

DAVIES, R. 2021. Defining legacy: a critical comparison of legacy literature definitions and the legacy objectives of the 2022 Qatar FIFA World Cup. *International journal of management and applied science* [online], 7(8), pages 12-18.
Available from: <http://iraj.doionline.org/dx/IJMAS-IRAJ-DOIONLINE-18127>

Defining legacy: a critical comparison of legacy literature definitions and the legacy objectives of the 2022 Qatar FIFA World Cup.

DAVIES, R.

2021

© Institute of Research and Journals.

DEFINING LEGACY: A CRITICAL COMPARISON OF LEGACY LITERATURE DEFINITIONS AND THE LEGACY OBJECTIVES OF THE 2022 QATAR FIFA WORLD CUP

RAYMOND DAVIES

Department of People, Organizations and Practice, Robert Gordon University, Aberdeen, United Kingdom
E-mail: r.j.davies@rgu.ac.uk

Abstract - In 2022 the Gulf State of Qatar will host the 22nd FIFA World Cup. This tournament follows on from a series of sporting mega events where the principle of legacy is embedded within its delivery and purpose. While claims for creating legacies are widespread, understanding how legacy is actually defined and perceived is an area of research in its infancy, being commonly misunderstood and currently without consensus agreement. This study explores the scholarly analysis into legacy development as a research theme. An interpretative approach is adopted which explores and catalogues legacy definitions within academic literature and segments applied terminology through a definition category framework. Comparative analysis is then conducted with the defined objectives of a current legacy focused mega event (2022 Qatar World Cup). The research findings lead to the creation of a new legacy definition for the event and to add to the limited examples already existing within the literature.

Keywords - Legacy, FIFA World Cup, Sporting Mega Events, Qatar

I. INTRODUCTION

The conceptual understanding of legacy is a difficult phenomena to convincingly define and comprehend for both the researcher and the practitioner. Legacy as a concept has been underdeveloped, under-explored, exploited, and frequently misunderstood [1-3].

It has been characterized as something that lacks clear conceptualization [4] and is heavily dependent on the environment in which it is intended [5]. Despite this, claims of legacy are becoming a reoccurring 'buzz word' that politicians, organizations, and stakeholders of all levels will utter as the justification for their projector events existence and approach; that it will leave a 'legacy' for future generations [6-7].

This is problematic in that legacy definitions mean different things to different people, and this shapes its context, understanding, and character to suit individual preferences[8]. In today's ethical business landscape the expansion of legacy development requires a move away from rhetorical commitments to a more formalized and focused understanding of its parameters [9]. This would provide organizations a common foundation for facilitating positive legacy outputs. It would assist in clarifying the required knowledge and skills for how to strive and seek generational benefits. Unfortunately, at present this is out of reach. The literature notes that the academic community has failed to provide a generally accepted or clearly understood definition of how legacy can be defined [10]. This leaves legacy development and its application in practice limited in scope,

individualistic, conceptual, and relatively untested [11-12].

All this while the regularity of legacy claims within projects and events are increasing in volume and expansiveness [4]. In 2012 The London Olympic games were lauded for integrating legacy throughout their development, often known as the 'legacy games' [13]. Ten years later the 2022 FIFA World Cup will launch in the Gulf State of Qatar with an expansive array of legacy initiatives and goals [14]. With legacy being something that is not static but multi-dimensional and an evolving concept [15], do these Qatari legacy ambitions correlate with what is understood on the topic? The objective of this work is to identify the definitions of legacy within academic literature on mega projects or sporting events and to compare how relevant they are to current practice. In this instance the specific legacy claims of the Qatar 2022 World Cup.

The Development of Legacy Understanding within Academic Literature

Traditional understanding for the term legacy was developed from legal frameworks and bequests, being characterized as 'property left by a will'[16]. This development stems from human belief and behavior to search for meaning. That individual or group efforts become recognized and intertwined with the desire for future remembrance or heritage to create a legacy[17]. While these origins are still relevant today, the notion of legacy has expanded to other scenarios.

There are legacy references for describing outdated or irrelevant IT systems and products [18]. But it is in the sporting mega event which has seen the most exploration for focus as a research theme [19]. The mega event being an exclusive category of large-scale, city/nation hosted activity with international importance and relevance [20]. The largest and most complex of these being the Summer and Winter Olympic / Paralympics Games, [21] and the FIFA World Cup [22]. These events with their aspirational nature, global identity, and worldwide prominence provide the event organizers a leading role in advancing how legacy is characterized, perceived, and defined [19]. While the winners and losers of the event may live long in the collective memory. For the event host, legacy is an important factor for retrospectively determining the overall success of the games [23]. Especially when past mega-events contain a chequered history for creating unsustainable vanity projects, urban booster is mand leaving a catalogue of white elephant infrastructure remnants. [24-26].

In response to this the International Olympic Committee (IOC) and Federation International de Football Association (FIFA) have advanced the importance of legacy in their operations and outlook [27]. This has led the way in transforming legacy development and the potential to seek after positive and beneficial legacy outcomes [28]. This has been done to the extent that both the IOC and FIFA have adopted legacy as a core value for their events and a governing principle of their existence[29]. These efforts were done in conjunction and collaboration with the academic community. In 2002, a defining moment in legacy development was initiated as the IOC held an international symposium to better understand and define legacy. It was an attempt to agree on clarification for how it could be correctly applied [30]. Invited to this were a number of leading researchers and academics. The outcome of this symposium was mixed. While there were advancements in recognizing the significance of legacies, ultimately researchers were unable to fully define and agree on the general concept. It did however facilitate subsequent research interest in the topic and inspire a range of attempts from authors to further explore characteristics and define what legacy could be [31].

II. METHODS

The aim of this research is to compare how current legacy objectives used in industry practice relate to the varied legacy definitions found in academic literature.

To understand how legacy is defined, an interpretive approach was adopted with the final objective to be able to formulate a legacy definition for the selected event of the Qatar 2022 FIFA World Cup. An

extensive literature review of academic journals was conducted incorporating not only mega-event literature, but also wider legacy themes. The focus was however specific to defining legacy, so did not consider related concepts such as sustainability or leveraging. Articles that were deemed appropriate for consideration were based on a set criteria. That their context discusses legacy principles as something that is to be designed, managed, and ultimately creates a legacy output of some manner. The journal inclusion range was not restricted to a certain timeframe and all articles that met the selection criteria were considered.

To represent the development of this research field, the two periods essential to its understanding were separated for investigation. The first being the initial efforts in formulating legacy definitions and the academic output of the 2002 Olympic Symposium (period between 2000-2003). The other is the subsequent post-symposium years (2004-2020) where a more critical application of these definitions was explored.

With this methodology, twelve academic legacy definitions were identified within the literature (**Fig. 1**).

Academic Journal Articles Defining Legacy	Pre & Olympic Symposium Definition Output (2000-2003)
	Ritchie, 2000 [32], Hiller, 2000 [33], IOC, 2003 [34], Chalip[35], Roche, 2003 [36], Barney, 2003 [37], Kidd, 2003 [38].
	Post Olympic Symposium Research (2004-2019)
	Preuss, 2007 [29], Gratton & Preuss, 2008 [30], Silva, 2015 [39], Franklin & Cheung, 2017 [17], Ma & Kaplanidou, 2017 [40].

Fig.1. Legacy Definitions by Authors and Period

These definitions were then analyzed for common reoccurrences in nature, description, and terminology. This enabled their defining characteristics to be grouped into categories based upon Preuss's framework [1] for questioning various perspectives and dimensions on how legacy is understood. These are built around 3 themes.

1. What constitutes a legacy.
2. When a legacy begins and how long it lasts.
3. Who legacy stakeholders are and how they are affected.

The author adapted these principles to create three legacy definition categories (see **Fig 2**).



Fig.2. Legacy Definition Categories

This enabled identified legacy terminology to be listed by their represented character and segmented into their associated category then recorded for frequency of use.

With this framework in place, the similarities and differences between academic understanding and application of industry practice were critically reviewed. The Qatar 2022 FIFA World Cup was selected for analysis. The rationale for this selection is that it is an event in which its legacy objectives and design fits within the parameters of the established literature [30]. It is an event that has clear legacy support and commitment from key stakeholders who have already published their legacy objectives and made them available to the public. Within this, five core legacy objectives are identified with a range of initiatives planned to achieve them (Fig 3).

The documentation used to identify legacy objectives were taken from the official Qatar National Legacy Committee publication for the FIFA 2022 World Cup: ‘Legacy Book’ [41].

Qatar 2022 World Cup Legacy Types	Initiatives Set to Achieve Them
Human Legacies	Challenge 22, Volunteer Programme, Human Capital Development Strategy for Tourism, Internship Programme, Observation and secondment programmes.
Social Legacies	Stadium Precincts, Woman in Football, Workers Welfare, Generation Amazing, Kakuma.
Economic Legacies	Josoor Institute, Trade Missions, Research Programme.
Environmental Legacies	Sustainable Tournament Infrastructure, Tarsheed 22, Environmental Sustainability Case Study Challenge.
Sporting Legacies	World Class Stadiums, Test Events, Workers Cup, Increasing Sports Participation.

Fig.3. Qatar 2022 World Cup Legacy Categories and Initiatives to Achieve Them

Through evaluation of legacy definitions both pre and post the Olympic legacy symposium, the author will suggest an appropriate legacy definition for the Qatar 2022 World Cup based on the nature and description of the legacy objectives provided.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

There were seven journal articles identified that provided a definition of legacy before and through to the Olympic Symposium (Fig. 4). Two of these being pre-event [32-33] and five as an output of this academic exploration for how to define what legacy is [34-38].

Pre & Olympic Symposium Legacy Definition Output (2000-2003)	Ritchie (2000)	Hiller (2000)	IOC (2003)	Chalip (2003)	Roche (2003)	Barney (2003)	Kidd (2003)	Sum
1. Legacy Nature								
Tangible / Permanent / Infrastructure	X	X	X					3
Intangible / Social / Human	X	X	X				X	4
Multifaceted / Complex			X	X				2
2. Time Based								
Long Term	X			X			X	3
Short Term				X				1
Past Orientated					X	X		2
Future Orientated					X	X		2
3. Impact & Improvement								
Improve / Enhance / Benefit	X	X		X		X		4
Generic Impact	X	X						2
Positive Impact								0
Negative Impact								0
Potential / Opportunity					X		X	2
Planned / Expected Outcomes								0
Unplanned / Unexpected Outcomes								0
Sustained								0

Fig.4. Legacy Definition Characteristics (2000-2003)

The literature research confirmed that there were no appropriate definitions of legacy before 2000 and that it is a research topic of recent development and infancy [30]. Reviewing the frequency of legacy characteristics given, it reveals a period of establishing a conceptual understanding of legacy. The most common grouping of descriptions (9 provided) is based on what the nature of legacy is or could be. Closely associated with this search for understanding was the repeated emphasis of time to the character of legacy. A factor that was established significantly with in the articles generated from the

symposium itself. The results also show that there is a limited emphasis for legacy consideration within the environment it is intended for. While there is consistency for identifying that legacy should provide improvement (4 of the 7 articles). What that improvement should be is barely explored. This however could be attributed to the newness of the research theme. It is understandable that it should take a maturity period to think beyond conceptual definitions and towards the application of legacy in specific contexts. This maturity theory seems to be confirmed in the legacy definitions provided post the Olympic symposium through the period 2004-2019 (Fig.5). This shows a retraction in legacy type definitions and a 125% increase in impact definitions provided. This is despite having two fewer articles with five post-symposium legacy definitions being identified [17] [29-30] [39-40].

Post Olympic Symposium Legacy Definition Output (2004-2019)	Preuss (2007)	Gratton & Preuss (2008)	Silva (2015)	Franklin & Cheung (2017)	Ma & Kaptaniou (2017)	Sum
1. Legacy Type / Nature						
Tangible / Permanent / Infrastructure	X	X				2
Intangible / Social / Human	X	X	X	X		4
Multifaceted / Complex						1
2. Time Based						
Long Term					X	1
Short Term					X	1
Past Orientated			X	X		2
Future Orientated	X	X	X	X		4
3. Impact & Improvement						
Improve / Enhance / Benefit			X		X	2
Generic Impact					X	1
Positive Impact	X	X	X		X	4
Negative Impact	X	X			X	3
Potential / Opportunity					X	1
Planned / Expected Outcomes	X	X			X	3
Unplanned / Unexpected Outcomes	X	X			X	3
Sustained					X	1

Fig.5. Legacy Definition Characteristics (2004-2019)

The post-symposium articles include the most widely referenced and influential definition within legacy literature from Gratton & Preuss [30]. They state,

“Legacy is planned and unplanned, positive and negative, intangible and tangible structures created through a sport event that remain after the event” [7]. A view that the majority of the articles within this period support and incorporate within their own definitions. To a substantial extent, thoughts for legacy impact and improvement are exemplified wider as a defining feature. These descriptions often highlight that legacy can be expansive and also contradictory in its effect. The broad use of terminology in these instances allows for further consequential applicable exploration. While doing so however it potentially adds to the conflict for understanding what legacy consists of. The searticulated descriptions still provide a high level of ambiguity [42].

Preuss’s definition [29] within this period also gives prominence to an issue not addressed pre-2003. That there are too many assumptions that legacies made will be effective or their planned benefits will materialize for their intended stakeholders [43]. Negative, uncontrolled, and unexpected outcomes are added to the collective legacy cognizance.

An o table deliverable from these selected articles was their increased inclusion for legacy having social or intangible features. This being the most common definition type articulated. This seems to be counter to conducted research in legacy development where the majority of focus is on the physical or tangible infrastructure [44] or the economic impact of developing this tangible legacy [45]. This could be perceived as an attempt to advance conceptual importance because intangible factors have been previously labeled within legacy understanding as a tangible ‘by-product’ or ‘afterthought’ [46]. It is a highly complex research field as intangible legacies can be regarded as subjective or more challenging to effectively quantify [47]. Social aspects of legacy development are particularly lacking in critical study [48]. It is interesting to note that current legacy developments for the 2022 Qatar FIFA World Cup have extensively designed social and human legacy measures within their event (see Fig.6).

Qatar 2022 World Cup Legacy Characteristics	Human Legacies	Social Legacies	Economic Legacies	Environmental Legacies	Sporting Legacies	Sum
1. Legacy Nature						
Tangible / Permanent / Infrastructure	X	X	X	X	X	5
Intangible / Social / Human	X	X		X	X	4
Multifaceted / Complex						0

2. Time Based						
Long Term	X	X	X	X	X	5
Short Term			X	X	X	3
Past Orientated			X	X		2
Future Orientated	X	X	X	X	X	5
3. Impact & Improvement						
Improve / Enhance / Benefit	X	X	X	X	X	5
Generic Impact		X	X		X	3
Positive Impact	X	X	X	X	X	5
Negative Impact						0
Potential / Opportunity	X	X	X	X	X	5
Planned / Expected Outcomes	X	X	X	X	X	5
Unplanned / Unexpected Outcomes						0
Sustained	X	X	X	X	X	5

Fig.6. Qatar 2022 FIFA World Cup Legacy Description Characteristics

What is distinct in the Qatar approach is that extensive tangible and infrastructure legacies are sought to support the social and intangible goals. This seems to confer with the literature that the two opposing natures can co-exist and that tangible creations make the concept of legacy easier to digest and visualize. That it can promote more widespread understanding and awareness for legacy being that it is something that stakeholders can see, feel and experience [2]. This in part enables a tangible output that then provides benefits that can have lasting multi generational impact through an extended lifecycle [33].

All five 2022 Qatar World Cup legacy objectives (human, social, economic, environmental, and sporting) are core to its legacy definition and are supported by a range of design initiatives to realise and deliver these ambitions. When applied to the legacy definition categories (Fig. 2) this creates an extensive range (twenty-eight) of improvement and impact considerations. The extent of this is similar to the results from the most recent legacy definition provided by Ma & Kaplanidou [40]. As legacy concepts in literature evolve, these findings denote that the Qatar event is aligned firmly with the most current understanding for defining legacy.

The most notable difference from the later literature when considering impact however is the absence of inclusion for negative or unexpected legacies. The Qatar World Cup approach to legacy is through an emphasis on planning for ‘positive’ outcomes. This is an established approach for how to achieve an effective legacy. That legacy is obtained through a controlled and defined process rather than to be left to chance or organic methods [44] [49]. This position is common amongst aspirational events where often the

key vision is to shape meaningful long-lasting benefits and improve quality of life through the impact of the event [50-52].

For a tournament of this nature (reliant on a defined start date), time was always going to be a consequential consideration. A pronounced feature of the Qatar World Cup plan is the appraisal of time within its legacy evaluations. It provides an emphasis that is heavily weighted towards the long term and the future rather than the immediate hosting of the event itself. This aligns with some of the fundamental legacy literature, which suggests that ‘true’ legacy is based around multigenerational outcomes based on an extended lifecycle post-event [2] [30]. This is often the subtle difference between hollow rhetoric which creates only a legacy placebo and a legacy that provides genuine benefits that are fit for purpose [53]. With World Cup stadiums required to support a capacity larger than even the local Qatar area population, the potential for unused or underused infrastructure is great [54]. This has been addressed with an approach that is just beginning to find traction within the literature; to embed sustainability measures as a foundation for achieving legacy objectives [39]. The Qatar World Cup initiatives are some of the most ambitious for interconnecting sustainability and legacy. The World Cup bid is built upon the State of Qatar’s 2030 vision, which a core pillar is to implement and achieve sustainability within its society [41]. In terms of definition and characterisation it is also a theme that could be further explored being rarely considered in the formation of legacy projects [52]. Conceptually there is substantial overlap. Both legacy and sustainability share a similar categorisation in that they focus on along-term future [5] [55]. It is this link where the Qatar World Cup initiatives expand boundaries for legacy potential, creation, and understanding in relation to current literature. An area where future monitoring on the delivery of this event can add additional research insight towards the ability to appropriately define and characterise legacy.

IV. DEFINITION & CONCLUSIONS

The analysis of the 2022 Qatar FIFA World Cup legacy documentation reveals a consistent and specific approach for obtaining set legacies. An output that is reflective and comparable for how legacy is defined and critically appraised within academic research. This suggests that the Qatar World Cup legacy plans have depth and appropriate relevance and are not artificial in their design. The current context for legacy literature is one where limited academic definitions exist and there is no consensus for articulating legacy. The perspectives and experience of legacy development in practice is an invaluable source for expanding further knowledge [56]. Through bottom-up collective analysis of events

and their approaches for application, a wider understanding of legacy as a 'whole' can be reached or advanced [57].

With that objective and based on the analysis of this study, a definition of legacy is proposed by the author for the Qatar 2022 FIFA World Cup as follows:

'Legacy is specifically planned for anticipated outcomes and benefits. It is focused on long-term and sustainable improvements around tangible infrastructure that benefits human need and social development'.

REFERENCE

- [1] H. Preuss, "A framework for identifying the legacies of a mega sport event", *Leisure Studies*, Vol. 34, No.6, pp. 643-664, 2015.
- [2] J.-L. Chappelet, "Mega sporting event legacies: a multifaceted concept", *Papers of Europe / Papeles de Europa*, Vol. 25, pp. 76-86, 2012.
- [3] M. Griffiths and K. Armour, "Physical education and youth sport in England: Conceptual and practical foundations for an Olympic legacy?", *International Journal of Sport Policy and Politics*, Vol. 5, pp. 213-227, 2013.
- [4] S. Ferrari & C. Guala, "Mega-events and their legacy Image and tourism in Genoa, Turin and Milan", *Leisure Studies*, Vol. 36, No.1, pp. 119-137, 2017.
- [5] S. Cornelissen, U. Bob, and K. Swart, "Towards redefining the concept of legacy in relation to sport mega events: Insights from the 2010 FIFA World Cup", *Development Southern Africa*, Vol. 3, pp. 207-318, 2011.
- [6] J.R. Gold and M.M. Gold, "Bring it under the legacy umbrella: Olympic host cities and the changing fortunes of the sustainability agenda", *Sustainability*, Vol.5, No.8, pp. 3526-3542, 2013.
- [7] R. Rogerson, "Re-defining temporal notions of event legacy: lessons from Glasgow's Commonwealth Games", *Annals of Leisure Research*, Vol. 19, No. 4, pp. 497-518, 2016.
- [8] E. Kassens-Noor, M. Wilson, S. Müller, B. Maharaj and L. Huntoon, "Towards a mega-event legacy framework", *Leisure Studies*, Vol. 34, No.6, pp. 665-671, 2015.
- [9] A.J. Veal, K. Toohey and S. Frawley, "The sport participation legacy of the Sydney 2000 Olympic Games and other international sporting events hosted in Australia", *Journal of Policy Research in Tourism, Leisure and Events*, Vol. 4, No. 2, pp. 155-184, 2012.
- [10] I. Pappalepore and M. Duignan, "The London 2012 cultural programme: A consideration of Olympic impacts and legacies for small creative organisations in east London", *Tourism Management*, Vol. 54, pp. 344-355, 2016.
- [11] S-H. Tsaor, C-H. Yen, J-H. Tu, C-H. Wang and Y-W. Liang, "Evaluation of the 2010 Taipei International Flora Exposition from the perceptions of host-city residents: a new framework for mega-event legacies measurement", *Leisure Studies* Vol. 36, No.1, pp. 65-88, 2017.
- [12] K. Kaplanidou, "The importance of legacy outcomes for Olympic Games four summer host cities residents' quality of life: 1996-2008", *European Sport Management Quarterly*, Vol. 12, No. 4, pp. 397-433, 2012.
- [13] D. Epstein, R. Jackson and P. Braithwaite, "Delivering London 2012: Sustainability strategy", *Civil Engineering*, Vol.164, pp.27-33, 2011.
- [14] K. Kaplanidou, A. Al Emadi, M. Sagas, A. Diop and G. Fritz, "Business legacy planning for mega events: The case of the 2022 World Cup in Qatar", *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 69, No. 10, pp. 4103-4111, 2016.
- [15] J. Grix and L. Phillpots, "London 2012 and its legacies", *International Journal of Sport Policy and Politics*, Vol. 5, No.2, pp. 163-164.
- [16] D. Harper, "Legacy", *Online Etymological Dictionary*, www.etymonline.com, 2001.
- [17] F. C. Franklin and M. Cheung, "Legacy interventions with patients with co-occurring disorders: Legacy definitions, life satisfaction, and self-efficacy", *Substance Use & Misuse*, Vol. 52, No.14, pp. 1840-1849, 2017.
- [18] P. Thiran, J-L. Hainaut, G-J. Houben, D. Benslimane, "Wrapper-based evolution of legacy information systems", *ACM Transactions on Software Engineering and Methodology*, Vol. 15, No. 4, pp. 329-359, 2006.
- [19] L. Chalip, "From legacy to leverage." In *Leveraging Legacies from Sports Mega-events: Concepts and Cases*, edited by J. Grix, London: Palgrave, pp. 2-12, 2014.
- [20] M. Roche, "Mega-events and modernity: olympics and expos in the growth of global culture", London: Routledge, 2000.
- [21] J. Horne and W. Manzenreiter, "An introduction to the sociology of sports mega-events", *Sociological Review Supplement*, Vol. 2, pp. 1-24, 2006.
- [22] C. Death, "Greening the 2010 FIFA World Cup: Environmental sustainability and the mega-event in South Africa", *Journal of Environmental Policy & Planning*, Vol. 13, No.2, pp. 99-117, 2011.
- [23] A. Tomlinson, "Olympic legacies: recurrent rhetoric and harsh realities", *Contemporary Social Science*, Vol. 9, No.2, pp. 137-158, 2014.
- [24] S. Tufts, "Building the 'competitive city': labour and Toronto's bid to host the Olympic games", *Geoforum*, Vol. 35, pp. 47-58, 2004.
- [25] S. Essex and B. Chalkey, "Olympic games: catalyst of urban change", *Leisure Studies*, Vol. 17, pp. 187-206, 1998.
- [26] L. DaCosta, "Olympic Studies: Current Intellectual Crossroads", Editora Gama Filho: Rio de Janeiro, pp. 69-90, 2002.
- [27] S. Cornelissen, "Crafting legacies: the changing political economy of global sport and the 2010 FIFA World Cup", *Politikon*, Vol.34, No.3, pp. 241-259, 2007.
- [28] B. Leopkey and M.M. Parent, "The (neo)institutionalization of legacy and its sustainable governance within the Olympic Movement", *European Sport Management Quarterly*, Vol.12, No.5, pp. 437-455, 2012.
- [29] H. Preuss, "The conceptualisation and measurement of mega sport event legacies", *The Journal of Sport & Tourism*, Vol. 12, Nos.3-4, pp. 207-227, 2007.
- [30] C. Gratton and H. Preuss, "Maximizing Olympic impacts by building up legacies", *The International Journal of the History of Sport*, Vol. 25, No. 14, pp. 1922-1938, 2008.
- [31] J.J. MacAloon, "Legacy as managerial/magical discourse in contemporary Olympic affairs", *The International Journal of the History of Sport*, Vol. 25, No.14, pp. 2060-2071, 2008.
- [32] J.R.B. Ritchie, "Turning 16 days into 16 years through Olympic legacies", *Event Management*, Vol. 6, No.3, pp. 155-165, 2000.
- [33] H. Hiller, "Mega-events, urban boosterism and growth strategies", *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, Vol. 24, pp. 439-458, 2000.
- [34] IOC Olympic Studies Centre. "The legacy of the Olympic games: 1984-2000: Conclusions and recommendations". Lausanne: International Olympic Committee, pp.5, 2003.
- [35] L. Chalip, "Tourism and the Olympic Games", Paper presented at the legacy of the Olympic games 1984-2000, International Symposium, 2003.
- [36] M. Roche, "The Olympics and the development of global society", Paper presented at the legacy of the Olympic games 1984-2000, International Symposium, 2003.
- [37] R.K. Barney, "The Olympic legacy of wealth: A double edged sword", Paper presented at the legacy of the Olympic games 1984-2000, International Symposium, 2003.
- [38] B. Kidd, "The global sporting legacy of the Olympic movement", Paper presented at the legacy of the Olympic games 1984-2000, International Symposium, 2003.
- [39] M. Silva, "Future-proof: foresight as a tool towards project legacy sustainability", *PM World Journal*, Vol. 4, No. 5, pp. 1-15, 2015.

- [40] S.C. Ma and K. Kaplanidou, "Legacy perceptions among host Tour de Taiwan residents: the mediating effect of quality of life", *Leisure Studies*, Vol. 36, No.3, pp. 423-437, 2017.
- [41] Supreme Committee for Delivery & Legacy, "Legacy book: edition one", 2016.
- [42] I. Pappalepore and M. Duignan, "The London 2012 cultural programme: A consideration of Olympic impacts and legacies for small creative organisations in East London", *Tourism Management*, Vol. 54, pp. 344-355, 2016.
- [43] N. Agha, S. Fairley and H. Gibson, "Considering legacy as a multi-dimensional construct: The legacy of the Olympic Games", *Sport Management Review*, Vol. 15, pp. 125-139, 2012.
- [44] P. Lienhard and H. Preuss, "Legacy, sustainability and CSR at mega sport events: An analysis of the UEFA EURO 2008 in Switzerland", Springer Gabler, 2014.
- [45] G. Silvestre, "The social impacts of mega events: Towards a framework", *Esporte e Sociedade*, Vol. 4, No.10, pp.1-25, 2009.
- [46] C. Persson, T. Andersson, and B. Sahlberg (Eds.), "The Impact of mega events. Ostersund: MidSweden University and Swedish Institute for Regional Research, 1998.
- [47] O. Seippel, "Sport and social capital", *Acta sociologica*, Vol. 49, No. 2, pp. 169-184, 2006.
- [48] L. Minnaert, "An Olympic legacy for all? The non-infrastructure outcomes of the Olympic Games for socially excluded groups (Atlanta-Beijing 2008)", *Tourism Management*, Vol. 33, pp. 361-370, 2011.
- [49] A. Smith and T. Fox, "From 'event-led' to 'event-themed' regeneration: The 2002 Commonwealth Games Legacy", *Urban Studies*, Vol. 44, No.5-6, pp. 1125-43, 2007.
- [50] V. Ziakas, "Planning and leveraging event portfolios: Towards a holistic theory", *Journal of Hospitality Marketing and Management*, Vol. 23, pp. 327-356, 2014.
- [51] R. Panagiotopoulou, "Nation branding and the Olympic Games: New media images for Greece and China", *The International Journal of the History of Sport*, Vol. 29, No. 16, pp. 2337-2348, 2012.
- [52] L.P. Cooper, M.H. Hecht, and A. Majchrzak, "Managing a project's legacy: implications for organizations and project management", IEEE, 2003.
- [53] C. Rojek, "Global Event Management: a critique", *Leisure Studies*, Vol. 33, No.1, pp. 32-47, 2014.
- [54] P.M. Brannagan and R. Giulianotti, "Soft power and soft disempowerment: Qatar, global sport and football's 2022 World Cup finals", *Leisure Studies*, Vol. 34, No. 6, pp. 703-719, 2015.
- [55] J. R. Gold and M.M. Gold, "Legacy, sustainability and Olympism: Crafting urban outcomes and London 2012", *Staps, De BoeckSuperieur*, Vol. 3, No 105, pp 23-35, 2014.
- [56] A.C. Reis, S. Frawley, D. Hodgetts, A. Thompson and K. Hughes, "Sport participation legacy and the Olympic games: Case of Sydney 2000, London 2012, and Rio 2016", *Event Management*, Vol. 21, pp. 139-158, 2017.
- [57] V. Girginov, "Governance of the London 2012 Olympic games legacy", *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, Vol. 47, No. 5, pp. 543-558, 2011.

