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Abstract

The international and commercialised recognition of the Olympic Games can bring upon prestigious benefits to a country's Olympic Games legacy. Due to this, candidate cities have capitalised on this opportunity to leverage their bids to successfully secure hosting rights. Consequently, this has commodified the bidding process, which has intensified the competition and the declining number of bids over recent years. Thus, jeopardising the legitimacy of the Olympic Games bids to its true values of Olympism. Hence, utilising a semi-systematic literature review, this thesis aims to investigate the extent and in what ways the Olympic Games bids have embodied the values of Olympism. Specifically exploring within three case-study examples; the Beijing 2008; the London 2012; and the Rio De Janeiro 2016 Summer Olympic Games. Adopting a thematic analysis and theoretical framework, findings have noted four overarching themes that influence the leveraging of bids; Economical, Political, Globalisation and the Public (Social). Further, and to a vague extent, the selected Olympic Games bids embodied the values of Olympism as secondary and appear to be a by-product of a prominent agenda that reflects the ebb and flow of politics and economics of the respective host-city. Interestingly, by examining the Olympism philosophy and legacy this may not be an issue due to its abstract construction and lack of precision, which has enabled great flexibility. As a resolution, this thesis calls for the values to be measurable and the implementation of evaluative committees that span beyond the Olympic Games to ensure Olympism values and its legacy is embodied successfully.

Key Words: Olympics, Bidding Process, Olympism, Leveraging, Legacy
Background

The relationship between politics and sport have been significantly explored within sport-science related works of literature. In decades past, the sporting industry has encountered various forms of politics-driven demonstrations by various key stakeholders, which has raised continuous debates on sport’s position within politics (Lin, Lee & Nai, 2009, Lenskyj, 2017). Thus, greatly influencing the relevance of such research. Past IOC leaders have stressed the importance of the Olympic Games to adopt an apolitical nature, which is deeply rooted in its revived origins set by founder Pierre De Coubertin (Lenskyj, 2017). However, with our everchanging society, this remains uncertain. As stated by the current IOC President, Thomas Bach, who reaffirmed that the IOC remains to be apolitical, however in reality sport itself is not (Lenskyj, 2017). This could be further justified as the sport industry continues to develop towards a more corporate-centred profitable business creating an opportunistic avenue for striking contradictions and power relations (Smith & Himmelfarb, 2008; Smart 2018). Thus, jeopardising the unique concept of the Olympic Games, which is driven by the philosophy of Olympism (Olympics, 2019). Due to this proclaimed apolitical nature of sport, countries have capitalised and utilised such avenue to promote their respective political agenda for various reasons (Lin, Lee & Nai, 2009). This includes utilising sport as a propaganda vehicle to grant diplomatic recognition, gaining national prestige and potentially socialising sport participants and non-participants to a political ideology (Lin, Lee & Nai, 2009). Further, this could subsequently facilitate the construction and reconstruction of national identity and nation-building (Lin, Lee & Nai, 2009).

Acknowledging such opportunities, it becomes evident that prospect host-cities are overshadowed by the ideals of prestigious benefits that stem from hosting a mega-sporting event such as the Olympic Games (Grix, Brannagan, Wood & Wynne, 2017; Lauermann, 2019). This has been extensively researched and this thesis will note accordingly. Due to such benefits, prospect host-cities capitalised such opportunities by leveraging their bids to successfully host the Olympic Games as it can catalyse to ignite respective political driven development agendas (Bason & Grix, 2018). However, there has been a decline in the Olympic Games bids over recent years (Bason & Grix, 2018). This is partly due to the increase of economic burdens, political factors and stringent requirements set in place by the IOC under Agenda 2020, which has been greatly
influenced by the commercialisation of the Olympic Games (Thorpe & Wheaton, 2019). This reflects the introduction of the Olympic Games within the global consumer culture as it infused with transnational corporate commerce that led to its dependency on global media (Smart, 2018). Thus, adequately narrowing the number of prospect host-cities based on compliance rather than interest (Bason & Grix, 2018). Further, suggests shifting the importance away from building a legacy deeply rooted in the values of Olympism.

**Research Purpose**

The overarching purpose of the thesis is to explore whether the Olympic Games bids transpose to embody the philosophical values of Olympism. Simultaneously, explore the growing literature on different ways the Olympic Games host-cities successfully leverage their bids and whether such host-cities upheld their promises as it can significantly influence the legacy that is projected. To the best of the researcher’s knowledge, this thesis brings originality as it aims to explore how consistent the Olympic Games bids upheld their promises in line with the philosophy of Olympism. Further, such thesis purpose stems from future directions suggested by previous research (Shoemaker, 2016; Bason & Grix, 2018; Bason, 2019). Acknowledging the gross number of the Olympic Games bids over decades, this thesis will solely focus on three Summer Olympic Games, specifically the Beijing 2008, the London 2012 and the Rio De Janeiro 2016 Summer Olympic Games due its recentness and unique propositions, in which this thesis will note accordingly.

**Scientific and Social Relevance**

The research aims to provide an overarching scientific contribution to the continuous debate on sport’s position with politics by exploring how do prospect host-cities leverage their Olympic Games bids and whether such bids aligns with the values of Olympism. Thus, appropriately acknowledging potential research gaps to further conceptualise this research topic. This can serve great importance as the Olympic Games industry rapidly evolves to a commercialised avenue, jeopardising the viability of the core values of Olympism (Smart, 2018). Additionally, this research hopes to
further understand the priorities of host-cities that inform the decisions undertaken surrounding the construction of their Olympic Games legacies. Further, acknowledge the existing power relations between the IOC and the host-cities to conceptualise their respective bids. The social relevance of this research is to educate on unaddressed agendas that key stakeholders utilise in mega-sport events and bring recognition to the importance of public support during the construction of the bids (Bason & Grix, 2018; Paulsson & Alm, 2020). Further, prompt a discourse, through a different perspective, on the changing narrative of sport and how it is and should be utilised.

**Research Question**

This thesis question details as follows;

*To what extent and in what ways do Host-cities embody the values of Olympism within the constructions of their bids?*
Previous Research

Philosophy of Olympism

Olympism, a philosophy of life that drives and anchors the Olympic Movement. Founder of the revived Olympic Games, Baron Pierre De Coubertin notes that such philosophy places sport as the service of humanity emphasising the equilibrium of qualities of the mind, body and will (IOC Museum, 2020; Firek, 2017). Further, it is expressed through actions that greatly align sport to education and culture (IOC Museum, 2020a). The construction of the philosophy was greatly influenced by Coubertin’s upbringing that bridge the 19th century English concept of Amateurism with traditional Greek ideals that embodied the trinity of the body, mind and soul, which were the foundations of the original Olympiad (Czula, 1975; Smart, 2018). Coubertin believed that sport had the capability of playing a crucial role in promoting progress and social unity, and therefore, envisioned a ‘purer, chivalrous and transparently sincere’ games (Czula, 1975). Besides introducing a modern and international dimension to the Olympic Games, Olympism drove a broader project, which was to promote education through sport, that stemmed from Coubertin’s long-lived ambition to reform youth and education in France (IOC Museum, 2020a). Olympism is protected by the International Organising Committee (IOC), which is the sole governing body of the National Olympic Committees (NOCs), which are the national constituents of the worldwide Olympic Movement and the philosophy is embedded within the Olympic Charter. The Olympic Charter (2019) depicts Olympism as “a philosophy of life, exalting and combining in a balanced whole the qualities of body, will and mind. Blending sport with culture and education, Olympism seeks to create a way of life, based on the joy of effort, the educational values of a good example, social responsibility and respect for universal fundamental ethical principles”. The core values of Olympism are ‘Excellence, Respect and Friendship’ (IOC, 2016). To briefly discuss the values, Excellence promotes the pursuit to be the best, whilst acknowledging the importance of participation (IOC, 2016). Respect aims to preserve humanity through the practice of accepting and respecting oneself, others, regulations, the sport and the environment to promote peace and international understanding (IOC, 2016). Lastly, the value of
Friendship encourages to recognise sport as a tool for mutual understanding and solidarity between individuals from all over the world (IOC, 2016).

Despite Olympism’s positive idealism, there remains uncertainty on its position within our current society and has suffered a growing degree of scepticism and criticism. Contemporary critics argued that this philosophy lacked a clear and precise definition (DaCosta, 2006). In fact, due to its simplicity, perhaps provided this philosophy with the flexibility that enabled its approval by traditional and conservative social and political groups and a new modernist society (Firek, 2017). Further, one could suggest that maintaining a high level of generality is a form of strategy to obtain universal agreement and inducement for reflections (DaCosta, 2006). Also, Olympism faced significant criticism and contradiction due to changes within the sporting industry, as it shifted towards a consumer-oriented business, which stemmed from the 20th century (Smart, 2018). This led to the ideals of the Olympic Movement to increasingly be incompatible with financial imperatives driven by the commercialised and consumeristic culture that have infested the Olympic Games (Smart, 2018).

Consequently, this has tainted and diminished the fundamental good principles to be significantly associated with the consumer market. Coubertin foreshadowed this as he believed that any public interference with associated Olympic sport organisations would fuel inefficiency and mediocrity (Czula, 1975). This could further justify the critiques of the institutional narcissism generated by the Olympic Movement, whereby such institution is resistant to new ideas that could alter the purity of the official philosophy (Lenskyj, 2017). Subsequently, re-enforcing the IOC’s dominance and autonomy over the movement and persistence of this philosophy, in which key stakeholders within the Olympic Games industry could utilise these ideas as a form of defence mechanism against protest and failures of host-cities (Lenskyj, 2017). Thus, protecting once and still is, a simple philosophy has now come with a cost. Further, suggesting such a philosophy that was once a priority has now become a secondary by-product. Hence, this thesis aims to further explore the philosophy of Olympism and its viability within our current and everchanging society.
Mega-Sport Events, Legacy and Leveraging

A mega-sport event can be justified in various ways. In general, Roche (2001) defines mega-events as large scale cultural, including commercial and sporting events, which has dramatic character, mass appeal and international significance. To an extent, such events are organised by a combination of national governmental and international non-government organisations (Roche, 2001). On top of this, Roberts (2004) added that such mega-events are typically one-off and different each time. It is a given that the Olympic Games are an internationally prominent mega-event (Lauermann, 2019; Attwell, Morgan & Parker, 2019). However, due to its growing global recognition, the Olympic Games are newly classified as a 'giga-event’ (Müller, 2015), which categorises through four factors; the number of people attending, media reach, total cost and infrastructure development. Thus, this thesis has classified the Olympic Games as a mega-sport event, in accordance to Roche’s (2001) and Robert’s (2004) definition whilst acknowledging contemporary classifications such as Müller’s (2015).

Due to the prominent nature of the Olympic Games, it is evident that such an event has significant impacts. A specific impact is the notion of legacy-building. To define legacy, Preuss (2007) identified six dimensions;

1. The legacy continues beyond the event itself.
2. As environmental factors change, new opportunities for legacy are present.
3. Impacts vary depending on the group of stakeholders.
4. Legacy consists of tangible and intangible effects.
5. Legacy is often limited to the host areas, however, there’s the potential of influence beyond that region.
6. Legacy may be unintentional such as negative impacts are unplanned.

It is important to note that the Olympic Charter states that the IOC has a role to promote a positive legacy from the Olympic Games to host-cities and countries (Olympics, 2019). This was to increase the likelihood for host-cities to commit sufficient effort and resources in producing legacies (Attwell et al., 2019). Despite this, the IOC does not have a clear and precise definition of legacy (Bason & Grix, 2018). This prospect of achieving and sustaining positive impacts has centralised event organisers (Dickson,
Benson & Blackman, 2011; Attwell et al. 2019). With that, it is no surprise that host-cities are overshadowed by an expectation that hosting the Olympic Games will benefit from a positive legacy (Grix et al., 2017). Thus, neglecting the possibility of unplanned negative impacts, as noted in Preuss’ (2007) definition (Bason & Grix, 2018). Acknowledging this justifies prospect host-cities to leverage their bids to increase the likelihood of positive benefits. As Chaplin (2014) noted that leveraging consists of prospect host-cities adopting additional strategies that ensure positive outcomes from hosting a mega-event. Smith (2014) notes two forms of leveraging; event-led and event-themed leveraging. Event-led leveraging seeks to amplify positive benefits that are expected from hosting a mega-event, whilst event-themed leveraging utilises the event as a ‘hook’ to achieve policy objectives (Bason & Grix, 2018). This includes soft-power strategies that enable the ability to achieve goals through attraction rather than coercion (Nye, 1990) Thus, bids have leveraged in areas of economic, social and environmental (Bason & Grix, 2018). Further, provide opportunities for host-cities to leverage their bids to receive positive benefits that can subsequently place a city ahead of rivals and improve their position in the hierarchy of World Cities (Feblowitz, 2012; Bason & Grix, 2018). Hence, this thesis acknowledges the Olympic Games to be rooted with legacy-building and how host-cities capitalise this opportunity to leverage bids to ensure positive benefits.

The Modern Olympic Games

The modern revision of the Olympic Games invites international athletes, competing for various sport, in hopes for their achievements to be spectated and celebrated globally (IOC Museum, 2020b). The purpose of the Olympic Games is to promote the practice of sport globally and disseminate the Olympic Games’ values of Excellence, Respect and Friendship (IOC Museum, 2020b). To note, the modern Olympic Games carries valuable elements of the past. Following the Ancient Greek ideology, the Olympic Games reflect a cathartic avenue aimed to strive towards a more peaceful world. In contrast to its ancient origins, the revision of the Olympic Games embodies an innovated, secular and international recognition for sport, art and culture (IOC Museum, 2020b). Due to the international magnitude of the event, this had led to the growing significance of the Olympic Games to be an avenue to be exploited for political and diplomatic reasons (IOC Museum, 2020b). To note some historic
moments, this includes the Berlin 1936 Summer Olympic Games, following the appropriation of the Nazi Regime at the Olympic Games; the Mexico City 1968 Summer Olympic Games, with athletes Tommy Smith and John Carlos, demonstrated against racism in the United States (USA) and more occurrences thereon (IOC Museum, 2020b).

Understandably, such political demonstrations undermine the Olympic Games’ ideals causing great distress as the IOC continues to declare the apolitical nature for this international event (Giatsis, Ziakas, Zygouri & Giatsi, 2004). Despite, whether the political orientation may differ or align to humanity principles embodied by the Olympic Movement. The occurrence for such exploitation stems from the shift of the Olympic Games and its movement towards greater commercial-centredness. This is reflected in the recent IOC reform and the construction of Agenda 2020, which depicted the Olympic Games to shift from a sport-based event to an event-based programme (Thorpe & Wheaton, 2019). Subsequently, this conflicts with the ideals of Olympism as it does not necessarily accommodate the world of commerce (Giatsis et al., 2004), which re-justifies Coubertin’s prediction of negative effects of public interference to the Olympic Movement (Czula, 1975).

However, it is important to note that the protection of an apolitical nature in itself can be considered an ambiguous political agenda (Giatsis et al., 2004). This can be further re-enforced by the questionable power relations of the IOC committee and the transactions with global commerce. It is evident to suggest that sustaining the strength of global recognition for the Olympic Games has not only appropriately spread the Olympic Games’ ideals as intended but generated increased revenue for the Olympic Games industry (Giatsis et al., 2014). This includes host-cities of the Olympic Games. Hosting a mega-sport event such as the Olympic Games is a catalyst for urban development (Lauermann, 2019). Such contemporary project drives long-term benefits such as facilitating infrastructure investments, policy innovation and international significance (Lauermann, 2019; Attwell et al., 2019). Despite the attractive benefits, the industry is increasingly struggling to find potential host-cities. Thus, leading to consequences for the potential creation of a monopoly of countries that are considered feasible to host (Lauermann, 2019). Hence, this thesis continues to explore the platform the Olympic Games provides for political exploitations, with a particular focus on the Olympic Games host-cities regarding the next section on the bidding process.
The Olympic Games Bidding Process

The bidding process for the Olympic Games has undergone significant changes following Agenda 2020. However, noting the case-study examples of this thesis utilises, it is appropriate to briefly narrate the previous bidding format whilst acknowledging the current process. The bidding process is a diligently planned process that spans over several years before the Olympic Games itself (Shoemaker, 2016). Before Agenda 2020, the process began with an informal inquiry by the IOC to gather information on prospect host-cities’ interests (Shoemaker, 2016). Working alongside their respective NOCs, the most adequate city will be nominated to the IOC. Subsequently, a detailed questionnaire will follow supporting the city’s application as a candidate city (Shoemaker, 2016). The most promising bid will advance to the candidate stage, whereby cities will be required to provide a detailed plan regarding the Olympic Games. Thus, submissions will be reviewed by the IOC evaluation commission, followed by a formal vote (Shoemaker, 2016).

Differing marginally, the newly revised process aims to reduced costs and workload by eliminating certain deliverables such as travel shares and expensive printing (MacAlloon, 2016). Further, rhetorically it brings greater alignment towards sustainability and non-Olympic Games development goals, which are critical pillars for the construction of an Olympic Games legacy (Olympics, 2020). Thus, has influenced the structure of the new process. Currently, it consists of two main phases; firstly, a non-formal commitment invitation phase and secondly, the candidature process (Olympics, 2020). The invitation phase is a new addition to the process, as it directly stems from Agenda 2020. This phase aims to build a rapport between potential host-cities and the IOC, through workshops that establish a dialogue for collaboration and cooperation (Olympics, 2020). Following this is the candidature process, which is split into three stages; Vision, games concept and strategy; Governance, legal and venue-funding, and the Olympic Games delivery, experience and venue-legacy (Olympics, 2020). Throughout these stages, the IOC’s evaluation commission will actively evaluate and review the candidate’s Olympic Games operations through workshops, video conferencing and debrief (Olympics, 2020). The critical change with the new process is the open dialogue with the IOC, which provides prospect host-cities with additional support and facilitating a more collaborative approach to the process.
Despite an adequately outlined process, the Olympic Games bidding process has been continuously questioned. A fundamental problem that such processes face is that it is governed by self-regulating organisations that cannot necessarily manage the rapid growth for such events (Szymanski, 2016). Understanding that such events like the Olympic Games require a significant amount of government support, political and financial resources, potential host-cities are faced with further demands and pressure by the IOC (Paulsson & Alms, 2020). Consequently, this had led to a significant decline in bidding cities and a further amount of withdrawals from democratic countries as depicted in Figure 1 (Bason & Grix, 2018; Bason, 2019). The demands placed by the IOC can be extensive, which may require potential host-cities to alter their policies to accommodate the Olympic Games and protect the Olympic Games’ intellectual property (Szymanski, 2016). This was exhibited by Oslo (Norway), when they had withdrawn their bid for the 2022 Winter Olympic Games mainly on the scale of demands imposed by the IOC and the refusal to associate political relations with the IOC (Szymanski, 2016; Paulson & Alms, 2020). Acknowledging the power dynamics and potential to leverage bids for positive outcomes, this calls for enhanced governing procedures to determine the legitimacy of bid proposals (Szymanski, 2016).

Table 1. Number of the bidders for the Summer Olympic Games 1896 - 2028. Retrieved from Bason, 2019
Theoretical Framework

This section aims to outline a theoretical framework of concepts and theories that will be addressed within this thesis. Such a framework will assist in facilitating the analysis and discussion of the research question. Due to the extensive nature of the selected concepts and theory, a simplified and concise problematisation is annotated. To address its relevance, the framework is informed by previous research and this thesis will note accordingly.

Power

Exploring the literature on power, such a concept can be conceptualised in various ways. Dahl (1957) coined the term as ‘A’ has the power over ‘B’, which can influence ‘B’ to do something that ‘B’ would not otherwise do. Such definition acknowledges that power is a relationship amongst people that can be exploited through various means (Dahl, 1957). Critics have noted that such definition is vaguely constructed, however, this was the fundamental of purpose, as Dahl (1957) suggests that it captures the central intuitively understood meaning of power (Lukes, 2015).

To further conceptualise Dahl’s (1957) understanding of power, Lukes (1974) constructed a three-dimensional view on power. Through the one-dimensional view, power was exercised through the elements of coercive behaviour within decision-making and conflict, which may not be actualised (Lukes, 1974; Robinson, 2006; Bradshaw, 1976). On top of decision-making, the second-dimensional view added agenda-setting behaviours that implicitly restricts the agency of choice. Lastly, incorporating the previous dimensions, the third dimension noted the ability to manipulate and shape preferences through a given ideology. Acknowledging this multi-faceted view of power, re-justifies Dahl’s (1957) abstract concept, as it is broad enough to include the ability to change one’s behaviour through constructed agendas and manipulating consciousness (Baldwin, 2015; Lukes, 2015). Thus, Luke’s (1974) three-dimensional view on power provides a holistic conceptualisation on the evident power
relations of the IOC with candidate cities within the bidding process, which are limited to parameters of the Olympic Charter, agenda and Olympism-rooted values.

However, within our ever-changing society, the narrative of power, in terms of sources is changing. Thereby, resources such as technology, education and economic growth are deemed more important in contrast to raw materials, geography and population (Nye, 1990). Such economic power can no longer be measured merely by tangible, but intangible resources. Furthermore, dominant countries can obtain broad measures of consent on general principles that re-enforce supremacy of the dominant class, whilst offering satisfaction to the less powerful (Cox, 1987). This can be exploited through soft-power strategies, whereby a state can legitimise their powers amongst others, and if their culture and ideology are significantly attractive, will cause others to follow (Nye, 1990). For example, the exhibition of culture at the opening and closing ceremonies. Hence, the ability of a country’s culture to establish favourable principles and play a significant role within the international sporting activity is considered a critical source of power (Nye, 1990). This is widely evident with the sporting industry, as prospect host-cities of mega-sporting events continue to exploit soft-power strategies to gain greater global recognition and improve their status amongst other cities (Grix et al., 2017; Bason, 2019; Lauermann, 2019; Paulsson & Alms, 2020). Recognising the extensive nature of the concept of power, this thesis will primarily acknowledge associated definitions as addressed that is primarily rooted in Dahl’s (1957) definition of power.

Cultural Hegemony

Cultural Hegemony was developed by Antonio Gramsci. Despite a precise definition, the theory addresses the relation between culture and power under capitalism (Lears, 1985). Gramsci claims that power is located in cultural institutions. In a nutshell, the theory depicts the ability of a ruling group to impose a direction on social living, whereby subordinates are manipulatively persuaded to adhere to such dominant fundamentals (Lear, 1985). Cultural hegemony aids “us” to understand how ideas may be reinforced or undermine existing social structures to further conceptualise the power relations of a dominant class exhibiting autonomy over subordinates (Lears, 1985). Such dominance is legitimised by ideas, values, and experiences of dominant groups.
which are expressed and validated through public discourse. Within our current society, these refer to tools such as schools, mass media, pop culture etc. Consequently, shaping the consciousness of subordinates by making particular experiences readily available and others suppressed (Lears, 1985). This can be termed as ‘false consciousness’. Thus, such consciousness re-enforces autonomy of the dominant class as it limits the ability for subordinates to adopt their respective values and prohibit opportunities for a revolution (Lears, 1985).

Within the Olympic Games industry, the IOC holds autonomy in the direction of the Olympic Games, particularly on the allocation of host-cities. Through the Olympic Charter, agenda and Olympism-rooted values, bidding cities are required to abide by regulations to be considered as a candidate city. This reflects components of Lukes’ (1974) three-dimensional view on power, thus depicting a given power relation between the IOC and prospect host-cities. Hence, justifying a war of position that the theory of cultural hegemony expresses (Lears, 1985). Due to such power interaction with the outside world justifies the Olympic Games industry as political (Giatsis et al., 2004). However, with the evident decline of bids and failures of previous host-cities, one could suggest that the IOC’s position of dominance is becoming fragile, thus jeopardising the overall power dynamics and the ‘false consciousness’ surrounding the idealistic values of Olympism. Due to this decline, it thus called the urgency for reforms depicted by Agenda 2020 to re-enforce the IOC’s position within this hegemonic construct. Acknowledging the IOC as a self-perpetuating elitist organisation (Boykoff, 2013), reflecting the perception of ‘institutional narcissism’ (Lenskyj, 2017), which deflects the ability to accept change, such reforms should be viewed critically as to whether it is practised sufficiently remains uncertain due to its timely nature.

Symbolism and Values

When utilising these concepts, it is important to recognise the inter-dependency between symbols and values, however, respectively distinct between the two. Symbolic features bear greater significance to collective identities, whereby values are with personal identities (Bachika, 2011). Symbolisation ravels the concept as people embody and live their symbolisation collectively, which shows a degree of objectivity constraints one’s agency (Bachika, 2011). In contrast, valuation is considered the
evaluation of meaning that is explicitly expressed and such act is further internalised as it is repeated (Bachika, 2011). Nevertheless, both symbolisation and values overlap as images and/or modes of behaviours and being, as well as, ideas of behaviours and being (Bachika, 2011).

The way symbols and values function and utilise can impact significantly. Due to the cognitive nature of symbolisation, it can be easily manipulated (Bachika, 2011). This is evident with the Olympic Games’ symbols, which has been heavily commercialised and commodified the Olympic Games as a consumeristic product thus positioning itself within an economic activity (Sewart, 1987; Smart, 2018). Further, the process of symbolisation has been re-enforced by growing dependency on sponsorship and broadcasting rights as the IOC’s primary income generated by the Olympic Games (Giatsis et al., 2004). For example, with the London 2012 Summer Olympic Games, the city required to make appropriate changes to legalisations to accommodate the protection of the Olympic Games’ symbols (James & Osborn, 2011). Acknowledging this validates Bachika (2011) point whereby symbolic features become the main fare of identities, the significance of values decreases. Thus, may provide relevant justification for the diminishing values of Olympism within our everchanging society, specifically recent Olympic Games legacies.
Methodology

Research Design

As qualitative research was undertaken, this thesis adopted an ontology, which represents the researcher’s perspective, that is subjective as the investigated research phenomena of Olympism and the bidding process are socially constructed (Flick 2009; Smith & Sparkes, 2016). The subjective ontology informs a researcher’s epistemology, which represents their theory of knowledge. Thus, an interpretive epistemology is utilised as such approach views reality as socially-constructed and enables to conceptualise the meanings of a given phenomenon. Further, a phenomenological methodology is appropriate as such an approach aims to describe and analyse the subjective constructions of meanings, rules, and understandings (Flick, 2009), which aligns greatly to the research purpose of evaluating the embodiment of Olympism values within the Olympic Games bidding process.

For this thesis, a semi-systematic literature review was selected. A literature review as a methodology has been argued as a firm foundation for advancing knowledge and facilitative theory development (Webster & Watson, 2002). Semi-systematic literature was selected for this researcher as such methodology aims to map theoretical approaches or themes as well as identifying knowledge gaps within literature (Synder, 2019). Relevant topics such as Olympism and the impacts of mega-sport events have been explored within different domains and different theoretical perspectives, thus this form of the methodology is appropriate (Synder, 2019). Further, as noted by previous research, conceptualising leverage bids remains an under-researched area (Bason & Grix, 2018), particularly its association with the values of Olympism, thus this methodology will identify research gaps accordingly. Additionally, to further conceptualise and provide greater specificity on the bidding process through both the host-cities and the IOC perspective, respectively, this thesis utilised three case-study examples as follows; the Beijing 2008, the London 2012 and the Rio De Janeiro 2016 Summer Olympic Games, due to the recent nature of the Olympic Games and its unique propositions which this thesis will note accordingly.
Data Collection

To ensure a reliable and valid review, transparency is crucial (Synder, 2019). Thus, an inclusion criterion was deployed as seen in Table 1. This will inform the type of literature that was selected, the range of date of publication. Additionally, selected keywords/concepts guided the selection process. The construction of the inclusion criteria was closely influenced by Synder (2019). An appropriate and large amount of literature is needed to be sampled to ensure there is enough to map such patterns and themes. Hence, a total of 50 works of literature have been selected.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of publication</th>
<th>The 2000s – Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Type of Literature  | Scholarly/Scientific Articles  
                     Peer-reviewed  
                     Masters and Doctoral Theses  
                     Official documents/Reports |
| Source              | Reputable Academic Resources:  
                     E.g. Malmö University Library Search,  
                     Google Scholar, EBSCO, OATD and  
                     the IOC Olympic Studies Centre. |
| Key Terms           | “Olympic Games”  
                     “Bidding Process”  
                     “Olympism”  
                     “International Olympic Committee”  
                     “Host-Cities”  
                     “Mega-Sport Events”  
                     “Leverage Bids”  
                     “Beijing 2008”  
                     “London 2012”  
                     “Rio De Janeiro 2016” |

Table 1. Inclusion criteria for literature selection

Preliminary selection of papers was selected based on the key terms listed in Table 1 and abstracts were analysed to determine its relevance accordingly. Key terms are justified by the research question, purpose and previous research. Such terms will be searched and/or combined respectively. Subsequently, papers were categorised based on
its relevance to the selected key terms and have been read accordingly without a specific order.

**Data Analysis**

With the selected form of methodology, a thematic analysis was utilised. Such analysis aims to identify, analyse and report patterns and themes across a qualitative dataset (Braun & Clarke, 2006). The analysis was informed by the given research question, purpose, and method of data collection. Additionally, the analysis consisted of a coding framework, assisted for theme development, which informed how the analysis was drawn together. Braun & Clarke’s (2006) 15-point checklist will be utilised to ensure a good thematic analysis is carried out.

It has been noted that there are various ways to conduct such analysis, thus this analysis was constructed best to align with the skillset of the researcher to maximise efficiency and output. The adopted process is noted as follows;

To begin, the researcher familiarised the content of the selected set of papers. This was done by a complete read-through of the material, followed by a summary, for recollection, and to ease future referencing. On top of this, initial codes were generated based on noting key ideas of the paper, which could be set as a potential theme. Such key ideas are driven deductively based on the research question, however, ideas that were driven inductively based on the data presented were not neglected. At this stage, it was vital for the research to note accordingly, contradicting patterns that emerged from the data, to ensure a holistic analysis. These initial steps were repeated for all selected papers. The researcher’s annotations following such a process can be found in Appendix A.

Upon completion, the next phase of theme development was initiated. Generated codes were collated from all papers and crossed-analysed to identify similarities and contrasting themes. This was done based on a tally system, where key ideas were numerically categorised by frequency. Subsequently, categorised similarly and associating key ideas under an overarching theme. This was enabled in the process of defining themes.
Ethical Considerations

As the chosen methodology is a literature review, this minimises the risks for unethical conduct. However, as a thematic analysis requires interpretation, certain considerations are essential. Throughout the research process, researcher reflexivity will be adopted with emphasis during sampling literature and utilising the thematic analysis to develop themes and coding framework. Particularly with the thematic analysis, this is necessary as one needs to reflect on their values, beliefs and ideological positions as these can influence subjective biases when interpreting data (Smith & Sparkes, 2016). Further, this will enable a comprehensive analysis by ensuring a holistic approach is adopted to capture both supporting and contrasting information. To ensure an adequate thematic analysis was justified, Braun & Clarkes (2006) 15-point reflexive guideline was utilised as noted in Table 2. Additionally, this thesis aims to continuously remain transparent, through active reflection on choices made during the research process and maintain integrity as research by crediting work appropriately. Overall, this thesis adopts and follows the APA referencing framework.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transcription</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Data have been transcribed to an appropriate level of detail, and the transcripts have been checked against the tapes for “accuracy”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coding</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Each data item has been given equal attention in coding process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Themes have not been generated from vivid examples, but instead the coding process been thorough, inclusive and comprehensive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>All relevant extracts for all each theme have been collated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Themes have been checked against each other and back to the original dataset.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Themes are internally coherent, consistent and distinctive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Data have been analysed, interpreted, made sense of—rather than just paraphrased or described.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Analysis and data match each other, the extracts illustrate the analytic claims.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Analysis tells a convincing and well-organised story about the data and topic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>A good balance between analytic narrative and illustrative extracts is provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Enough time has been allocated to complete all phases of the analysis adequately, with rushing a phase or giving it a light once-over.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Report</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>The assumption about, and specific approach to, thematic analysis is clearly explicated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>There is a good fit between what you claim you do, what you show, you have done. i.e. described method and reported analysis are consistent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>The language and concepts used in the report are consistent with the epistemological position of the analysis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|               | 15  | The research is positioned as active in the research process; themes do not just “emerge”.

Table 2. Braun & Clarkes (2006) 15-Point Reflexive guideline
Results

This section details general findings from the literature review. Firstly, this section will discuss the four overarching themes that were informed by the thematic analysis. Secondly, it will outline the three case-study examples to provide general information regarding the selected Olympic Games. This section aims to provide readers with adequate information surrounding the literature on the concept of leveraging the Olympic Games bids and how the values of Olympism are embodied. Further, this is valuable information to further conceptualise the discussion of the results.

Economical

Through the literature review, it was discovered the Olympic Games bids are heavily influenced by economical-driven factors and thus, it is important to acknowledge and further conceptualise the bidding process. Most of the literature has acknowledged that by successfully winning hosting rights can bring upon prestigious benefits, both tangible and intangible. To distinguish the two; tangible benefits are physical in form whilst intangible benefits are not (Rosenblum, 2009; Scandizzo & Pierloni, 2017). According to the literature, tangible benefits include a boost in expenditures that attracts public and private investments, which are in turn, used to improve standards of infrastructures and further urban development (Rosenblum, 2009; Scandizzo & Pierloni, 2017). Consequently, able to initiate new trade relations and event-related jobs creation, which improves and contributes a reduction to a city’s unemployment rate (Rosenblum, 2009; Scandizzo & Pierloni, 2017). Further, such jobs may not necessarily be directly associated with the Olympic Games, but indirect fields such as retail and tourism due to the large number of spectators attracted by the Olympic Games (Rosenblum, 2009; Scandizzo & Pierloni, 2017). A significant intangible benefit is the re-occurrence of improving the host-city’s international recognition, which subsequently brings upon tangible benefits as noted previously. Nevertheless, both forms of benefits can significantly boost a city’s economy.

Despite such benefits, due to the perceived extravagance of the Olympic Games, the cost of hosting has increased both tangibly and intangibly as depicted in table 3. As a consequence, this has led to the evident decline in the Olympic Games bids.
(Shoemaker, 2016; Bason, 2019), which has narrowed the opportunities and number of bid-cities that can 'afford' hosting the Olympic Games. To note, the approximate costs given for the three case-study examples are as follows; USD 44 billion for the Beijing 2008 (Rosenblum, 2009; Bason, 2019) USD 18 billion for the London 2012 (Rosenblum, 2009; Norris, Rutter & Medland, 2013; Bason, 2019) and USD 13.1 billion for the Rio De Janeiro 2016 Summer Olympic Games (Bason, 2019). However, it is important to acknowledge that such figures are estimated due to the variation of studies collected, which may vary the information presented.

According to Rosenblum (2009), the Olympic Games are not financially justifiable on the benefit of greater exposure. Additionally, the high cost needed to ensure an extravagant display is deemed unnecessary, as the IOC does note any specific requirements on the number of sporting infrastructures are needed for the Olympic Games and cities are responsible over the numbers (Rosenblum, 2009). However, this remains uncertain as to if a developing country were to host such Olympic Games, these unnecessary projects would be necessary and thus re-justifying the high costs of the Olympic Games (Rosenblum, 2009). Following Agenda 2020, the IOC has aimed to reduce such costs, but there remains scepticism regarding the practicality of such reform (MacAlloon, 2016). Thus, suggesting that host-cities view the Olympic Games merely as

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Boost of expenditures from public and private sectors</td>
<td>• Under-used/ Unused infrastructures, utilities and amenities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Infrastructural &amp; urban regeneration</td>
<td>• Increase in public debt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Tourism</td>
<td>• Increase in taxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Trade</td>
<td>• Sanitation, hygiene, waste costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Job opportunities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increased GDP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tangible</strong></td>
<td><strong>Intangible</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Marketing</td>
<td>• Social Injustices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Host-city’s branding</td>
<td>• Bad publicity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• International reputation</td>
<td>• Overcrowding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Experiences in hosting a mega-sporting event</td>
<td>• Environmental concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Nationalism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Tangible and Intangible impacts of the Olympic Games. Information retrieved from Rosenblum, 2009; Petrenko, 2014; Scandizzo & Pierloni, 2017
a cost-benefit analysis rather than its original concept rooted by Coubertin’s principles of Olympism (Rosenblum, 2009). Reflecting Coubertin’s concerns that it would be very unfortunate if the exaggerated expenses incurred would deter smaller countries from putting themselves forward as potential hosts (Girginov & Hills, 2008; Cain, 2019).

**Political**

Acknowledging the concept of leveraging, prospect host-cities strategically plan their bids to fulfil politically-driven agendas. This is evident by the rhetoric-reality gap that may be present within the Olympic Games bids, whereby what is promised may not be practised or causing detrimental effects. The literature has noted that the Olympic Games bids can catalyse long-term development planning, such as urban and infrastructure development noted previously (Lauermann, 2014). Also, there are instances in which such plans are disguised or masked to align towards the Olympic Games legacy, that does not necessarily comply with the ideals of Olympism (Szymanski, 2011). This includes host-cities utilising manipulative strategies of using public funds and disguising it as social regeneration to gain support and beneficial returns (Szymanski, 2011). As an example, the Rio De Janeiro 2016 Summer Olympic Games was part of the city’s long-term strategic plan on utilising sporting events to facilitate urban development (Silvestre, 2012). Similarly, the Beijing 2008 Summer Olympic Games were to justify their position on the international map by bridging a relation between the East and the West (Collins, 2011). Thus, suggesting the Olympic Games bids are depicted as another political agenda and leveraging is a justified method to capitalise this opportunity (Hiller & Wanner, 2018).

Furthermore, it was politically-driven from both the IOC and prospect host-cities’ perspectives. Reflecting the IOC’s ownership of the Olympic Games, its sole responsibility is ensuring that the Olympic Games happen every four years. This provides the IOC with power in terms of control over the Olympic Games, in particular awarding cities with hosting rights. With that, the IOC’s priority remains at ensuring that awarded cities have sufficient resources to carry out the event. Thus, if prospect host-cities are leveraging their bids to emphasise their bids whilst serving the own good of their respective city’s development agendas (Szymanski, 2011; Silvestre, 2012), this jeopardises the legitimacy of the bid itself. In which could complicate the IOC’s
responsibility and increasing room for alleged corruption incidents (Syzmanski, 2011; Zimbalist, 2011). Hence, this calls for enhanced governing procedures to determine the legitimacy of bid proposals (Syzmanski, 2016).

Globalisation

The Olympic Games as a mega-sport event hints its international significance. This is due to the growing nature of globalisation. By constantly attracting new participants globally, it expands the reach of the Olympic Games. As a result, significantly spreading the reach of the Olympic Movement and its values. To specify, embodying the Olympic Movement’s principle of Universalism and value of Friendship through intercultural understanding. This was evident amongst all the selected Olympic Games host-cities, in particular, Beijing’s 2008 Summer Olympic Games, which aimed to facilitate a relationship between the East and the West (Haugen, 2003; Collins, 2011). Also, the economic benefits are driven by this global recognition, which justifies prospect host-cities to leverage their bids to fulfil political agendas (Scandizzo & Pierloni, 2017; Maenning & Verhaus, 2019). Grix & Brannagan (2016) outlines that mega-sport events bring attraction to a host-city’s respective culture. Consequently, this will increase tourism to the successfully awarded host-city (Grix et al., 2016). Further, increasing the branding of the city, which facilitates new and stronger forms of diplomacy of the state and thus signalling for trade (Grix et al., 2016).

However, due to globalisation, this has led to an increase in the scale of the Olympic Games and thus the evident rise in costs. Due to the synergy between sport and transnational corporate commerce, the extravagance of the Olympic Games is facilitated by the growing involvement of sponsorship and television broadcasting (Malia, 2014). Consequently, the IOC has the responsibility to ensure that the Olympic Games are continuously deemed ‘attractive’ to keep people entertained and engaged as it is the new norm (Malia, 2014). Thus, reflects the commercialisation of the Olympic Games, which either have or will diminish the values of Olympism. This is supported by the literature suggesting that the bidding process itself commodifies the Olympic Games and thus the legacy itself (James & Osborn, 2011; MacAlloon, 2016). Hence, this re-enforces the power and hegemonic struggle over hosting rights. This is evident as host-cities
capitalised on this opportunity to display soft-power strategies within their bids (Grix et al., 2016).

Public (Social)

Throughout the literature review, there is an evident concern regarding the public’s role surrounding the Olympic Games. The lack of public support over the Olympic Games bids has been a contributing factor to the declining trend of the Olympic Games bid, particularly in Western democratic countries (MacAloon, 2016; Hiller & Wanner, 2018; Paulsson & Alm, 2020). Consequently, this has led to the Agenda 2020 reform, which addressed the collaboration with the public and the necessities of their support from prospect host-cities. Despite this, it seems that public opinions still play a minor role in the IOC’s evaluations (Hiller & Wanner, 2018). Nevertheless, the bidding process, whether new or old, inherently favours the organiser’s interest at the expense of the respective city’s well-being (Shoemaker, 2016; Nooij & Berg, 2018). To an extent, happiness that is generated from the Olympic Games by the public may be the only source for welfare gains that political figures could credibly justify bidding for (Nooij & Berg, 2018).

The majority of bids are addressed to improve social living for host-cities populations. As the literature review addressed, there is a possibility that this is merely a manipulative technique to utilise public funds to leverage bids. Subsequently, constructing false promises that led to failed or incomplete outcomes that has an indirect impact on the public (Carey, Masey & Misener, 2011). Thus, suggesting that the public stands to lose the most from bidding mega-sport events (Zimbalist, 2011). This can be supported by the lack of systematically monitoring and measuring of public opinion throughout hosting the Olympic Games, and the lack of emphasis on public impact within the Olympic Games reports (Hiller & Wanner, 2018). Further, it justifies the increase in democratic countries withdrawing their bids due to the lack of support (Paulsson & Alm, 2020). However, despite reforms, there remains scepticism surrounding the IOC and whether such acts are sufficient (MacAloon, 2016). Thus, suggesting there is a negative perception surrounding the IOC and without addressing this issue, this can further jeopardise the number of prospect bidding cities (MacAloon, 2016).
Beijing 2008 Summer Olympic Games

The 2008 Summer Olympic Games was the second bid for Beijing, after having lost marginally to Sydney for the 2000 Summer Olympic Games. Beijing’s second Olympic Games bid was believed to be dedicated to enhancing cultural exchanges between the East and the West, and an opportunity to demonstrate China’s achievement in reform and to accelerate the country’s economic and social development (BOCOG, 2007). Beijing’s Olympic Games Organising Committee claims the success of the bid was supported by factors such as China’s economic strength, political and social stability, active participation in sport, infrastructure support and successful experience in hosting mega-sport events (BOCOG, 2007).

Despite this, Beijing was challenged in terms of fierce bids competition; differences in culture and ideology; lack of recognition by the IOC in comparison to other candidate cities and weak environment and infrastructure management (BOCOG, 2007). The main concepts for the Beijing 2008 Summer Olympic Games are noted as follows;

1. Green Olympics.
2. High-technology Olympics.
3. People’s Olympics.

The concept of a Green Olympics drew a connection with Ancient Chinese philosophy, which recognised the sustainable use of the environment and human existence, which greatly aligns with the Olympic Movement (BOCOG, 2007). Simultaneously, Beijing aimed to utilise high-technology equipment that would benefit the construction of the Olympic Games and its society (BOCOG, 2007). Lastly, the concept of the ‘People’s Olympics’ was to promote the multi-cultural exchanges, whilst embracing Chinese ancient civilisation, bridging an understanding and friendship between the East and the rest of the world (BOCOG, 2007).

Beijing’s bid to host for the 2008 Summer Olympic Games was strongly supported by very high profile political figures of the People’s Republic China (PRC), Deng Xiaoping (former Paramount Leader of the PRC) and Yang Shankun (former President of the PRC), who expressed China’s readiness and eagerness to host the Olympic Games (Collins, 2011). In line with the concept of the ‘People’s Olympics’, the Beijing 2008 Summer Olympic Games was not merely a sporting event, but an
attempt to solidify China’s position within the international sporting activity (Collins, 2011; Zhou & Bauer, 2012). In comparison, to previous East-Asian Summer Olympic Games host-cities (Tokyo 1964 and Seoul 1988), the Beijing 2008 Summer Olympic Games outshined in terms of modern hybridity and a greater mutual coevality of the East and the West (Collins, 2011). This dominating narrative made Beijing’s 2008 Summer Olympic Games purpose unique from previous Olympic Games which focused on urban regeneration, international tourism and/or advancing commercial opportunities (Andranovich, Burbank & Heying, 2001; Zhou & Bauer, 2012). Thus, suggesting the Beijing 2008 Summer Olympic Games could have legitimatise the principle of Universality at the Olympic Games (Collins, 2011).

Nevertheless, there were concerns with the Beijing 2008 Summer Olympic Games, particularly surrounding the high levels of air pollution, greatly jeopardising its ability to fulfil its ‘Green Olympics’ concept. Indeed, China made efforts to relieving such pressures, which has contributed to the increased gross cost of the Games. This was further justified by the extra need for infrastructure development to accommodate the Summer Olympic Games sport such as cycling, beach volleyball, kayaking and more (Petrenko, 2014). According to the literature, the economic effect of the Beijing 2008 Summer Olympic Games remains questionable (Petrenko, 2014). This could be partly due to the tourism levels, which were less than expected because of the high-security levels, leading to visa issues (Petrenko, 2014). Further, Beijing’s Bird Nest Stadium considers itself as a ‘white elephant’ due to the lack of future sporting events within time-proximity of the Olympic Games meant that revenues would not be generated from those infrastructures to pay-off initial costs (Petrenko, 2014; Shoemaker, 2016). In terms of social legacy, the Beijing 2008 Summer Olympic Games had noted successful outcomes in terms of volunteering numbers during the Olympic Games, with an approximate of one million locals applied to volunteer throughout the Beijing 2008 Summer Olympic Games (Petrenko, 2014). Further, 400,000 schools collectively participated in educational programmes to actively promote the Olympic Games values to children (Petrenko, 2014). Despite such attempts, there were grave concerns regarding China’s human rights issues. Acknowledging the Olympic Games ability to improve economic development, it was argued that such an improvement could facilitate China’s democratisation and thus improve the human rights situation.
London 2012 Summer Olympic Games

London’s bid for the 2012 Summer Olympic Games was greatly influenced by Britain’s Olympic Games history, hosting the 1908 and the 1948 Summer Olympic Games (LOCOG, 2012). This was the country’s fourth attempt in hosting the Olympic Games since 1948 (LOCOG, 2012). It is important to note that previous bid attempts were by, then preferred cities, Birmingham and Manchester (LOCOG, 2012). It was noted that it was evident for a bid to have credibility, it was necessary to have unequivocal support from three stakeholders, the central government, city/local government and the British Olympic Association (LOCOG, 2012). Thus, a reason why London was not considered in the UK nominations as a bid city for the previous two attempts (LOCOG, 2012). The main foundations supporting the vision of the 2012 Summer Olympic Games in London were as follows;

1. Delivering the experience of a lifetime for athletes.
2. Leaving a legacy for sport in the UK.
3. Benefitting the community through regeneration.
4. Supporting the IOC and the Olympic Movement.
5. Compact, iconic and well-connected venues.

The idealistic foundations broadly addressed the necessities for new urban infrastructures, in hopes to inspire a new generation of youth for greater sporting participation and finest sporting facilities for hosting national and international events (LOCOG, 2012). The legacy also focused on the regeneration of East London as an Olympic Park, which aimed to bring communities together and act as a catalyst for profound social and economic change (LOCOG, 2012). Lastly, the London 2012 Summer Olympic Games aimed to protect and enhance the Olympic Games by utilising London's assets of historic landmarks, creating memorable media by embracing London's rich culture and contemporariness (LOCOG, 2012).

The London 2012 Summer Olympic Games was noted to be one of the first host-city to include a formal legacy component to its Olympic Games project (MacAlloon, 2008; Norris, Rutter & Medland, 2013; Cain, 2019). This concept envisioned a 'British Olympism' which placed Britain as the epicentre for the Olympic Games (Beck, 2012). Indeed, it was successfully expressing nationalism through readily
available means such as the ceremonies and merchandising (Malia, 2014). The large proportion of London’s 2012 Summer Olympic Games legacy was focused on the regeneration of East London, situated in an area with high levels of environmental degradation and socio-economic deprivation (Hiller & Wanner, 2018), to benefit the local communities with (Brownhill, 2013). According to London’s Olympic Games Impact Study, London met its short-term goals such as transportation infrastructure, development of the Queen Elizabeth Olympic Park, and securing future tenants for the newly developed sporting facilities, minimising the effects of 'white elephant' infrastructures (Cain, 2019). Additionally, despite addressing long-term goals such as social exclusion rates and reduction in poverty, there remains uncertainty in the fulfilment for such an agenda, particularly with housing and sporting participation. It has been noted that the post-Olympic Games housing prices had significantly increased, thus only classifying 50% of the infrastructure to be deemed affordable for the locals (Teeuwen, 2018, Cain; 2019). Further, it has been noted that the London 2012 Summer Olympic Games brought intangible benefits such as raising public awareness of the sport, however, sustaining participation rates remains questionable (Cain; 2019). Hence raising concerns regarding sustainable effects of the Olympic Games legacy and its movement.

Rio De Janeiro 2016 Summer Olympic Games

Brazil as a country has been consistent with its long aspirations to host the Olympic Games. With their previous failed bids for the 1936, the 2004 and the 2012 Summer Olympic Games, Brazil adopted a learning-curve strategy by nurturing their shortcomings and working on improving their assets (ROCOG, 2016). This was facilitated by reaching out with previous host committees and the IOC to understand their shortcomings. Acknowledging their failed bids, Brazil strategically decided to focus on Rio De Janeiro’s bid for the Pan American Games in 2007 and the FIFA World Cup in 2014, which successfully prepared Rio de Janeiro to bid for the 2016 Summer Olympic Games (ROCOG, 2016). Indeed, the success of Rio De Janeiro’s bid was due to a long-term plan designed to boost sport in Brazil (ROCOG, 2016). Additionally, Rio De Janeiro possessed key assets that facilitated the success, which was; their passion for sport, pre-existing facilities and venue layout, and Brazil’s
economic stability following the 2008 financial crisis (ROCOG, 2016). Rio De Janeiro represented a unique opportunity for the Olympic Games as the first South American host-city (ROCOG, 2016).

As noted, Rio De Janeiro’s 2016 Summer Olympic Games project was part of the city’s revised master plan, which promised a social legacy that focused on the urban regeneration of the city’s infrastructure to benefit its population. The bid was specifically influenced by the ‘Barcelona Model’, which reflected Barcelona’s achievements whilst hosting the 1992 Summer Olympic Games. The model has been a benchmark in assisting host-cities of mega-sport events in terms of attributes such as urban design, leveraging support and funding for the large-scale regeneration and constructing of a strategic plan that accommodated various sectors (Capel, 2007; Silvestre, 2012). Rio De Janeiro’s 2016 Summer Olympic Games project accumulated experienced social actors, such as the Organising Committee of the 2007 Pan American Games and Barcelona 1992 Summer Olympic Games, which contributed significantly supported the succession of the project (Silvestre, 2012).

Despite the long-term planning and experienced support, the Rio De Janeiro 2016 Summer Olympic Games suffered certain challenges. Sustainability concerns aroused surrounding the construction of an Olympic Games infrastructure, which contested the sustainable narrative within its Olympic Games legacy. This includes human violations and environmental concerns, such as housing evictions; vegetation and natural habitat devastations, that contradicted the promised concept of social inclusion (Almeida, Jurnior & Pike, 2014). Further, Brazil suffered unpredicted challenges, which included the time-proximity of the Zika Virus outbreak and an economic recession, which sparked health and financial concerns for the Olympic Games (Bremer, 2016). Nevertheless, the city had persevered through these challenges. However, such challenges have brought doubt on the overall impact of the Olympic Games on the city’s residents (Silvestre, 2012).
Discussion

Acknowledging the general findings from the literature review, this section will now apply the knowledge towards the values of Olympism and bring specificity by applying to the three case-study examples. To reiterate; values of Olympism are ‘Excellence, Respect and Friendship’, which embodies the principles of Universality and Humanity (IOC, 2016). Further, findings will be theoretically analysed within the frameworks of Power (Dalhl, 1957; Lukes, 1974), Gramsci’s Cultural Hegemony (Lears, 1985) and Values (Bachika, 2011; Featherstone; 2011).

The bidding process IS the Olympic Games

According to the IOC (2016), the value of Excellence addressed the sense of striving for the best possible result whilst acknowledging the importance of participation over winning. Drawing on this value to the bidding process, one could suggest that indeed winning hosting rights brings upon prestigious benefits as explored (Rosenblum, 2009; Grix & Brannagan, 2016; Scandizzo & Pierloni, 2017; Burgo & Cromartie, 2018). However, participating bid-cities despite unsuccessful results can stimulate local development planning due to associating nature of the bids to political and development agendas (Rose & Speigel, 2009; Lauermann, 2014; MacAlloon, 2016). This may be an idealistic concept, as the reality is that the bidding process is nevertheless a gamble, whereby one city is the ultimate successor of hosting rights. The sense of uncertainty of bids makes detailed discussion and debates hypothetical, thus those remaining can incur great losses with invested resources (Hiller & Wanner, 2018; Bason, 2019). Hence, acknowledging this re-justifies the evident power struggle amongst prospect host-cities. Thus, leveraging bids increases one’s chances of winning hosting rights.

Theoretically aligning to concepts of power (Dahl, 1957; Lukes, 1974) and Gramsci’s Cultural Hegemony (Lears, 1985), one could suggest that the bidding process paints a hierarchy, and thus creating a strong perception that certain cities, particularly host-cities to be painted hegemonic over other cities as they are compromised with resources that give them the ability to host the event. As the literature has branded these benefits from hosting as ‘prestigious’, this could label such resources to be ‘prestigious’
too (Grix & Houlihan, 2017). Due to globalisation, thus strengthen the recognition of prestige, which Gramsci notes as a critical element which re-enforces the power dynamics (Lears, 1985). This was evident surrounding the Beijing 2008 Summer Olympic Games, which aimed to build a relationship between the East and the West. Indeed, Beijing’s desire to host the Olympic Games was fuelled by the commitment to integrate with the international community, but also to establish their stance in terms of dominance (Haugen, 2003; Collins, 2011). The IOC presents Olympism as a force for modernisation and universalistic humanism, in which Beijing capitalised on this force to ignite change (Haugen, 2005). Utilising soft-power strategies, particularly exhibited at their opening ceremony, which greatly aligned with the Olympic Movement due to its peace and harmony theme was an opportunity for Beijing to modernise (Giulianotti, 2015). This reflects, Luke’s (1974) third-dimensional of power, which is the ability to shape, determine and/or influence one’s belief, which grasps the essence of soft power strategies (Grix & Houllihan, 2017). However, such demonstrations exhibited did not align with Western ideologies, thus signifying their regime (Collins, 2011).

China presents an alternative model of economic development that may not be easily incorporated into Western modernisation, thus posing a threat to the West and jeopardising the Western hegemony of the modern society (Collins, 2011). Hence, the Beijing 2008 Summer Olympic Games does contribute to the discourse that the Olympic Games are universal, however, such discourse is confined within the Western practice, thus suggesting that allocating Beijing as a host could have shaped a new discourse calling for a truly global Olympism to be formed (Collins, 2011).

Furthermore, with the evident decline of the Olympic Games bids, perhaps signified the revolution that Gramsci had noted whereby the ideals of ‘false consciousness’ were no longer appreciated by the working-class (Lears, 1985). To apply, this could suggest that prospect cities were doubting the Olympic Movement, consequently abstaining to place a bid for the Olympic Games. As a result, the IOC was pressured to set reforms, depicted by Agenda 2020, to re-justify their position of power.

Also, if the value of Excellence promoted the importance of participation, this calls attention for a more democratic bidding process to be adopted that could signify greater collaboration. As an idealistic suggestion, the IOC could create a rotational system, similar to the FIFA World Cup (Matheson, Schwab & Koval, 2017), amongst all participating countries and economic-dominating countries could actively and collectively contribute towards countries that are scarce in resources to assist in hosting...
the Olympic Games and thus creating the Olympic Games to be a more collaborative effort. However, this is not the case in reality due to pre-existing political ideologies that may limit the possibility of collaboration, thus undermining the additions made to Agenda 2020, which celebrates the importance of collaboration. Further, due to the extravagant infrastructures necessary to host the Olympic Games, this creates additional geopolitical issues as countries may not have the adequate capacity to host such mega-scale event. Thus, highlighting that due to the commercialised and globalised nature of the Olympic Games, which has contributed to its status as a mega-sport event, has called for infrastructures that may be considered unnecessary to be essential (Rosenblum, 2009). Consequently, creating a monopoly of countries that must possess the adequate resources, which are notably developed countries and significant political support, visible in countries that have a long-term history of autocratic bid for the Olympic Games (Maenning & Vierhaus, 2019). Ironically, this juxtaposes the predominant narrative of bids, which partly focus on establishing a legacy of urban development, as readily developed host-cities are most likely and predominantly awarded because they possess adequate resources. Hence, indicating a rhetoric-reality gap between the value of Excellence, which highlights the importance of participation and how much the value is practised. Further, re-enforcing the commodification and hegemonisation of the Olympic Games, which ultimately makes particular cities hegemonic against others.

**Universality and Friendship**

Exploring the values of Olympism within the case-study examples of the Beijing 2008 and the Rio De Janeiro 2016 Summer Olympic Games, it is evident that the Olympic Games enhanced universality by broadening the geography of the Olympic Games. The Rio De Janeiro 2016 Summer Olympic Games was the first Olympiad to be hosted in South America (ROCOG, 2016). In contrast, the Beijing 2008 Summer Olympic Games was an opportunity to establish relations between the East and the West (Collins, 2011). Investigating the respective bids for both the Olympic Games, such values were evident within the bids. However, it was masked by a greater agenda, a political strategy to gain greater international recognition. As noted in the previous section, due to the global recognition of the Olympic Games, it can significantly initiate
both political and economic development in terms of branding, trade, diplomacy and tourism for not only the host-city but the country (Grix & Brannagan, 2016). Thus, one may hint that such development benefits can carry significant weight over the values of Olympism, particularly Universalism. Hence, leading to the argument that the values of Olympism falls second and merely a by-product over a greater agenda. Exploring this point through Bachika (2011) theoretical understanding of values, this greatly aligns to the point whereby symbolisation become fairer of identities, valuation decreases. This comes with no surprise due to the commercialisation of the Olympic Games, which has led to the commodification of the Olympic Games into a consumer product reflected by the risky economic gamble of the bidding process (Sewart, 1987). Due to the coexisting nature between commercialisation and commodification, the branding of the Olympic Games has brought to light greater benefits for host-cities that shine brighter than the values of Olympism itself. Thus, re-enforces prospect host-cities be overshadowed by these benefits whilst constructing their bids. To apply, due to the commodification of the process, this has made certain countries hegemonic as reflected by the Rio De Janeiro 2016 Summer Olympic Games. Indeed, Rio De Janeiro capitalised this opportunity to broaden the geography of the Olympic Games, however, it can be argued that it was an attempt to solidify the city’s dominance in South America in a race of making history. To fulfil such an agenda, they utilised soft-power strategies, which enabled them to collaborate with the best expertise, e.g. individuals who were part of the Barcelona’s 1992 Olympic Games Organising Committee, to sustain successful results (Silvestre, 2012; Almeida et al., 2014).

Also, it can be argued that the value of Universality facilitates the path of embodying the value of Friendship, in hopes of mediating a collective intercultural understanding of various countries (IOC, 2016). Exhibited through the Olympic Games commodities, such as the opening and closing ceremonies, providing a great avenue to showcase a host-city’s respective culture. However, there remains ambiguity on what truly defines intercultural understanding. Indeed, due to the globalised reach, host-cities can capitalise on this opportunity to flourish not only their culture but their displays of political power, in hopes of greater exposure. However, such exposure brings ambivalence on how such intercultural understanding is understood and appropriately embodied. This can be further justified by the lack of post-Olympic Games evaluations and the short lifespan of a one-time event which limits for significant embodiment (Hayday, Pappous & Koutrou, 2019).
As an example; Beijing may have legitimised the concept of Universality and capitalised on the opportunity to facilitate a friendship between the East and the West through the exhibition of its culture. However, this may be a reflection of its deeply-rooted history as a realist nation-state, which depicts a self-interested state whereby any state action aims to obtain and competes for power to seek dominance (Johnston, 1958; Holsti, 1964; Haugen, 2003). This may be evident as it aimed to build a relationship with the West and such gestures were instead perceived as a threat to Westernisation (Collins, 2011). Additionally, the international media exploring Beijing’s human rights priorities neglected the understanding that different societies prioritise human rights differently in light of particular histories and stage development (Rowe, 2012; MacAloon, 2016). For instance, China places a priority on economic rights as the central human rights, which contradicts the Western ideology of human rights (Rowe, 2012; MacAloon, 2016). This was a contributing factor to Beijing's failure with their first Summer Olympic Games bid for 2000 (MacAloon, 2016). Further, this led to believe that by hosting the 2008 Summer Olympic Games would have sparked economic development, which facilitated the process of democratisation, consequently alleviating the human rights situation. Thus, one may argue that the value of Universality is constructed within a Western perspective, in which it re-enforces the ambiguity of intercultural understanding and the way it is truly embodied. Further, this can arise to question the integrity in purpose for such demonstrations. As it re-justifies the utilisation of soft-power strategies, to overcome the given power struggle over hosting rights and the prestigious benefits stemming from hosting mega-sporting events to dominate international sporting activity (Grix & Brannagan, 2016; Grix & Houlihan, 2017).

Do cities practise what they preach?

A proportion of the narrative within the bids is directed towards social and community development, representing the main pillar to host-cities’ respective legacies. With the London 2012 Summer Olympic Games, there was an immediate focus for the Olympic Games to mediate an increase in sporting participation, this was the first Olympic Games to do so (Cain, 2019). However, literature examining post-effects of the Olympic Games have pointed findings suggesting otherwise. Hayday et al., (2019)
noted that the results for a sport participation legacy remain ambiguous, particularly due to the varying studies investigating impacts between hosting and non-hosting regions. Certain papers noted an impact for pre-existing active individuals whereas a weak impact for non-active individuals (Weed et al., 2015; Chen & Henry, 2016). In contrast, there is literature that suggests the possibility of allocated funds to enhance sporting participation, were used towards the Olympic Games itself (Cain, 2019). Hinting at the given priorities for the Olympic Games. This could be due to the commodified nature of the Olympic Games, contributing to the diminishing of its values.

Despite setting a focused agenda to effectively tackle this issue, there is an assumption to believe that the organisations and government policies have failed to capture the opportunities of demonstration effect, whereby exposure to the elite sport will stimulate mass sport participation (Weed et al., 2015; Hayday et al., 2019). Thus, for a successful impact of the Olympic Games to fulfil such an agenda there should be an evaluation committee set in place that focuses on post-Olympic Games impacts. To justify, the lifespan of organising committees surrounding the London 2012 Summer Olympic Games are significantly shorter than the timescale necessary to effectively evaluate the legacy impacts post-Olympic Games. Thus, contradicting Preuss’ (2007) definition of legacy, where such impacts need to persist over time and this could simply be due to the lack of clarity of responsibility on supervising the delivery of this agenda (Leopkey & Parent, 2012; Bell & Gilmore, 2015). Nevertheless, direct responsibility should not solely be placed upon the host-cities as the IOC should also play an active role in post-Olympic Games effects if they truly embody the values of Olympism and the new awareness of collaborative effort addressed within the Agenda 2020. This could be placing greater enforcement and ramifications to ensure bid promises are fulfilled (Pentifallo & VanWynsberghe, 2012). Hence, raising concerns whether the recent reforms are sufficient, if not truly practised. Re-justifying the IOC’s label as an ‘institutional narcissism' who are resistant to change (Lenskyj, 2017) and thus reflecting their hegemonic position throughout the Olympic Games discourse.

To an extent, the ‘Public’ is neglected

As previously hinted, social and community development is argued as a central pillar to a city’s respective legacy. However, impacts from these set agendas do not
necessarily have a direct impact or to an extent neglected. The Rio De Janeiro 2016 Summer Olympic Games were criticised for their efforts as a host-city as they sparked certain social injustices (Gaffney, 2013; Boykoff & Mascarenhas, 2016; Knijnik, 2016). As promised for a social legacy that promised to provide basic services to the ‘Favela’ community, who are inhabitants that live in urban slums of Rio de Janeiro, were instead confronted with human violations that led to forced evictions of their homes to accommodate the construction of the Olympic Games infrastructures (Gaffney, 2013; Knijnik, 2016). Further, arising sustainability issues with the construction of Rio De Janeiro's Golf Project, which can be problematic for a developing country that does not embody a pre-existing golf culture. Thus, such project merely crystallises the social inequalities and adds the symbolisation of the wealth as it occupies a vast amount of land that can be utilised for greater social benefits (Gaffney, 2013; Knijnik, 2016).

Similarly, the London 2012 Summer Olympic Games was a catalyst for the gentrification of East London, providing housing and employment as promised. However, such gentrification only led to higher costs for housing, particularly within that given area (Cain 2019; Teeuwen, 2018). Thus, decreasing the affordability for locals (Cain; 2019; Teeuwen, 2018). Additionally, non-hosting cities had also contributed funds towards the Olympic Games, however, merely receiving any direct nor indirect impacts (Chen & Henry, 2016; Bell & Gilmore; 2015). Hence, through these examples, instead of providing a positive social legacy, it subsequently only widens the socio-economic gaps between the rich and the poor. Further, re-justifying the geopolitical divide between urban and rural areas. Thus, one could suggest that it does not represent the Olympism value of Respect as the host-city’s population to an extent is significantly compromised.

Furthermore, education and the youth are critical elements of Olympism, however, are addressed but not prominently practised by the host-cities. The Rio De Janeiro 2016 Summer Olympic Games established the ‘Transform’ Program which aims to educate youths deeply rooted within the values of Olympism (ROCOG, 2016; Santos, 2018). However, upon evaluation of the programme it is concluded there is an absence of action that has allowed the programme to have continuity and evolution. This is similar to London’s 2012 Summer Olympic Games initiatives of utilising the values of Olympism and the symbols of the Olympic Games to facilitate sporting participation (Kohe & Brown-Jones, 2016). However, the literature has noted that the periodical event can leverage opportunities to raise awareness to social issues such as participation
rates, however, does not adequately stimulate sustain effects that can foster behavioural and attitudinal change (Kohe & Brown-Jones, 2016). Thus, re-enforcing the ideology that by including education establishments can actively promote a candidate city’s bid to leverage over the IOC’s evaluations. However, the reality is to ensure successful results it relies on the academic support for significantly integrating the Olympic Games’ models into pre-existing learnings models (Monnin, 2012). Thus, without such support, this will ultimately produce insignificant results. Further, exploring from the IOC perspective, integration of Olympism values into schools can be a way of securing institutional recognition (Monnin, 2012). Thus, theoretically justifying Gramsci’s theory of cultural hegemony, where such recognition expressed within such cultural institutions re-enforces the power of the dominating class (Lears, 1985) and in this case, it’s the IOC.

Acknowledging that the Olympic Games are partly funded by public funds (e.g. taxpayers), hints the importance of public collaboration (Hiller & Wanner, 2018). However, consciously aware of the power dynamics, this can jeopardise the process of what is referred to as collaboration. Further, to what extent is Agenda 2020, which calls for public collaboration has come to fruition. As previously noted, the concept of leveraging bids can be depicted as a manipulative technique to utilise public funds and disguise bids as agenda for social regeneration, despite only receiving minimal returns (Syzmanski, 2011). Thus, re-enforcing the idea that the public themselves could be the ones who lose most in this gamble (Hiller & Wanner, 2018; Nooij & Berg, 2018; Bason, 2019). Additionally, it is important to note that the requirement set by the IOC are stringent, which could reduce the likelihood for bid-cities to successfully fulfil them. Thus, hinting a possible rhetoric-reality gap, in terms of practising what has been promised. Therefore, ideally one could suggest that the IOC should make aware bid-cities that demonstrate significant achievement for socially desirable goals. However, democratic countries that rely on public support, are withdrawing their bids consequently contributing to the decline in bids (Paulsson & Alm, 2020). Hence, creating a monopolised pool of autocratic countries, which may not prioritise social development thoroughly instead capitalising on the values of Olympism as a manipulative method for greater political agenda.
Shortcomings of Olympism

The previous sections have hinted Olympism values to be manipulated and resulting as a by-product of a greater political agenda. Thus, raises the question of the viability of the philosophy. Indeed, Olympism is ambiguously defined. Due to this, it brings upon flexibility that enables the philosophy to be altered and argued in various ways from various perspectives. This can be evident from the inconsistent embodiment of the philosophy as seen in the three case-study examples. The London 2012 Summer Olympic Games saw the embodiment of a ‘British Olympism’, which depicts Britain as an early epicentre for the Olympic Games. However, such exhibition was merely a promotion for nationalism, in which can be anti-ethical to the values of Olympism (Malia, 2014). Malia (2014) notes as the Olympic Games is a competition that organises itself based on countries, this embraces the concepts of nationalism, in which demonstrations by the spectators and associated institutions could further perpetuate the concept of a friendly rivalry depicted as ‘us versus them’. Thus, opposing the principles of Solidarity and Universalism, which captures the essence of Olympism (IOC, 2016). Similarly, the Beijing 2008 Summer Olympic Games dedicated to embracing a ‘Green Olympics; High-Tech Olympics; People’s Olympics’ which may have promoted the values of Olympism however juxtaposed the top-down control of an autocratic country and host-city’s branding (Zhang & Zhao, 2009; Guilianotti, 2015). As the literature investigating post-effects of the Olympic Games noted that the host-city's rhetorical values established by the government may have not well-represented people's experiences and perception (Zhang & Zhao, 2009; Guilianotti, 2015). Similarly, Rio de Janeiro’s promise for social legacy consequently led to further social injustices with the Favela community and environmental issues (Gaffney, 2013; Knijnik, 2016). Thus, residents’ perceptions were positive surrounding the improvements for urban mobility and the increase in tourism, however, were negative regarding non-lasting legacy effects such as misuse of public resources and increase in prices (Zouain, Lohmann, Cardosa, Virkki & Martelotte, 2019). As exhibited, these examples depict an inconsistent embodiment of Olympism. However, it is difficult to penalise such embodiment as the construct of Olympism remains abstract, reflecting its flexible nature to be easily adapted to fit a given narrative.
To an extent, a movement should strike the norm. It is the ideology of achieving something unachievable could be defined as the movement in itself (MacAloon, 2016). This draws comparison to the indefinite nature of philosophy and the persistence over time found in legacies. This could be referred to as a process philosophy (DaCosta, 2006). It notes that the high level of generality is a form of strategy for obtaining agreement or as an inducement for reflection. Thus, enabling the philosophy to remain universal whilst finding distinctiveness within local expressions. This can be supported theoretically by Featherstone (2011) who notes that indeed values are distinct. Hence, as a recommendation to ensure a greater embodiment of Olympism by host-cities, such values should be measurable to an extent. In which, evaluation committees should be set in place to focus on such agendas timely, specifically post-Olympic Games, to sustain legacies. However, it is important to note that such values should not be imposed as norms as it can produce unhealthy results (Bachika, 2011). Arguably, this reflects the IOC’s current responsibility for the values of Olympism, thus shifting the responsibility onto the host-cities to successfully fulfil its promised agenda.

**Future Directions and Limitations**

From the analysis, there are certain future implications this thesis can address. Regarding the values of Olympism, the literature has noted that there is an inconsistent embodiment of such values. As previously suggested, ideally a more democratic bidding process would be more coherent with Olympism values as it would facilitate a collaborative effort that would celebrate participatory and intercultural understanding. However, as countries continue to prioritise the excellence of their own and the continued growth for extravagant infrastructure, this has merely created a monopoly of countries that can adequately host. Thus, as a suggestion, there could be an emphasis to make the values of Olympism to be measurable. Indeed, to an extent, this may disrupt the flexibility of the philosophy. However, bringing measurability to the values could facilitate greater consistencies on value embodiment, particularly with greater alignment during legacy construction. Addressing legacy planning, the works of literature points to a potential issue in sustaining legacies. This is partly reflected by the lifespan of organising committees that dissolves shortly after the Olympic Games are hosted. Due to this, there remains a lack of supervision on overseeing the post-impacts of the Olympic Games and upholding the promises that were set before the Olympic Games.
being held. Thus, implementing evaluative committees that span past the Olympic Games being held would be beneficial to ensure legacies are sustainable. Stemming from this point, this thesis’ finding is limited as it did not investigate the existence of penalising strategies the IOC may enforce on host-cities to ensure promises are upheld and legacies are sustained.

As hinted, this thesis consists of limitations. It is particularly important to address that the three selected case-study examples were conducted under the previous bidding framework, which as noted early in this thesis of its reforms. Thus, such bids are evaluated under a different set of requirements and guidance, which ultimately may have an impact on the outcomes of the Olympic Games, which has contributed to the construction of Agenda 2020. It is necessary to note that the effectiveness of the reforms remains unknown awaiting for the upcoming Olympic Games to play out. Also, the literature review consisted of various types of studies, particularly those exploring the economic benefits and determining the exact costs and expenditures of hosting the Olympic Games. As noted by Scandizzo & Pierloni (2017), depending on the type of study this can vary the information presented as the structure of the analysis may exaggerate and neglect findings and thus affecting the generalisability of this thesis.

Furthermore, there are issues concerning bias. Firstly, the majority works of literature explore the narrative of the Olympic Games from a Western perspective, particularly with the Beijing 2008 Summer Olympic Games whereby analyses explored the Eastern constructs within the frameworks driven by Western ideology. This could be re-enforced as selected papers were sourced in English, which may neglect research that was written in the respective native language. Thus, potentially limiting the nature of the findings and subjecting it to potential biases. This also reflects this thesis’ interpretivist epistemology, in which the researcher’s reflexivity has been utilised to minimise the risk of subjective biases, however, such biases may implicitly occur.

Upon analysing the works of literature, it is important to note that certain topics had emerged that may have not been addressed thoroughly. This is particularly due to the inclusion criteria that were adopted for this thesis, which limited the scope of the literature selected. This included topics of property pricing, host-cities’ residents' perceptions, governance, social injustices and education programs. Acknowledging the brief discussion of such topics, this reflects the nature of a semi-structured literature review as such method can appropriately inform potential research areas (Synder,
2019). Thus, informing areas that enable to further conceptualise the bidding narrative and its consequences, which greatly aligns to scientific relevance of this thesis.

Also, as this thesis solely focused on the influence of the IOC and host-cities’ countries, future research could further investigate other key stakeholders such as athletes and volunteers and their embodiment perspective of the Olympism values. For instance, athletes play such a crucial role in the Olympic Games. As the globalising nature of the Olympic Games, this has provided athletes with greater power and a platform for them to influence sporting cultures and politics to an extent (Boykoff, 2017). Thus, in line with the relevance of this thesis, it may be appropriate to conceptualise whether athletes embody values that re-enforces the integrity of the Olympic Movement, or reflects branding driven by commercialisation (e.g. sport apparel sponsorships). Further, due to the close association of the Olympic Games with the entertainment industry, it could be fruitful to investigate associated entertainers’ and performers’ part in the Olympic Games ceremonies, whether to what extent the Olympic principles and values inform the decisions and construction surrounding their performances. Additionally, as volunteers ideally participate with good and altruistic intentions, understanding how they embody the values of Olympism may demonstrate the success of the Olympic Movement.
Conclusion

In conclusion, to an extent, the values of Olympism are vaguely embodied. Specifically, the values remain to be addressed and appear to be as a by-product of a prominent agenda that reflects the ebb-and-flow of politics and economics. This is due to the globalising nature surrounding the Olympic Games, which has in effect, significantly commercialised the Olympic Games. Consequently, creating an inconsistent embodiment and understanding of the values. However, contrastingly, one may argue that it may not be an issue due to the abstract construction of the philosophy.

In turn, affecting the Olympic Games legacies, which the IOC do not have a precise definition for. Thus, such gaps of ambiguity could be capitalised and leverage by host-cities to promote development projects, which could be argued to align with the values of Olympism rhetorically but may not be practised. Thus, jeopardising the legitimacy of the Olympic Games bids. Hence, this brings upon doubt with the key stakeholders as their priorities are clouded by the power struggle due to the commodification of the Olympic Games and the hegemonic construct of benefits surrounding hosting rights. As the Olympic Games strives to greater heights towards the future, this calls for attention to the viability of Olympism values. Thus, as suggested, a measurable component can be added to uphold the Olympism core values of ‘Excellence, Respect and Friendship’ to ensure it is embodied to a greater extent in its proposed context. Further, the implementation of post-Olympic Games evaluative committees would be necessary to ensure governance in fulfilling promised legacy agendas. Stemming on the limitation of this research, the future direction could explore other crucial stakeholders such as athletes, volunteers, entertainers and the public to provide a holistic understanding of the bidding discourse. Thus, reinforcing the need to have greater clarity and transparency around the bidding process can help ensure positive and healthy perception outcomes for the stakeholder ecosystem and further strengthen the understanding of the Olympism values. Nevertheless, this thesis depicts the bidding process as the Olympic Games itself and thus reflecting the commodified and hegemonic construct.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author (YEAR)</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Key Terms</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MacAlloon (2016)</td>
<td>Notes Agenda 2020 reforms, highlights an issue of public perception of the IOC, which has influenced the decline in bids. Outline a contrasting view of the Olympic movement, human rights and the type of nation authority. Notes a rhetoric-reality gap and points predictions for Agenda 2020</td>
<td>Agenda 2020; Public Relations; Human rights; Economics, Power; Culture differences</td>
<td>Influence of the public led to the inclusion of public opinion in agenda 2020. Notes who has leadership can influence nature of the IOC. Acknowledges that a ‘movement’ should strike the norm, idea of achieving something unachievable is the movement itself. Failing bids still produces success in other ways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Szymanski (2011)</td>
<td>Nations willing to host mega-sport events for benefits, but economic impact of this spending is limited</td>
<td>Economic Impact; Political</td>
<td>Manipulative techniques of using taxpayer money and disguising it as social regeneration so they get returns. Notes that IOC should award countries that demonstrate significant achievement for socially desirable goals. But democratic states do this, but they are not bidding anymore. Indicating IOC responsibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowe (2012)</td>
<td>Strategic management of hosting the Olympics and Olympism. Utilised Beijing as a case study.</td>
<td>Olympism; Mega-Sport Event; Image, Global media politics, power</td>
<td>Acknowledge global media and the civil society surrounding the Beijing 2008 Games</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nooij &amp; Berg (2018)</td>
<td>Politician perspective on hosting a sport event</td>
<td>Economics; Political Economy</td>
<td>Notes the economic benefits of hosting the Olympics. Mentions about Happiness, making society happy, backs the support. This is interesting, when public opinion is not necessarily taken under evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author(s) (Year)</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Key Concepts</td>
<td>Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leurmann (2014)</td>
<td>Analysis of bids, exploring the concept of legacy. Acknowledges policies that hinder or support legacy strategies surrounding the Games.</td>
<td>Legacy; Urban legacy;</td>
<td>Bidding for the Games formalises local development strategies, bid plans are often implemented to a certain degree, linking bid to local development planning. List recommendations of encouraging urban legacies in unsuccessful bids.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimbalist (2011)</td>
<td>Notes the Olympics for potential corruption, depicts examples</td>
<td>Economy, Politics, Corruption, Public</td>
<td>Taxpayers stand to lose the most from bidding for these sport events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matheson, Schwab &amp; Koval (2017)</td>
<td>Corruption in the bidding process, taxpayers make the biggest lost. Provides prevention recommendation. Outline types of corruption within the Olympics itself.</td>
<td>Economy, Power, Corruption</td>
<td>Notes that rhetoric reforms are only as good as physical reforms. Makes you question, people of IOC respect such reform and will abide to it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maenning &amp; Vierhaus (2019)</td>
<td>Explores the relationship of Olympics bids with socio-economic + political factors. Suggest ways to increase the bids.</td>
<td>Economic, Political &amp; Social</td>
<td>Countries that have high tourism and urban pop, democracy or long-term history of autocracy with IOC, prioritises the development of health standards and social globalisation are more likely to bid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grix &amp; Brannagan (2016)</td>
<td>Conceptualises ‘soft power’ includes 5 resources</td>
<td>Soft power; Mega sport events,</td>
<td>Ideally, SME’s create attraction by embodying ‘culture’ which will increase ‘tourism’ which will increase ‘branding’ and ‘diplomacy’ of the state, thus signalling ‘trade’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosenblum (2009)</td>
<td>Argues the Olympics is shifting from its origins of shining light on athletes to a cost-benefit analysis for host cities. Impacts of London 2012 focusing more on the build-up to the Games.</td>
<td>Tangible/Intangible benefits</td>
<td>Argued that if a developing nation hosted, such ‘unnecessary project’ would be necessary therefore the high cost is valid. Support the idea that the bid is gamble.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scandizzo &amp; Pierloni (2017)</td>
<td>Highlighted the tangible/intangible benefits of Olympics</td>
<td>Tangible/Intangible benefits</td>
<td>List of tangible/intangible benefits. Depending on what type of study, it will depict what kind of cost/benefits (critical point, limitation to my thesis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grix &amp; Houlihan (2017)</td>
<td>Utilising sport mega events as soft power strategies. London Olympics 2012</td>
<td>Soft power, prestige</td>
<td>Notes about prestige which links to hegemony theory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>Disciplines</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collins (2011)</td>
<td>East Asian practices</td>
<td>Soft power; legacy; globalisation; modernity</td>
<td>Conceptualises the eastern-west discourse. Notes that the eastern culture was perceived as a threat to the west, could be linked to hegemony theory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haugen (2003)</td>
<td>Explains how Beijing 2008 developed into an Olympic City – and discusses the construct of the Olympics Games.</td>
<td>Globalisation, Soft Power, Modernity, East-West</td>
<td>Argued that Beijing and Olympics are similar as they are stable entities but differ as the Olympic movement was the force of change for China.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giulianotti (2015)</td>
<td>Explore the relations between globalisation and soft power, particularly with China as a BRIC nation</td>
<td>Globalisation, Soft Power, BRIC</td>
<td>Noted public/residences perceptions of the Games. It did not align with what top officials believed in</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Haugen (2005)     | Geography study on the elements of time and space of the Olympic Games | Urban dev; Prestige; Public Support, Legacy, East-West | Push-Pull factors of hosting an event
Addresses the east-west relation and compares Beijing and the Olympics. Notes the Olympics was the driving force Beijing needed. |
| Bell & Gallimore (2015) | Explores legacy planning of the London 2012 Games. Explains why the IOC set out the concept of legacy. | Legacy, Strategic Planning | If money invested only impacts a small group of people, non-host committees choose to pay despite direct benefits. The IOC reformed called for collaboration, but it is not only about committed stakeholders, but they have to be interested. Paper calls for organisation committees post event to ensure legacy as London did not do this. Made impact on sub-regions but no follow up - leaving for more disruptions and inconsistencies. |
| James & Osborn (2011) | Legalisation/policy changes due to the 2012 Olympics. In order to protect the Olympic brand/Olympism. | Policy change; Olympism, Commercialisation | Noted that bid itself commodified the Games and therefore the legacy is commodified too. 
Policy changes to protect the ‘brand’, good argument for the change of ‘value’ narrative.                           |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beck (2012)</td>
<td>History of Britain and Sport events</td>
<td>History; Mega-Sport Events, London</td>
<td>Briton created their own version of ‘Olympism’ as their integrity to protect the Games, reflects the flexibility of the philosophy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayday, Pappous &amp; Koutrou (2019)</td>
<td>Propositions for how to sustain legacy based on the London Games</td>
<td>Sustainability, Legacy, London 2012</td>
<td>Argues for a well-defined, measurable legacy is needed to avoid interpretations – is this realistic? Or based respectively?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silvestre (2012)</td>
<td>Discusses the process Rio turned into an Olympic City. Explored previous bids for the Olympics and Pan Am Games</td>
<td>Rio Games; Bid; Legacy; Mega event strategy</td>
<td>The Games was part of a long-term development plan for Rio. The mega-event strategy was born out of a political agenda, in order to diversify the geography of the Olympics and was supported by experienced individuals (Barcelona)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carey, Masey &amp; Misener (2011)</td>
<td>Explores how the Rio Games were constructed on the concepts of CSR and Community Development.</td>
<td>CSR, Community Dev, Social, Rio Games</td>
<td>This narrative was evident in the Olympic Bid, but was it fulfilled (no). False promises could be an idea of false consciousness from hegemony theory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bremer (2016)</td>
<td>A cost benefit analysis of the Rio Olympics</td>
<td>Cost; Benefits, Rio Olympics</td>
<td>Financial struggles, scrutiny from international media and uncontrollable issues e.g. Zika. And Hit a recession basically hosted the Olympics on a economy that was not predicted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pentifallo &amp; VanWynsbergh (2012)</td>
<td>Calls for greater pressure on sustainability and environmental protection.</td>
<td>Sustainability; Rio Games; Bid</td>
<td>Enforcing bid promises, focusing on sustainability. but what about as a whole? If the environment is a critical pillar of Olympism (as stated in the charter + Agenda 2020), it’s clear IOC plays a big responsibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brownill (2013)</td>
<td>Discuss the legacies of London 2012 and Rio 2016</td>
<td>Legacy, Mega-sport events; Rio 2106; London 2012</td>
<td>Discuss the social legacy promises for the respective Games.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Key Topics</td>
<td>Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almeida, Junior, Pike</td>
<td>Revealed how sport used as a strategy of foreign policy to improve country’s soft power</td>
<td>Foreign Policy, Soft power, mega-sport events</td>
<td>Elements to relate towards Olympism. Argued that rio’s bid was to promote social inclusion, but a misconception. Acknowledges that bids are relative to who is bidding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cain (2019)</td>
<td>Exploring London 2012 Olympics legacy, noted what was promised and the outcomes. Comparison of the old and new bidding process</td>
<td>Legacy, Bids, London; false promises</td>
<td>UK GOV did a survey found success in short-term goals and some long-term goals but not participation in sports. Questions what they considered as Olympism and what their priorities are in terms of legacy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose &amp; Speigel (2009)</td>
<td>Quantitative study on determining economic impacts of the Olympics both for successful/non-successful bids.</td>
<td>Economic; Olympics; Bids.</td>
<td>‘Olympic effect’ present for both successful and non-successful bids, it signals to other countries for trade.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zouain, Lohmann, Cardosa,</td>
<td>Study on resident’s perception on the impacts of Rio 2016, before -during - after</td>
<td>Public; Impact; legacy</td>
<td>Improvement of urban mobility and tourism, but negative on misuse of public resources, increase prices, non-lasting legacies, security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virkki &amp; Martelotte</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bason (2019)</td>
<td>Explores the way cities leverage their bids, despite winning or losing the bid.</td>
<td>Leverage, Legacy, Mega-sport event, Bidding process</td>
<td>Thesis stems from this study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knijnik (2016)</td>
<td>Discusses Rio’s Sustainability and Human Rights concerns</td>
<td>Sustainability, Public, environmental, politics</td>
<td>Noted the impacts of the games on the ‘flavela’ community and the golf project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOCOG</td>
<td>Official Report of Beijing’s bidding process</td>
<td>Beijing, Bidding Process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCOC</td>
<td>Official Report of London’s bidding process</td>
<td>London, Bidding process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Location/Process</td>
<td>Summary of Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girginov &amp; Johaness</td>
<td>Official report of intangible Olympic legacies of London 2012</td>
<td>London 2012, Legacy, Economics</td>
<td>Notes that there was an increase in housing and only 50% of the infrastructures that were made into housing was deemed affordable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teeuwen (2018)</td>
<td>Impacts of the London Olympics on housing prices</td>
<td>London, Housing, Economics, Legacy</td>
<td>If the primary reason to host the games is for sporting participation, it is a bad investment. Used London as a case-study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chen &amp; Henry (2016)</td>
<td>London’s Olympics effects on sporting participation in non-hosting regions</td>
<td>London 2012; Public, Legacy</td>
<td>Weak impact on the sporting participation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santos (2018)</td>
<td>‘Tranformal’ Education Programme</td>
<td>Rio 2016, Public, Education</td>
<td>Project that aimed to educate Olympism values however due to there was an absence in action which inhibited the continuity of the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monnin 2012</td>
<td>Investigates the Olympic movement of integrating Olympism values into the education system.</td>
<td>Legacy, Olympism, Education</td>
<td>Integrating is not an issue, it remains on pre-existing education systems/educators believing in the values and effectively implement into such systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhang &amp; Zhou</td>
<td>Investigated the publics opinion on Beijing’s city branding post-Olympics.</td>
<td>Beijing 2008, public, legacy</td>
<td>Notes that the city’s branding did not represent the public’s perceptions. Reflects Beijing/China’s governance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>