allen).²

Contents

Executive Summary	2
1. The definition of legacy	3
2. The life course of an event	6
3. Maximising the benefits of legacy:	8

¹ Full biographies available here:

Postlethwaite: <https://www.linkedin.com/in/verity-postlethwaite-812155a9/>

Kohe: <https://www.kent.ac.uk/sport-sciences/people/2187/kohe-geoffery-z>

Molnár: <https://www.worcester.ac.uk/about/profiles/dr-gyozo-molnar>

² Previous call for evidence submission available in a publicly accessible format here:

<https://www.counselltd.com/insights/impact-of-covid-19-on-dcms-sectors>

Executive Summary

How should the success of major cultural and sporting events be measured and what should their legacies be?

We have addressed the question above in relation to our ongoing critical evaluations of sport mega events and, in particular, research undertaken on the London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games (London 2012) legacy aim to ‘Inspire a Generation’ over the past decade. Beyond the question above, this submission links to the other sub-questions and broader terms of reference of this call for evidence.

1. ***The definition of legacy:*** Notwithstanding the utility of scientific frameworks, wider understandings and evaluations of legacy are needed. A successful strategy for measuring legacy is built into empowering specific communities or organisations in understanding impacts of legacy and how they can identify, understand and evaluate such legacy. We will demonstrate this below through the measurement of the Get Set programme during London 2012.
2. ***The life course of an event:*** a major cultural and sporting event goes through numerous stages of management and across different political and economic contexts. The success of legacy, therefore, must be built into every stage of planning and be robust enough to reflect and adapt to significant changes in circumstances. Also, that aspects of legacy framing/discussion become relevant at different times of the event cycle. We will demonstrate this below through the 2010 change in national UK Government and how this altered London 2012 legacy planning.
3. ***Maximising the benefits of legacy:*** the evidence from recent UK (and other countries, such as Japan) major cultural and sporting events demonstrate that legacy is boosted when local, regional, national and international visions and interests are aligned. Economies to scale around human and physical resources are a key component to achieving this synergy and boost. We will demonstrate this below through the ‘one bid, one city’ shift during London 2012 and how different actors utilised the Get Set programme.

The evidence presented here is a combination of the authors’ own academic work, other academic work and primary materials from bodies connected to organising or evaluating London 2012.

The analysis presented here is a snapshot of a number of complex issues and opportunities related to event hosting and legacy. We will be happy to offer more detail or advice, plus encourage the readers to use the footnoted sources as further reading or evidence. At the end of each of the three points, we offer a series of brief concluding thoughts with practical recommendations, summarised here:

- Revisit the ‘Inspire Mark’ and ‘Get Set’ models (funding, delivery and collaboration) for enacting legacy at local, national, regional and international layers.
- Continue to promote a consultative and participatory approach to forming and developing legacy aims from the outset of an event bid, as context and locality impact on the success of legacy programme understanding.

- Look for components of legacy planning that fosters maximisation of legacy for varying stakeholders, e.g., joint hosting, facility or committee sharing or observer programmes.

1. The definition of legacy

In the UK and further afield, sport, and many other cultural mega events, have increasingly leveraged education impacts and value as part of bidding, hosting and post-event processes. In the context of London 2012 educational programmes, the element of shared value creation among stakeholders is important.³ Adding the process of creating value to the framework of stakeholder relations is useful, researchers note, as it involves balancing varying constituencies with a vision that can unite stakeholders.⁴ Get Set, the main London 2012 education programme delivered through primary and secondary schools across the UK, for example, championed Olympic and Paralympic values that provided a focus for legacy activity and a cause around which stakeholders could collaborate. While connectivity of thought can create, consolidate and enhance stakeholder relations within the sport-education sector, there can be no guarantees that collaborative efforts may be mutually beneficial, sustainable, or, least of all, meaningful (both in an ideological or practical sense).⁵ Moreover, within the context of delivering on educational projects with mega events, it is evident that stakeholders' motives for engagement are not always concerned with the sustainability of legacy deliverables (for example, the resource requirements and burdens placed on end-point users. In this case, schools, teachers and young people).

Regarding London 2012, two significant actors simultaneously, but not necessarily collaboratively, were creating value and relations around the 'Inspire a Generation' legacy aim. Firstly, LOCOG, who drove the delivery of the London 2012 Games and were accountable to the International Olympic Committee (IOC)⁶ and UK government, plus worked alongside a range of other stakeholders, such as schools and sponsors. The role of LOCOG is not permanent. As Agha, Fairley, and Gibson illustrated the organising committee

³ Postlethwaite, V., Kohe, G.Z. & Molnar, G. (2018). "Inspiring a generation: an examination of stakeholder relations in the context of London 2012 Olympics and Paralympics educational programmes", *Managing sport and leisure*, vol. 23, no. 4-6, pp. 391-407.

⁴ Jensen, M. C. (2010). Value maximization, stakeholder theory, and the corporate objective function. *Journal of Applied Corporate Finance*, 22(1), 32-42.

⁵ Kohe, G. Z., & Collison, H. (2019). *Sport, education, Corporatisation: Spaces of connection, contestation and creativity*. Oxon: Routledge; Kohe, G. Z., Aramaki, A., Sekine, M., Masumoto, N., & Hsu, L. (2021). Conceptualising L'Espac Olympique: Tokyo 2020 Olympic education in thought, production and action. *Educational Review*, (Online) 1-27.

⁶ To an extent, the International Paralympic Committee (IPC), where necessary we will differentiate between the two international organisations.

often commit and construct legacy aims, yet disband when the event is over and have limited or no accountability to fulfilling long term legacy.⁷ The second significant actor is the host city and national government, as these actors are (relatively) more permanent than the organising committee, they are often drivers of the long term value creation and sustainable legacy.⁸ Pertinent to the ‘Inspire a Generation’ legacy aim was the efforts of LOCOG (who own the Get Set programme), then the host city and national governments (who maintain the school sport and Physical Education). The combination of interests and efforts produced opportunities and threats for the success of specific and broader legacy aims and targets.

The Get Set programme and the ‘Inspire a Generation’ legacy aim relied upon principles of the demonstration effect⁹ and strategic partnerships at national, regional and local levels.¹⁰ It is known that to host a mega-event there is a need for a range of stakeholders. Those stakeholders are drawn from different, yet linked, industries, government, and indeed sectors (i.e., public, private, or third sector). In the case of the ‘Inspire a Generation’ legacy aim and the Get Set programme, there were some distinct definition issues which hindered the ability of the organisations driving and delivering legacy.¹¹ Most explicitly in this case, it was around how legacy connected into the education sector. In 2013 an Education Committee inquiry¹² into school sport following London 2012, Jackie Brock Doyle, Director of Communications and Public Affairs at the London Organising Committee of the Olympic and Paralympic Games (LOCOG), submitted written evidence (HoC Vol III, Ev w10) outlining that:

⁷ Agha, N., Fairley, S., & Gibson, H. (2011). Considering legacy as a multi-dimensional construct: The legacy of the Olympic games. *Sport Management Review*, 15(1), 125–139.

⁸ A larger discussion point here (and beyond the scope of this submission) is the level of scrutiny by varying bodies of the bid processes and submissions.

⁹ Weed, M. et al. (2015) ‘The Olympic Games and raising sport participation: a systematic review of evidence and an interrogation of policy for a demonstration effect’, *European Sport Management Quarterly*. 15(2), pp. 195–226.

¹⁰ Bell, B. and Gallimore, K. (2015) ‘Embracing the games? Leverage and legacy of London 2012 Olympics at the sub-regional level by means of strategic partnerships’, *Leisure Studies*. 34(6), pp. 720–741.

¹¹ Kohe, G. Z., & Chatziefstathiou, D. (2017). Olympic Education in the United Kingdom: Rethinking London 2012, Learning ‘Legacies’ and their Pedagogical potential. In *Olympic Education: An International Review* (pp. 60–72). Abingdon: Routledge

¹² House of Commons Education Committee. (2013b). Volume 1: School sport following London 2012: No more political football. London: The Stationary Office Limited. Available at: <https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201314/cmselect/cmeduc/164/164.pdf>

...the education strategy [for London 2012] was built around the Get Set programme, which gave schools the tools to integrate the Games and the Olympic and Paralympic Values into their own activities.

The “Values” that Doyle refers to were not explicitly what the government or other stakeholders contributing to the inquiry saw as the purpose or outcome of Get Set and more broadly the ‘Inspire a Generation’ legacy aim. This speaks to the issue noted in footnote seven about the level at which schools or other educational stakeholders influenced LOCOG or IOC process.

In contrast to this position by Doyle and LOCOG, the dominant conversation by non-LOCOG stakeholders was around competitive sport and the continued focus on domestic sport policy in relation to the elements of winning and losing. Mike Diaper, then Director of Community Sport, Sport England commented: “School sport and also competition in schools can be about fun. It is definitely about winning and losing. It helps us to build team and leadership skills” (HoC Vol II, Ev 2). Beyond the national policy perspective, Linda Cairns (HoC Vol II, Ev 14), School Sport Co-ordinator, George Abbot School stated “... if we put too much focus on competition, we are missing out on delivering sport, PE and physical activity to the large majority of our children and students.” The variation on the understanding of the purpose of school sport (and to an extent the conflation of school sport and Physical Education) and the role of London 2012 can exacerbate the ability to achieve legacy aims.

Notably, the role of LOCOG as a stakeholder and Get Set here and elsewhere is a minor relation in the broader discourse around sport and competition. Yet, this minor role in the broader set of relations is not explicitly acknowledged by the LOCOG or Olympic and Paralympic based stakeholders, ultimately leading to a significant tension in the understanding of the relations and ability to build a values-based outcome from a specific programme or legacy aim.

The evidence and analysis presented here showcase that:

- Engagement with grassroots/end-users right at the outset (be they community, education, or youth) is absolutely fundamental to meaningful legacy creation.
- There can be no guarantees as to how stakeholders will work together either when formal structures are provided, like Get Set, or when a legacy aim is diluted across a really broad education space such as school sport and Physical Education.

2. The life course of an event

Upon winning the rights to host the 2012 Olympics in 2005, the UK Government committed considerable funding; this amounted to over nine billion pounds of public money across the life course of London 2012. Life course refers to the chronological bid, plan, delivery, host and legacy stages of London 2012. As noted in the previous evidence submission¹³ across the life course of London 2012, different UK Government departments sought to develop or boost policy or agendas through and via the London 2012 project. A positive development during this period was the Government Olympic Executive (GOE) in the Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS). They would coordinate the “biggest ever public sector delivery effort” around sport.¹⁴ A term emphasised by the Blair, then Brown, Labour Government was ‘legacy’, and this both captured the policy imagination and added complexity to what could be achieved by London 2012.

In retrospective inquiries and research, the House of Lords¹⁵ and the Institute for Government¹⁶ have noted the challenge of a national or mega sporting event being used to influence policy decision making. In connection to tensions around purpose, another discourse manifested around London 2012 being a missed opportunity and implying from a variety of stakeholders that legacy outcomes within school sport were not immediately successful. This discourse predominantly focused on dialogue about domestic policy changes (i.e., the change in national government in 2010), especially, funding and power structures. For example, Andy Reed, then Chairman of the Sport and Recreation Alliance, commented that:

¹³ Symons, H., Allen, J. and Postlethwaite, V. (2020) Previous submission of evidence for the DCMS Committee ‘Impact of Covid 19 on DCMS sectors.’ Available at: <https://www.counselltd.com/insights/impact-of-covid-19-on-dcms-sectors>

¹⁴ Norris, E., Rutter, J. and Medland, J. (2013) Making the Games. What government can learn from London 2012? London: Institute for Government. Available at: <https://www.instituteforgovernment.org.uk/sites/default/files/publications/Making%20the%20Games%20final%200.pdf> (Accessed: 10 March 2018). p.4.

¹⁵ House of Lords, The Committee on Olympic and Paralympic Legacy (2013) Keeping the flame alive: the Olympic and Paralympic Legacy. HL Paper 78. London: The Stationary Office. Available at: <https://www.parliament.uk/business/committees/committees-a-z/lords-select/olympic-paralympic-legacy/publications/?type=&session=1&sort=false&inquiry=all> (Accessed: 12 December 2015).

¹⁶ Institute for Government (2012) ‘Making the games: A conversation with Jeremy Beeton and David Goldstone – Government Olympic Executive’ [Speech]. London, Institute for Government, 9 October. Available at: <https://www.instituteforgovernment.org.uk/events/making-games-conversation-jeremy-beeton-and-david-goldstone-government-olympic-executive> (Accessed: 05 November 2017).

...part of the problem is that there has not been a definition of strategically who is leading all these things, and of course when there are new moneys around, there is a tendency to try to find out which part in which slice of the cake is relevant to each (HoC Vol II, Ev 2).

The prevalence of this discourse reduced the amount of dialogue around the significant investment made through London 2012 and Get Set programme by various stakeholders. Instead the focus was more on the domestic policy and political changes. For example, Dame Tessa Jowell, former Olympic Minister in the Labour Government stated:

... policy has suffered to some degree through fragmentation across Government. That was a struggle that we had when we were in government—to achieve proper lockstep between DCMS [Department for Culture, Media and Sport] and DFE [Department of Education]. Also ... there is an important role for the Department of Health. (HoC Vol II, Ev 35)

The comment here illustrates the tension within central government regarding who is the dominant governmental stakeholder in school sport (and Physical Education) and what that means for relations around London 2012 legacy and school sport. Across the life course of an event, especially when there are significant economic or political changes, large legacy planning is prone to fragmentation of strategy and delivery. Further to the points raised above around definition of legacy, a success from London 2012 and the Get Set programme was the ability of LOCOG to be shielded from changes, whereas, domestic stakeholders (such as, schools) were subject to policy, political or economic changes across the life course of the event.

The evidence and analysis presented here showcase that:

- Legacy is more than just measurement, but an ongoing dialogue between the history and intentions of an event and the communities it effects. Legacy, therefore, must be a dynamic concept and be related to the varying economic and political contexts.
- As sustainable legacy and targeting young people is a continued endeavour, further study is encouraged to reflect on and bridge sport mega event literature, previous UK hosted events and literature around domestic policy.

3. Maximising the benefits of legacy:

The examples presented in the first two points connected to the Get Set programme and the ‘Inspire a Generation’ legacy aim showcase a variety of perspectives and lessons to be learned for future events. Most notably, if an organising committee aims to impact the values of a host city or nation, in particular, around educational programmes they must consider how they can unite and empower the constituent stakeholders. A success of this from London 2012, was the ‘one bid, one city’ – collaboration between IPC and IOC and then the collaboration between LOCOG and other partners around Paralympic and Olympic brands, values and events.¹⁷ From the outset of the London 2012 there was a drive to streamline tangible and intangible aims and assets, e.g., economies of scale around human and physical resource between the Olympic and Paralympic aspects of the Games. This went beyond sharing and actually encouraged substantive cost, time and resource (re)use, transferability and scalability. Specifically, the Get Set programme (although the official Olympic education programme), included both Olympic and Paralympic Values, brands and histories. This joint approach was the first Olympic and Paralympic Games educational programme to collaborate and maximise the benefit for LOCOG, IOC, IPC and the end-users, i.e., the education sector and young people.

Further to the maximisation by the international sports organisations and organising committee, another successful aspect of the ‘Inspire a Generation’ legacy aim is connected to domestic stakeholder maximisation. There are notable examples to show how stakeholders utilised the ‘Inspire a Generation’ legacy aim and/or the Get Set educational programme through collaborative or independently interpreted use in their own context. For example, Derek Peale, Head teacher Park House School, explicitly aligned the need for bottom-up and local stakeholders’ understandings of the:

...wider impact on school improvement, including positive outcomes in relation to Social, Moral, Spiritual and Cultural Development ... reflect creative approaches to the integration of sports-themed programmes such as Get Set (HoC Vol II, Ev 62).

The understanding from a Head Teacher and school perspective here goes some way to being an opportunity discussed by Kohe and Chatziefstathiou that the IOC and IPC brand can galvanize a stakeholder to create educational outcomes in their own setting.¹⁸ Such evidence

¹⁷ Gold, John R., and Margaret M. Gold. *The Paralympic Games*. In *Olympic Cities*. Routledge, 2016. Pp. 132-156.

¹⁸ *Ibid* 11.

supports Jensen's¹⁹ suggestion that values-based framework can be a useful way to enact a vision amongst stakeholders. However, Peale and Park House School appear to be the exception not the norm as the majority of school-based evidence reported passive engagement rather than opportunity to translate it into the local context (HoC Vol I, 2013a).

In a non-school perspective, the Wellcome Trust contributed evidence from their "In the Zone" initiative that used sport and physiology content in a touring exhibition and experiment kits for school. In terms of London 2012, the Trust summarised their contribution as:

...part of the practical learning strand of Get Set – the official London 2012 reward and recognition scheme for schools and colleges demonstrating a commitment to living the Olympic and Paralympic values – and was awarded the Inspire Mark by the London Organising Committee of the Olympic Games (HoC Vol III, Ev w34).

The dialogue from the Wellcome Trust, similarly to the Head Teacher perspective, demonstrates an interpretation of the London 2012 educational agenda as a way to maximise the programmes or sentiment in their own contexts. Moreover, the ability to gain reward and recognition as an outcome for their own ends. The Inspire Mark referenced in the quote from the Wellcome Trust is a separate scheme to the Get Set programme, and beyond the scope of this evidence submission. The two programmes [Get Set and Inspire Mark] illustrate that the benefits for local, regional, national and international based stakeholders are increased if there is alignment of resource, ability to translate legacy into local contexts, and bodies/programmes recognising these efforts.

The evidence and analysis presented here showcase that:

- Revisiting the process and formation of the 'Inspire Mark' and the 'Get Set' programmes from London 2012 would be productive as significant learning can be applied to the current and future context in the UK.
- The inquiry-based evidence presented throughout shows legacy (and the measurement of success and/or legacy) could be successful through a maximisation approach. However, more needs to be understood as to how this can be enacted equitably and effectively in future UK major cultural and sporting events, especially in relation to

¹⁹ Ibid 4.

non-Olympic/Paralympic events (i.e., hosting regional championships), in non-London and Home Nation settings (i.e., considering city/regional aspects).

End.

Submitted: 14th May 2021

Word count: 3527 (including footnotes)