The Legacy of the Olympic Games: A Viewers Perspective of Olympic Games Legacies

Kostas Karadakis
Southern New Hampshire University
k.karadakis@snhu.edu

Trevor Bopp
University of Florida
tbopp@ufl.edu

Megan T. Gassman
Southern New Hampshire University
m.gassman@snhu.edu

Abstract

The awarding of the Olympic Games to a host city often results in increased media attention. The increased media attention can help to maintain the temporal aspect of legacies from viewers and consumers of the Olympic Games. With increased viewing and consumption mediums, the opportunity to develop and capitalize on an event's potential legacy within the mind of non-attendees exists. The term 'event legacies' has gained traction in recent years, however there is a lack of literature examining legacy perceptions from a temporal and proximity perspective. The purpose of this study was to examine the perceptions of dominant legacy themes of both viewers and consumers of the Olympic Games, subsequently contributing to the lack of research examining Legacy perceptions from a temporal and proximity perspective. The dominant legacy themes identified by viewers of the Olympic Games in the current study were Event Prestige/History, Economic, Sport, Psychological, Organizational, Environmental, Socio-cultural, Tourism, and Athletes. Athletes was a new category identified in the current study and demonstrates the potential for individual athletes and endorsers/sponsors to capitalize on participants of the Games. By gaining a better understanding of how viewers' perceive legacies, event organizers can focus attention on promoting these dominant legacy themes.

Keywords

Olympic Games, Legacies, Media, Consumers

Introduction

The awarding of the Olympic Games to a host city often results in increased media attention which can have "significant consequences for the host city, region, or nation in which they occur" (Horne, 2007, p. 82). The host city likely experiences an increase of tourists, improvement to the city's international image, and an economic benefit (Cornelissen, Bob, & Swart, 2011). Additionally, host cities garner international attention and prestige, which can subsequently lead to significant infrastructure renovations to the host country through legacy initiatives (Kassens-Noor, Wilson, Muller, Maharaj, & Huntoon, 2015). As stated by the International Olympic Committee's (IOC, 2018, p. 5) Olympic Agenda 2020, there is increased attention for candidate cities to present "a holistic concept of respect for the environment, feasibility and of development, to leave a lasting legacy." The increased media attention can help maintain the temporal aspect of legacies (Cornelissen et al., 2011) from viewers and consumers of the Olympic Games. With increased viewing and consumption mediums (e.g., the Internet and media sites, multiple television channels, live data and statistics updates, etc.), the opportunity to develop and capitalize on an event's potential legacy within the mind of non-attendees exists. Thus, the term 'event legacies' has gained traction in recent years and has been popularized as a result of event organizers also being tasked with leveraging mega-events (e.g., the Olympic Games) for the long-term benefit of the host city or nation (Weed & Bull, 2004) with the IOC committing to the idea that a positive legacy "must be one of the primary objectives" (IOC, 2018, p. 22).

With recent research and post-Games monitoring (IOC, 2018, p. 23) of the legacies that remain after the event, a lack of research that examines the temporal aspect of legacies (Cornelissen et al., 2011; Preuss, 2019) from viewers and consumers (non-attendees) of the Olympic Games remains in the literature. Thus, the purpose of this study was to determine which event legacies are more prominent for non-attending viewers and consumers of the Olympic Games. To this end, the following research questions guided this study: 1) What are the dominant legacy themes among Olympic Game viewers and consumers?, 2) Are there any differences in legacy themes for viewers with regards to the Winter Olympic Games and the Summer Olympic Games, and 3) Are athletes themselves perceived to be Legacies in the minds of viewers and consumers?

Literature Review

Defining Legacies

Existing literature examining legacies has offered little in the way of a consensus on the characteristics and definition of legacy; thus, many studies have focused on the economic and infrastructure legacies of mega-events, with little attention examining the socio-cultural, political, and environmental legacies (Cornelissen et al., 2011). Kaplanidou and Karadakis (2010) reported that the term legacy has mainly been explored by reviewing documents, historical archives, bid books, and the opinion of stakeholders responsible for managing the event. According to the literature, it is difficult to define the term legacy because the meaning of legacy can be understood differently across cultures (IOC, 2003); regardless, it is generally perceived as being a positive term (MacAloon, 2008; Preuss, 2007; 2019; Searle, 2002). The reason for this positive perception could be because of the Olympic Movement's wish to validate the escalating costs of the Olympic Games (Preuss, 2019), and a positive perception by various stakeholders may ensure future host cities (Girginov & Hills, 2008; Misener et al., 2013).

Examples of positive legacies range from easy-to-identify legacies, such as business network expansions and sport infrastructure, to difficult-to-identify legacies, such as urban regeneration, improved global reputation, emotional capital, and diffusion of knowledge and governance reform (Cashman, 2005; Gratton & Preuss, 2008; Grix et al., 2017; Leopkey & Parent, 2012; Kaplanidou & Karadakis, 2010; Mangan, 2008a; Preuss, 2007; Solberg & Preuss, 2007). However, in an exploratory study of the term legacy from the perspective of a number of stakeholders of the 2010 Vancouver Olympic Games, Kaplanidou and Karadakis (2010) found that the term legacy was believed to include opportunity costs; specifically, those costs associated with negative legacies. Negative legacies include debt from construction, unnecessary infrastructure, short-term crowding-out, increased rent for property, and unfair displacement and re-distributions (Cashman, 2005; Gratton & Preuss, 2008; Kaplanidou & Karadakis, 2010; Mangan, 2008a; Preuss, 2007; Solberg & Preuss, 2007). Perhaps the most well-known example of a negative legacy is the debt that Montreal residents were required to repay over a 30-year period as a result of hosting the 1976 Summer Olympic Games (Cornelissen et al., 2011). Despite the assertion of researchers that negative legacies can indeed result from hosting a mega-event (Gratton & Preuss,

2008; Kaplanidou & Karadakis, 2010; Mangan, 2008b; Preuss, 2007), rarely are they considered in the literature or during the bid process (Cornelissen et al., 2011). Examining negative legacies is important as they can help inform future cities (Preuss, 2019), something that the IOC has identified in the Olympic Agenda 2020 and committed to addressing. The IOC has established a Sustainability and Legacy Commission in order to help host cities throughout the entire process (bid, host, post-Games) with regards to the legacies of the Olympic Games (IOC, 2018).

Irrespective of negative or positive outcomes, two of the more commonly used definitions are put forth by Chappelet and Junod (2006) and Preuss (2007). According to Chappelet and Junod (2006, p. 84), legacies are "the material and non-material effects produced directly or indirectly by the sport event, whether planned or not, that durably transform the host region in an objectively and subjectively, positive or negative way". Similarly, Preuss (2007, p. 211) defines legacy as "all planned and unplanned, positive and negative, tangible and intangible structures created for a sport event that remain longer than the event itself", regardless of when and where production took place. Chappelet (2012) discussed the idea that legacies are multifaceted and added to Preuss' definition the dimensions of "territorial/personal, global/local, and sport/non-sport related" and the need to examine legacies from different stakeholder perspectives (Preuss, 2019, p. 105).

More recently, within the Olympic Agenda 2020 the IOC defined Olympic Legacy as "all the tangible and intangible long-term benefits for people, cities/territories and the Olympic Movement" (IOC, 2018, p. 13). Tangible legacies are clearly recognizable, and include outcomes from an event relating to infrastructure (sport and non-sport related), programs and initiatives, advancements to the environment and technology, and the prospect for businesses to network and expand (Kaplanidou & Karadakis, 2010). Intangible legacies are more challenging to recognize but are associated with the dissemination of knowledge, government reform, emotional capital, social change, and image enhancement (Kaplanidou & Karadakis, 2010). Although difficult to identify, intangible legacies are linked to the subjective experiences of the host country and should be examined because of the potential social and psychological impacts (Cornelissen et al., 2011; Kaplanidou & Karadakis, 2010; Karadakis & Kaplanidou, 2012).

After a thorough review on the term, Preuss (2019, p. 106) suggested the following definition "Legacy is any outcomes that affect people and/or space caused by structural changes that stem from the Olympic Games."

The Impact of Event Legacies

The classification of legacies varies based on the researcher's approach. Recognized as one of the first to categorize the impacts of mega-events, Ritchie (1984) suggested the following categories: economic, physical, psychological and socio-cultural, and political impacts. Travis and Croize (1987) identified similar impacts, however, added the value of knowledge gained in terms of hosting experience, as well as, the skill development for workers. As research continued on the terms "legacy" and "impact", more categories and distinctions such as economic benefits, built environment, information and education, public life, politics and cultures, sport, memories and history, and socioeconomic were added (Cashman & Hughes, 1999; Malfas et al, 2004). Clark (2008) went so far as to categorize impacts of mega-events into eight classifications: visitor economy, transportation and other physical infrastructure, cultural infrastructure, sporting infrastructure, visible legacy, city image, business interest and managerial, and events strategy. The IOC's (2009) definition has evolved from the legacies of five Games, distinguishing between sporting, social, cultural, political, environmental, economic, and urban legacies. Taken together, these various definitions confirm the multidimensional aspects of mega-event impacts and legacies, including economic, tourist-related, physical, sporting, cultural, infrastructural, social, environmental, political, architectural and urbanistic (Cashman, 2005; Cornelissen et al., 2011; Dansero & Puttilli, 2010).

From the literature review reported by Preuss (2015; 2019) the five generally cited categories of legacies are economics, infrastructure, social, sport, and culture. Similar results were also found by Grix et al. (2017) with economics, urban regeneration, national pride/feel-good factor, increased participation in physical activity, and international prestige and 'soft power' (Preuss, 2019, p. 105).

However, what is lacking in the literature is the temporal aspect of the term legacy and the 'reach' of an event's legacy (Cornelissen et al., 2011). Consequently, perceptions of the legacies associated with hosting a mega-event over time, and reports of any perceptual

changes that occur as a result of the time lapse are not readily available (Kim, Gursoy, & Lee, 2006; Preuss, 2019) from viewers' and consumers' perspectives. As Rogerson (2016, p. 497) stated, research into legacies "has highlighted the need to explore more critically the ways in which such legacy is defined and assessed in specific contexts and how different approaches to production of legacy is being created". Furthermore, Preuss (2015; 2019) suggested that stakeholders perceive and experience legacies differently based on the event itself and that time and space are important in examining legacy measurement.

The current literature on temporal aspects of legacies is limited. Preuss (2015) provided a framework considering the time and duration of a legacy, classifying them into three distinct categories: the pregnancy effect, latent legacy, and retro legacy. The 'pregnancy effect' is a legacy not of the event itself, but in planning for it; the 'latent legacy' which can occur post-event, but only if the opportunity is activated or used, therefore developing the legacy, otherwise it remains latent. Latency refers to the duration of time between the event and the impact or legacy. This can be experienced differently by various stakeholders, where outcomes exist over short periods of time (e.g. emotions) versus longer periods (e.g. infrastructure). Lastly, the "retro legacy" refers to the fast-track renovation of infrastructure that was likely to have already been in need of change or updating.

In a study looking to examine temporal aspects of legacy themes amongst host and non-host residents of the 2010 Vancouver Olympic Games, Karadakis, Kaplanidou and Karlis (2016) reported that themes generated, fell into the common classifications of economic, socio-cultural, organizational, environmental, sport, tourism, event prestige, and psychological legacies. However, most important to the current study was the finding that valued legacies of residents shifted prior to, and after the event. Six months prior to the event, residents of the host city cited economic legacies as most important, yet psychological legacies were cited as the most important six months after the event.

Furthermore, there is a lack of literature examining legacy perceptions from a temporal and proximity perspective (Cornelissen et al., 2011). Legacies can be experienced on different levels: individual (e.g., skill development), local (e.g., living conditions such as infrastructure developed), national (e.g. feeling an increase in patriotism), and international (e.g. increase

in international recognition (Chappelet, 2012; Close et al., 2007; Grix & Brannagan, 2016; Preuss, 2019). Karadakis et al., (2016) suggested further studies should be done in order to explore which dominant legacies are present in the minds of Olympic Games consumers when considering the legacies produced from specific Olympic Games versus a more general understanding of the Olympic Games. To this end, the current study examined the prominent legacy themes with regards to a general perception of the Olympics, as well as both the Summer and Winter Olympic Games. By gaining a better understanding of how viewers perceive legacies, event organizers can focus attention on promoting these dominant legacy themes.

Adding to this study are the technological media advances that afford event producers the ability to broadcast mega-events through a variety of mediums, as it is clear that not all those who consume mega-events do so in person, nor do they travel to a host country. The majority of those who watch an event do so through some form of media (television, computer, tablets, cell phones, etc.) (Horne, 2007; Sudgen & Tomlinson, 2012). The rights to broadcast the Summer Games has increased in value from USD 34.9 million for the 1976 Montreal Games to the USD 2,569 million price tag for the media rights of the 2012 London Games (Muller, 2015, p. 630). Given the exposure broadcasting the Olympic Games provides, approximately 3.64 billion people watched the 2012 London Games (IOC, 2014), it is no wonder the cost of doing so has dramatically risen. This increase in rights fees and consumer interest of viewing the Olympic Games suggest that mega-events are mediated instead of being directly experienced in-person (Muller, 2015).

Accordingly, from a broadcast perspective, the IOC believes the Olympic Games appeal is strong, reporting record audiences in the Olympic Agenda 2020. For instance, Beijing drew more than 1.5 billion viewers, Sochi 2014 had a global broadcast audience of 2.1 billion (an increase from previous Winter Olympic Games), and online consumption has grown significantly (IOC, 2014). To illustrate this growth, at the London Games, 432,000,000 visited the london2012.com website and the official #Sochi2014 was used 13 billion times on social media with the Games receiving more than 23 billion mentions (IOC, 2014, p. 48). The Olympic Agenda 2020 also states "Games delivery has met or surpassed the highest level of expectations, and revenues continue to increase.

Furthermore, the Games leave tangible and intangible legacies in the host city, ranging from sports participation and infrastructure to social and economic legacies" (IOC, 2014, p. 48).

In addition to the media hyping an event, developing the festival-like environment, and creating emotional connections to mega-events (MacAloon, 2010; Rojek, 2014; Tomlinson, 1996), media coverage also plays a central part in developing place images and awareness, improving the country/city brand (Grix, 2012; Zhang & Zhao, 2009). Just for reference, the Olympic Agenda 2020 reported media in attendance covering the Olympic Games was: London 24,274, Beijing 24,562, and Athens, 20,771 (IOC, 2014, p. 30). Therefore, with increased viewing and consumption mediums (e.g., the Internet and media sites, multiple television channels, live data and statistics updates, etc.), the opportunity to develop and capitalize on an event's potential legacy within the mind of non-attendees exists. With recent research focusing on the legacies that remain after the event, a lack of research that examines the temporal aspect of legacies (Cornelissen et al., 2011) from viewers and consumers of the Olympic Games remains in the literature. Thus, the aim of this study was to examine which potential legacies will be prominent for viewers and consumers of the 2012 London Olympic Games that do not attend the Olympic Games. Furthermore, the researchers will look to compare the potential legacy impacts of the London Games to those experienced in Vancouver, BC, Canada in 2010, as well as, the overall potential legacies of the Summer and Winter Olympic Games to help gain a better understanding of the potential 'reach' of an event's legacy (Cornelissen et al., 2011).

Methods

Echtner and Ritchie's (1993) measurement paradigm was adapted to measure legacy components, asking respondents to indicate three words that came to mind when they thought of the following terms: 1) Legacy of the Olympic Games, 2) Legacy of the Summer Olympic Games, 3) Legacy of the Winter Olympic Games, 4) Legacy of the 2010 Vancouver Olympic Game, 5) Legacy of the 2012 London Olympic Games and 6) People at the 2012 London Games.

The researchers utilized SPSS 19.0 to analyze responses and frequency counts for words associated with each of the legacy

aspects. The data collected was examined through an open coding method in that a priori themes were not established (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). One researcher independently examined and coded the data collected. The coded data were organized into themes that represented commonalities in concepts or ideas related to legacies. Once the final theme categories were formed, the coded data and resulting themes and categories were sent to a second researcher to validate the coding scheme (Kaplanidou, Kerwin, & Karadakis, 2014). Any differences and confusion were discussed until consensus was attained. The words generated for the legacies were classified into nine themes (outlined in the results and Table 1), which were substantiated by two faculty members with expertise in sport tourism and management for face and content validity.

Table 1. Frequencies of Nine Legacy Themes by Olympic Games

Legacy Themes	Overall Games Number (%)	Summer Games Number (%)	Winter Games Number (%)	Vancouver Games Number (%)	London Games Number (%)
Prestige/History	76 (22.2)	16 (4.5)	27 (7.6)	10 (3.1)	20 (5.7)
Economic	4 (1.2)	3 (0.9)	4 (1.1)	1 (0.3)	1 (0.3)
Sport	111 (32.4)	150 (42.6)	150 (42.1)	115 (35.6)	78 (22.4)
Psychological	26 (7.6)	13 (3.7)	20 (5.6)	7 (2.2)	11 (3.2)
Organizational	6 (1.7)	6 (1.7)	9 (2.5)	10 (3.1)	4 (1.1)
Environmental	1 (0.3)	20 (5.7)	45 (12.6)	56 (17.3)	3 (0.9)
Socio-cultural	51 (14.9)	16 (4.5)	16 (4.5)	9 (2.8)	19 (5.5)
Tourism	29 (8.5)	26 (7.4)	26 (7.3)	35 (10.8)	27 (7.8)
Athletes	39 (11.4)	102 (29)	59 (16.6)	80 (24.8)	185 (53.2)

To establish dependability and reliability of the results, the authors used three practices described by Patton (2002). First, the data were kept in an electronic database, which provides an audit trail and allows for external examiners to review the codes at any given time. Second, the coders coded the data and then came together to discuss the suitability of the established coding structure. This adds credibility to the findings as the data have been reviewed by more than one person. Supporting quotations are provided to add credibility to the findings and give a voice to the themes that were uncovered within the data (provided in Table 2). The final step in the analysis was to assign a numerical code to the responses

according to the theme they belonged to. This process allowed for a quantitative profile to the responses provided by the respondents.

Participants

The survey was administered to 141 undergraduate sport management students via the online data management platform, Qualtrics. Of the 141 participants, 122 (86.5%) successfully completed the entire survey. Participants were asked to identify their gender, with 43.8% (n = 53) identifying as female and 56.2% (n = 68) identifying as male. Regarding race and ethnicity, 71.9% (n = 87) of participants identified as Caucasian, 11.6% (n = 14) as Hispanic/Latino, 9.1% (n = 11) of participants identified as African American, 4.1% (n = 5) reported their identification as Other and 3.3% (n = 4) of the participants identified as Asian.

Results

An analysis of the overall data set revealed nine themes when participants were asked to list three words that came to mind when they thought of *Legacy of the Olympic Games, Legacy of the Summer Olympic Games, Legacy of the Winter Olympic Games, Legacy of the 2010 Vancouver Olympic Games, Legacy of the 2012 London Olympic Games,* and *People at the London Games.* The nine themes were classified as 1) Event Prestige and History, 2) Economic, 3) Sport, 4) Psychological, 5) Organizational, 6) Environmental, 7) Socio-cultural, 8) Tourism, and 9) Athletes. Data regarding the overall emergent themes can be found in Table 1, along with a list of the words that constitutes each legacy theme (Table 2).

The first legacy theme, *Event Prestige and History*, refers to historical attributes of the Games, as well as the reputation of the event and its significance (e.g. History, Classical, Mythical, and Tradition). The second legacy theme, *Economic,* involves the financial aspects of hosting the event that result in profits or costs to the hosts city or country. *Sport* is the third legacy theme and includes any and all activities and programs related to the sporting event itself, the promotion of the associated sports, and athlete development. *Psychological* legacy, the fourth theme, refers to the emotional aspects of the event including pride, enthusiasm, joy, nostalgia and even disappointment. The fifth legacy theme is *Organizational* and includes all physical and cognitive skills and knowledge related to the management of the event. Characteristics of the

event regarding the location, natural surroundings and physical elements were listed under the sixth legacy theme, *Environmental*. The seventh legacy theme, *Socio-Cultural*, contains wording relating to the social interaction and cultural exchange among participants, fans, administrators and consumers. *Tourism*, items relating to the attributes and awareness of the host city or country (e.g., destination image, tourism development, etc.), is the eighth legacy theme. The *Athletes* make up the ninth and final emergent legacy theme, which consists of any particular team or athlete names and images.

Table 2. Words used to describe legacy themes by respondents

Themes	Examples
Event Prestige/History	Chariots, Torch, Story Lines, History, Heroic, Old, Ceremonies, Ancient Games, Legend, Miracles, Anthem, Flags, Gods, Olympic Rings, Special, Traditional, Lasting
Economic	Economy, money, Expensive, Sponsorships, Sponsorship Companies
Sport	Athletic, Gold, Competition, Champion, Elite, Skiing, Bobsledding, Hockey, Skating, Strength, Spirit, Winners, Talented, Basketball, Boxing, Fast, Fit, Diving, Endurance, Power, Quick, Gymnastics, Records, Running, Sports, Sportsmanship, Track, Victory, Women's soccer/gymnastics, Ability
Psychological	Amazing, Awesome, Cool, Boring, Emotional, Exciting, Fun, Jaw Dropping, Memorable, Pride, Thrilling, Spectacular, Impressive, Inspiring, Uplifting, Exhilarating, Unbelievable, Dream, Courage, Fulfilling, Passion, Respected, Smile, Disappointment, Hope, Proud
Organizational	Limited, Sectioned, New, Dynamic, Dangerous, Eventful, Short, Successful, Long, Controversy, Bad host city, Death of an Athlete, unorganized, facilities
Environmental	Sky, Snow, Cold, Freezing, Ice, Winter, Outdoors, Beach, Heat, Hot, Water, Sun, Summer, Rain, Warm, Mountains
Socio-Cultural	American domination, Caucasian, cocaine, countries, drug abuse, evolution, flags, justice, nations, patriotism, politics, unity, philanthropy, evolution, camaraderie, world, worldwide, nationalistic, family, Global, Greek, Global Awareness, Foreign, International, Peace, people, Popular, Romans, together, unifying, united, union, youth, worldly, encompassing, feminism, friends, Jamaicans, representative, Women, Youthfulness, Canadian, Respect
Tourism	America, Canada, Europe, France, Lake Placid, Norway, Salt Lake City, USA, Vancouver, Utah, Squaw Valley, Athens, Beijing, China, Greece, Jamaica, London, Paris, Rome, Great Britain, Munich, Travel, England, Japan, Germany, North America, Whistler, Russia
Athletes	Apollo Ohno, Athletes, Body Miller, Dan Jansen, Herb Brooks, Lindsey Vonn, Michael Phelps, Shaun White, Juan Antonio Samaranch, USA hockey team, Dream Team, Fab Five women's gymnastics, Bruce Jenner, Mia Hamm, Ryan Lochte, Gabby Douglas, Oscar Pistorius, Misty May, Shawn Johnson, Usain Bolt, Women's Soccer, Alex Morgan, Lebron James, Lolo Jones, Wambach, Crosby, Ovechkin

Regarding the responses for each of the event legacy categories, 343 words were generated for *Legacy of the Olympic Games; Legacy of the 2010 Vancouver Olympic Games* elicited 323 words; 348 words were established for *Legacy of the 2012 London Olympic Games*; while *Legacy of the Summer Olympic Games* garnered 352 words and *Legacy of the Winter Olympic Games* tallied 356 words. Lastly, when asked to list three *People at the London Games,* 339 responses were recorded.

Table 1 provides complete details of the frequency counts and percentages for each of the individual legacy themes as they relate to the different Olympic Games. Results revealed the three most dominant legacies to be Sport (32%), followed by Event Prestige/History (22%), and Socio-cultural (15%) when asked about the *Overall Olympic Games.* When examining *Legacy of the Summer Olympic Games,* respondents referred to Sport (42%), Athletes (29%), and Tourism (7%) as the most dominant legacy themes. As for the *Legacy of the Winter Olympic Games,* the most dominant themes were Sport (42%), Athletes (17%), and Environmental (13%) legacies. Regarding *Legacy of the 2010 Vancouver Olympic Games,* the most dominant themes cited were Sport (36%), Athletes (25%), and Environmental (17%) legacies. To conclude, the 2012 *London Olympic Games* conjured the responses of Athletes (53%), Sport (22%), and Tourism (8%) as the most dominant legacy themes.

Further analysis revealed that respondents identified 237 (70.1%) male athletes and 101 (29.9%) female athletes, representing the following sports: Swimming and Diving (48.4%), Track (14.7%), Gymnastics (14.2%), Basketball (10%), Volleyball/Beach Volleyball (6.5%), Soccer (4.7%), Tennis (0.6%), Cycling (0.6%), and Badminton (0.3%). When asked to identify *People at the 2012 London Games* respondents most often named Michael Phelps (n = 91; 26.9%), followed by Ryan Lochte (n = 59; 17.5%), Usain Bolt (n = 36; 10.7%), Gabby Douglas (n = 26; 7.7%), and Lebron James (n = 21; 6.2%). No other athlete was named more than 12 (3.6%) times. A complete listing of the 41 individuals named can be found in Table 3.

Table 3. Frequencies of Athletes Mentioned

Athlete	Number	Percent	Athlete	Number	Percent
Michael Phelps	91	26.9%	Anthony Davis	1	0.3%
Ryan Lochte	59	17.5%	Bradley Wiggins	1	0.3%
Usain Bolt	36	10.7%	Brett Fraser	1	0.3%
Gabby Douglas	26	7.7%	Clayton Stanley	1	0.3%
Lebron James	21	6.2%	Conor Dwyer	1	0.3%
Jordyn Weiber	12	3.6%	Destinee Hooker	1	0.3%
Misty May-Traenor	12	3.6%	Dwyane Wade	1	0.3%
Aly Raisman	9	2.7%	Galen Rupp	1	0.3%
Kerri Walsh	8	2.4%	Genevieve LaCaze	1	0.3%
Hope Solo	7	2.1%	Justin Gatlin	1	0.3%
Missy Franklin	7	2.1%	Laura Trott	1	0.3%
Alex Morgan	5	1.5%	Lin Dan	1	0.3%
Kobe Bryant	5	1.5%	Nathan Adrian	1	0.3%
Abby Wambach	4	1.2%	Regina George	1	0.3%
Kevin Durant	3	0.9%	Robert Harting	1	0.3%
Lolo Jones	3	0.9%	Ruta Meilutyte	1	0.3%
Carmelo Anthony	2	0.6%	Sam Mikulak	1	0.3%
Jeff Demps	2	0.6%	Sanya Richards-Ross	1	0.3%
Oscar Pistorius	2	0.6%	Sun Yang	1	0.3%
Serena Williams	2	0.6%	Tyson Gay	1	0.3%
Tom Daley	2	0.6%	N =	338	100%

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to examine the perceptions of dominant legacy themes of both viewers and consumers of the Olympic Games, subsequently contributing to the lack of research examining legacy perceptions from a temporal and proximity perspective (Cornelissen et al., 2011). Additionally, this study aimed to address Karadakis et al.'s (2016) suggestion for further studies exploring which dominant legacies are present in the minds of consumers of the Olympic Games. This was achieved by examining differences in framing the legacy question from specific Olympic Games (e.g. Vancouver and London) to general Olympic Games (e.g. Winter and Summer). Interestingly, the results showed no differences in temporal perceptions from general to specific Olympic Games. Specifically, Summer and London perceptions were the same (Athlete, Sport, and Tourism being the most dominant themes); while Winter and Vancouver perceptions were the same (Sport, Athlete, and Environment being the most dominant themes). These results suggest that viewers of the Olympic Games do not discern a difference between general and specific

Olympics. That is, they perceive the same legacies with regards to the Summer and the host Olympic City and the same for the Winter and the host Olympic City.

With media coverage playing a central role in the development of place images and awareness, thus improving the brand of the host country/city (Grix, 2012; Zhang & Zhao, 2009) the authors argue that viewers of the Olympic Games should be considered as the building blocks from which a legacy can be built, as it is the viewers who perceive there to be a legacy and are aware of said legacy through their media consumption. The results of this study support the idea that the perspective of legacies is grounded in experience, and thus, varies between different stakeholders, and may be interpreted differently by the diverse populations whom consume the Olympic Games (Preuss 2015; 2019).

The dominant legacy themes identified by viewers of the Olympic Games in the current study were Event Prestige/History, Economic, Sport, Psychological, Organizational, Environmental, Socio-cultural, Tourism, and Athletes. Similar themes have been previously identified and supported by research using similar classifications (Cashman, 2005; Chappelet, 2012; Cornelissen et al., 2011; Dansero & Puttilli, 2010; Grix et al., 2017; Karadakis et al, 2016; Karadakis & Kaplanidou, 2012; Preuss, 2019). However, Athletes was a new category identified in the current study and demonstrates the potential for individual athletes and endorsers/sponsors to capitalize on participants of the Olympic Games. Previous definitions of Legacies (Chappelet & Junod 2006; Preuss, 2007; 2019) are supported through the results in that consumers and viewers of the Olympic Games identified material, non-material, tangible, intangible, direct and indirect legacies regardless of participants being framed for the general impression of the Olympic Games or particular legacies of the Olympic Games. A critical of this study is that viewers of the Olympic Games, when asked about legacies in general, were more inclined to identify those that relate to particular sports and athletes. This finding is important to those with broadcast rights of the Games, as it allows them to tailor viewers' experiences such that the sports and the athletes are paramount in the airing and video streaming of the Olympic Games.

Differences in the dominant themes were found amongst participant responses when asked about legacies of the Olympic Games; *Event Prestige/History* is the most often cited. For legacies attributed to the Summer Games participants first thought of *Tourism*, whereas the Environment was of upmost important to participants when

asked about the Winter Games. These results were confirmed when connecting specific host cities that represented both the Summer and Winter Games. When asked about the Vancouver Olympic Games (i.e., Winter) Environment was cited as the most dominant legacy, while the London Olympic Games (i.e., Summer) garnered responses regarding the legacy of *Tourism*. Similar results were reported by Karadakis et al., (2016) that as time went on, residents first identified tangible and direct legacies (economic legacies), and non-host residents identified intangible legacies (event prestige, and socio-cultural). However, once the Vancouver Olympic Games were over (six months after the event), host and non-host residents identified more of the non-material, intangible, indirect legacies with sport legacies being a dominant theme (Karadakis et al., 2016). Similar results were reported for viewers in the current study of the Olympics, where more focus was on the non-material legacies given that the Vancouver Olympics had been held two years prior to participants' answers. The current results of the study corroborate previous research regarding the multifaceted aspects of legacies (Chappelet, 2012; Preuss, 2019) and the role of time and space in the formation of legacies by different stakeholders (Preuss, 2019). Practitioners and event managers should take note of the results when planning legacy projects and marketing initiatives and make use the dominant themes to attract and inform viewers and non-attendees. For example, Summer Olympic Games organizers and event managers can market the tourism legacies, while those organizing Winter Olympic Games can focus on environmental legacies. The results can help address the IOC's Olympic Agenda 2020 recommendations to provide content for digital and social media platforms (IOC, 2014, p. 63).

It is important to comment on how many History/Prestige references there were for Legacy of Olympic Games in general, while Legacies for Winter and Summer Olympics produced specific answers (i.e., Athletes and Sport). A reason for this could be that when respondents were asked to think of a specific Olympic Games (i.e., London) it was specific athlete performances that were remembered. However, when individuals are asked about the Legacy of the Olympics in general, they began to think of what the Olympics have traditionally stood for. Interestingly, viewers of the Olympic Games did not consider the tangible legacies (i.e. Economic legacies) nearly as often as they did those that are intangible. Thus, it is suggested that more studies be conducted to examine which dominant intangible legacies are present in the minds of consumers of the Olympic Games.

Recall that the resultant legacies offered a new category: *Athletes*. Since athletes were mentioned with reference to Legacies, it is suggested that performances can serve as a Legacy of the Olympic Games, supporting the notion that a legacy can be established as transpiring within specific and bounded settings (Thomson, Schlenker, and Schulenkorf, 2013). Similar amongst the five most mentioned names (Michael Phelps, Ryan Lochte, Usain Bolt, Gabby Douglas, and Lebron James) was that they all won gold medals and were dominant in doing so. Likewise, the top four athletes mentioned all perform in individual-based sports (i.e., swimming, track & field, and gymnastics). Thus, the media attention provided for these athletes prior to the Olympic Games was found to resonate with consumers, such that the athletes who fulfilled the media-hype and won gold were also dominant from a temporal aspect. This new legacy theme and the previously established legacy themes showed interrelationships. That is, an athlete mentioned, such as Phelps, winning gold, may have influenced other legacy themes suggesting a viewer thought of pride (Psychological Legacy) when prompted about legacies. As in previous studies (Karadakis et al., 2016; Leopkey, 2009) the legacy themes generated showed interrelationships confirming previous definitions of the multi-dimensional aspects of the term legacy (Chappelet, 2012; Preuss, 2015; 2019).

Furthermore, understanding which athletes viewers identified helps provide support for the Olympic Agenda 2020 in which the IOC wants "to give our athletes and sports the worldwide media exposure they deserve" in addition to the goal of giving "the youth better access to athletes, sport, Olympic History, Olympic Culture and Olympic Values (IOC, 2014, p. 7). Monitoring the performance legacy, and the athletes themselves to ensure they are clean athletes, also helps meet the goal of positive promotional opportunities and recognition of the clean athletes (IOC, 2014). It is important to note, however, that the legacy of increasing sport participation because of the performance of an athlete has not provided substantial evidence beyond the idea of re-engaging lapsed participants (Weed et al., 2015; Grix et al., 2017).

Another interesting note is that most respondents identified male athletes, this could be because of the media exposure/attention and the record setting medals/performances of these athletes. These results also support the notion that the media coverage plays a role in forming awareness and the emotional attachment to the event, with this case being the athletes and their performances (Muller, 2015). These results suggest that event managers and broadcasters of the

Olympic Games should be concerned with and plan for the legacies associated with their Games. More specifically, focus should be on amplifying the sports and athletes by collaborating with the different sport federations to promote individual sports and the athletes that represent those sports. From a marketing perspective, the results of the athletes suggest that organizers wishing to promote a specific sport/event should sponsor or use specific athletes (i.e. Phelps) to endorse the sport/event, since people relate the athletes with the event.

References

Cashman, R. (2005). The Bitter-sweet awakening. The legacy of the Sydney 2000 Olympic Games. *Sydney: Walla Walla Press.*

Cashman, R., & Hughes, A. (Eds.). (1999). *Staging the Olympics: The event and its impact.* Sydney: University of New South Wales Press.

Chappelet, J.-L., & Junod, T. (2006). A tale of 3 Olympic cities: What can Turin learn from the Olympic legacy of other alpine cities? . In Torres, D. (Ed.), Proceedings of Workshop on *Major Sport Events as Opportunity for Development* (pp. 83-90). Valencia, Spain.

Chappelet, J.L. (2012). Mega sporting event legacies: a multifaceted concept. Papeles de Europa, 25, 76–86. doi:10.5209/ rev_PADE.2012. n25.41096

Clark, G. (2008). *Local development benefits from staging global events.* Paris: OECD.

Close, P., Askew, D., and Xu, X. (2007). T*he Beijing Olympiad: the political economy of a sporting mega-event.* London: Routledge.

Cornelissen, S., Bob, U., & Swart, K. (2011). Towards redefining the concept of legacy in relation to sport mega-events: Insights from the 2010 FIFA World Cup. *Development Southern Africa*, 28(3), 307-318.

Dansero, E., & Puttilli, M. (2010). Mega-events tourism legacies: The case of the Torino 2006 Winter Olympic Games – A territorialisation approach. *Leisure Studies*, 29(3), 321–341, doi:10.1080/02614361003716966

Echtner, C. M., & Ritchie, B. (1993). The measurement of destination image: An empirical assessment. *Journal of Travel Research*, 31(4), 3-13.

Girginov, V. and Hills, L. (2008). A sustainable sports legacy: creating a link between the London Olympics and sports participation. T*he International Journal of the History of Sport*, 25 (14), 2091–2116.

Gratton, C., & Preuss, H. (2008). Maximizing Olympic Impacts by Building Up Legacies. *The International Journal of the History of Sport*, 25(14), 1922-1938.

Grix, J. (2012). "Image" leveraging and sports mega-events: Germany and the 2006 FIFA World Cup. *Journal of Sport & Tourism*, 17, 289–312. doi:10.1080/ 14775085.2012.760934.

Grix, J. and Brannagan, P.M. (2016). Of mechanisms and myths: conceptualising states' "soft power" strategies through sports mega-events. *Diplomacy and Sport*, 27 (2), 251–272.

Grix, J., et al. (2017). State strategies for leveraging sports mega-events: unpacking the concept of 'legacy'. I*nternational Journal of Sport Policy and Politics*, 9 (2), 203–218.

Horne, J. (2007). The Four 'Knowns' of Sports Mega-Events. *Leisure Studies*, 26(1), 81-96.

International Olympic Committee. (2003). *Report of the IOC Evaluation Commission.* Website: http://www.olympic.org/Documents/Reports/EN/en_report_706.pdf

International Olympic Committee. (2009). I*OC guide on sport, environment and sustainable development.* Lausanne: Author.

International Olympic Committee. (2014). *Olympic marketing fact file. Lausanne: Author.*

International Olympic Committee. (2014). *Olympic Agenda 2020. 20+20 Recommendations.* Lausanne: IOC

International Olympic Committee. (2018). *Legacy strategic approach: moving forward.* Lausanne, Available from https://www.olympic.org/~/media/ Document%20Library/OlympicOrg/Documents/Olympic-Legacy/IOC_Legacy_Strategy_Full_version.pdf?la=en

Kassens-Noor, E., Wilson, M., Muller, S., Maharaj, B., & Huntoon, L. (2015). Towards a mega-event legacy framework. *Leisure Studies*, 34(6), 6654-671, DOI:10.1080/02614367.2015.1035316.

Kaplanidou, K., & Karadakis, K. (2010). Understanding the Legacies of a Host Olympic City: The Case of the 2010 Vancouver Olympic Games. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 19, 110-117.

Kaplanidou, K., Kerwin, S., & Karadakis, K. (2014). Understanding sport event success: Exploring perceptions of sport event consumers and event providers. *Journal of Sport & Tourism.* doi:10.1080/14775085.2013.861358.

Karadakis, K., & Kaplanidou, K. (2012). Legacy perceptions among host and non-host Olympic Games residents: A longitudinal study of the 2010 Vancouver Olympic Games. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 12(3), 243-264.

Karadakis, K., Kaplanidou, K., & Karlis, G. (2016). Host and nonhost resident awareness and perceptions of legacies for the 2010 Vancouver Winter Olympic Games. *Loisir et Société / Society and Leisure*, DOI: 10.1080/07053436.2016.1198594.

Kim, H. J., Gursoy, D., & Lee, S.-B. (2006). The impact of the 2002 World Cup on South Korea: comparisons of pre- and post-games. *Tourism Management*, 27, 86-96.

Leopkey, B. (2009). *The historical evolution of Olympic Games Legacy.* Lausanne: IOC Olympic Studies Centre.

Leopkey, B., and Parent, M. M. (2012). Olympic games legacy: from general benefits to sustainable long-term legacy. *The International Journal of the History of Sport*, 29 (6), 924–943.

MacAloon, J. J. (2008). Legacy as Managerial/Magical Discourse in Contemporary Olympic Affairs. T*he International Journal of the History of Sport*, 25(14), 2060-2071.

MacAloon, J. (2010). Olympic Games and the theory of the spectacle in modern societies. In V. Girginov (Ed.), *The Olympics: A critical reader* (pp. 80–107). London: Routledge.

Malfas, M., Houlihan, B., & Theodoraki, E. (2004). Impacts of the Olympic Games as mega-events. Proceedings of the *ICE – Municipal Engineer*, 157, 209–220.

Mangan, J. A. (2008a). Prologue: Guarantees of Global Goodwill: Post-Olympic Legacies - Too Many Limping White Elephants? T*he International Journal of the History of Sport*, 25(14), 1869-1883.

Mangan, J. A. (2008b). Prologue: Guarantess of global goodwill: Post-Olympic legacies - Too many limping white elephants? . *The International Journal of the History of Sport*, 25, 1869-1883.

Misener, L., et al. (2013). Beyond Olympic legacy: understanding Paralympic legacy through a thematic analysis. *Journal of Sport Management*, 27, 329–341.

Müller, M. (2015). What makes an event a mega-event? Definitions and sizes. *Leisure Studies*, 34(6), 627-642, DOI: 10.1080/02614367.2014.993333.

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Preuss, H. (2007). The Conceptualisation and Measurement of Mega Sport Event Legacies. *Journal of Sport & Tourism*, 12(3-4), 207-227.

Preuss, H. (2015). A framework for identifying the legacies of a mega sport event. *Leisure Studies*, 34(6), 643-664, DOI: 10.1080/02614367.2014.994552.

Preuss, H. (2019). Event legacy framework and measurement. *International Journal of Sport Policy and Politics*, 11(1), 103-118.

Ritchie, J. B. R. (1984). Assessing the impact of hallmark events: Conceptual and research issues. *Journal of Travel Research*, 23, 2–11.

Rogerson, R. (2016). Re-defining temporal notions of event legacy: lessons from Glasgow's Commonwealth Games, Annals of Leisure Research, 19(4), 497-518, DOI: 10.1080/11745398.2016.1151367.

Rojek, C. (2014). Global event management: A critique. *Leisure Studies*, 33, 32–47, doi:10.1080/02614367.2012.716077

Searle, G. (2002). Uncertain Legacy: Sydney's Olympic Stadiums. *European Planning Studies*, 10(7), 845-860.

Solberg, H. A., & Preuss, H. (2007). Major Sport Events and Long-Term Tourism Impacts. *Journal of Sport Management*, 21(2), 213-234.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1990). *A basics of qualitative research theory methods.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Sugden, J., & Tomlinson, A. (Eds.). (2012). *Watching the Olympics: Politics, power, and representation.* London: Routledge.

Thomson, A., Schlenker, K., & Schulenkorf, N. (2013). Conceptualizing sport event legacy. *Event Management*, 17, 111–122.

Tomlinson, A. (1996). Olympic spectacle: Opening ceremonies and some paradoxes of globalization. *Media, Culture and Society*, 18, 583–602, doi:10.1177/016344396018004005.

Travis, A. S., & Croizé, J.-C. (1987). The role and impact of mega-events and attractions on tourism development in Europe: A micro perspective. Paper presented at the *37th AIEST Congress*, Calgary.

Weed, M., & Bull, C. (2004). S*ports tourism: Participants, policy and providers.* Oxford: Elsevier.

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

Zhang, L., & Zhao, S. X. (2009). City branding and the Olympic effect: A case study of Beijing. *Cities*, 26, 245–254. doi:10.1016/j.cities.2009.05.002.

Authors

Kostas Karadakis is an Associate Professor in Sport Management at Southern New Hampshire University. He holds a Ph.D. in Sport Management with research interests focused in sport marketing and tourism, event impacts, legacies, and quality of life.

Trevor Bopp is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Sport Management at the University of Florida. He holds a Ph.D. in Sport Management and studies the impact of race on sport participation, access, and experiences, as well as the role of sport, physical literacy, and activity in youth development.

Megan Gassman is an Assistant Professor of Business at Southern New Hampshire University. She holds a Ph.D. in International Business with research interests focused in sport marketing & sponsorship and corporate social responsibility.