Evaluating the volunteering infrastructure legacy of the Olympic Games: Sydney 2000 and London 2012

Leonie Lockstone-Binney
William Angliss Institute

Kirsten Holmes
Curtin University

Richard Shipway
Bournemouth University

Karen A. Smith
Victoria University of Wellington

June 2016

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

ABSTRACT

This project examines how Olympic volunteer programmes can lead to post-Games volunteer legacies for host cities through engagement with the established volunteer infrastructure in host cities before, during and after the events. This volunteering infrastructure being the organisations and programmes in place to promote, support and manage volunteering; including volunteering peak bodies, volunteer resource centres, national governing bodies of sport, community organisations and local government. Two Summer Olympic Games were used as case studies for this purpose: the recent case of London 2012 and the longer-term case of Sydney 2000.

Two research phases were conducted. Stage 1 involved a comprehensive review of secondary data on the Sydney and London Olympic and Paralympic Games, and Stage 2 involved 27 interviews with key informants in each host city. The findings reveal limitations with legacy planning for each OCOG. While SOCOG had no specific remit for legacy planning, the voluntary sector led legacy efforts in Australia. In London there was Government-led legacy planning but the failure to engage with the voluntary sector hampered implementation. Recommendations are provided for host cities and the IOC to enable future Olympic Games host cities and countries to leverage from the Games volunteer programmes to generate wider benefits for their communities.

KEY WORDS

Host cities, infrastructure, knowledge transfer, legacy, OCOG, volunteering, voluntary sector

GLOSSARY

CSPN: Country Sports Partnership Network
DCMS: Department for Culture, Media & Sport
FE: Further Education sector
GamesForce 2000/Volunteers 2000: Sydney 2000's official volunteering programme
Games Makers: Name of London 2012's official volunteering programme
GLA: Greater London Authority
GLV: Greater London Volunteering
HE: Higher Education sector
IOC: International Olympic Committee
IYV: International Year of Volunteering 2001
Join In: Official volunteer legacy programme of the 2012 London Games
LOCOG: London Organising Committee of the Olympic and Paralympic Games
MEV: Manchester Event Volunteers
NCVO: National Council for Voluntary Organisations
NSW: New South Wales, Australia
OCOG: Organising Committee for the Olympic Games
ODA: Olympic Delivery Authority
OGI: Olympic Games Impact study
OGKM: Olympic Games Knowledge Management
ORTA: Olympic Roads and Transport Authority
Pioneer Volunteers: A core group of 500 volunteers from the first phase of volunteer recruitment for the Sydney Games
Podium: The HE and FE unit for the London Games
RFS: Rural Fire Service
SMEVP/EventCorps: Sydney Major Event Volunteering Pool
SOCOG: Sydney Organising Committee for the Olympic Games
TAFE: Technical and Further Education, vocational tertiary education institutions in Australia
Team London Ambassadors: Volunteers who welcomed and directed visitors to London during the London Games
Team London Young Ambassadors: Mayor of London's volunteer programme for schools
TfL Transport Ambassadors: Non-operational Transport for London (TfL) staff deployed for customer service and information purposes over the Games period
Transport Team Travel Champions: Volunteers who facilitated visitor movement via railways throughout London over the Games period.
VANOC: Vancouver Organising Committee for the 2010 Olympic and Paralympic Winter Games
VRC: Volunteer Resource Centre
YMCA: Young Men's Christian Association
YWCA: Young Women's Christian Association

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Purpose
- This project examines how Olympic volunteer programmes can lead to post-Games volunteer legacies through engagement with the established volunteer infrastructure in host cities.
- In doing so, the study in part addresses the 2015/2016 IOC priority research field 3, namely, investigation of the "key factors in the engagement of the host city and country governing bodies and population to contribute to the success of the Olympic Games and a sustainable positive legacy".

Key definitions
- The volunteering infrastructure is defined for the purposes of this study as being the organisations and programmes in place to promote, support and manage volunteering; including volunteering peak bodies, volunteer resource centres, national governing bodies of sport, community organisations and local government.

Approach
- This project is based on two Summer Olympic Games case studies: the recent case of London 2012 and the longer-term case of Sydney 2000.
- Data collection involved a comprehensive review of secondary data on the Sydney and London Olympic and Paralympic Games and 27 interviews (London 16; Sydney 11).

Findings

Impacts
- The profile of volunteering was raised as a result of the publicity generated during both Olympic Games.
- In Sydney, Games volunteering broadened the scope of volunteering in people's minds, encouraging them to participate in episodic and event volunteering.
- In contrast, in London, volunteering during Games time led to uneven profiling of select forms of volunteering. Sports and events were the primary beneficiaries of any legacy.

Volunteer programme before Games
- At London, there was the perception that voluntary organisations were left largely unengaged.
- Some respondents felt this lack of engagement was a strategy specifically employed by LOCOG to attract people new to volunteering.
- Instead, volunteer organisations worked with non-LOCOG programmes (such as Team London) to leverage off the existing volunteering infrastructure.
- Sydney data points to a deeper level of engagement facilitated between the volunteer sector and SOCOG.
- Games volunteering was used both as a recruitment tool to encourage new volunteers to get involved and as a reward for people who had been long-time volunteers.

Volunteer legacy planned by OCOG and/or government
- There was a lack of clarity with legacy directives from both LOCOG and SOCOG. Neither OCOG was in charge of implementing their legacies and indeed it was not their job to do so.
- At Sydney, legacy initiatives were largely bottom up and driven by the voluntary sector and the volunteers themselves.
- Join In was the key initiative planned to manage the volunteer legacy in the case of London. However, the clarity of Join In's legacy directives, its focus (is it just sports volunteering?) and its reach into areas beyond London were queried.
- Join In may have come too late in the planning process towards the impending end of the Games, rather than being a fully planned legacy initiative.

Volunteer legacy planned by others
- Team London, Sport England, Spirit of 2012, selective National Governing Bodies for Sport, and CSPs were the key organisations that were involved in volunteer legacies for London.
- Team London's initiatives included developing a volunteering app to facilitate participation and Team London was seen as having engaged more with existing volunteering infrastructure in their programmes.
- The two sectors in Sydney that leveraged off the Sydney Games to create legacies were universities in NSW and the volunteering sector.

Management of volunteer legacy
- Data from London pointed to opportunities that had been missed to capitalise on the volunteer legacy of the 2012 Games.
- In London, there was limited evidence of an increase in post-Games volunteering, which some attributed to LOCOG's focus on an asset legacy rather than a social one.
- In Sydney, an active group of volunteers managed their own legacy with regular meet-ups and by participating in further volunteering at mega and major events.
- There was an assumption at both Games that the feel-good effects of volunteering would lead to continued volunteer involvement through the self-directed initiative of the volunteers.
- However, there was a lack of mechanisms available to deliver enthusiastic Sydney and London Games volunteers to suitable roles.

Resources
- Both the London and Sydney interviewees emphasised the importance of identifying funding sources to resource legacy initiatives.
- Some of the potential funding sources mentioned included the OCOG's budget, government's budget, proceeds from the sale of Olympic assets, or a fixed allocation of sponsorship money into a legacy fund, the latter suggestion more prominently raised by the London respondents.
- It was noted that while funding was required to run legacy programmes, it was hard to obtain after the Games, thereby highlighting the importance of securing dedicated budgets for legacy initiatives upfront.
- Time limitations on funding availability was also an issue, as a long-term volunteer legacy would require recurrent funding.

- Quantifying the value of Olympic volunteer programmes would help to convince governments to provide legacy funding.

Structures and delivery mechanisms
- The temporary nature of OCOGs restricts their capacity to delivery legacies. It is also not the responsibility of OCOGs to deliver event legacies.
- The two key alternatives suggested for managing volunteer legacies were government and a separate, independent organisation set up specifically to manage volunteer legacy, working in tandem with the OCOG.
- The organisation that managed volunteer legacy would have to work closely with existing volunteer organisations and make use of the existing volunteering infrastructure.
- The delivery mechanisms to facilitate volunteer legacy were absent immediately post-Games.
- In Sydney, the privacy laws of the time prevented volunteers' contact information (gained at application stage) from being disseminated to volunteer organisations.
- LOCOG delayed making a decision about what to do with volunteers' contact information, thereby delaying also any follow-up with volunteers.
- In both cases, the need to follow up quickly post-Games was imperative to capitalise on the goodwill that resulted from the Games time volunteering programmes.

Strategy
- For both London and Sydney, the earlier the volunteer legacy was factored into the planning process, the more benefits could be realised. It was suggested that bid cities need to think about their volunteer legacy prior to bidding, and incorporate the volunteer legacy within the bid document.
- The articulation of any legacies should be clear and transparent, with specific and measurable targets set so that progress can be monitored.
- Any organisation set up to manage volunteer legacy should be held to account for those legacy objectives and add value to the existing volunteer landscape (i.e., not duplicate existing resources).

Knowledge transfer
- The official mechanisms for knowledge transfer, whilst initiated by Sydney and in place for London, were not clear and transparent.
- Knowledge transfer was seen as important not just for the next Olympic Games, but also in terms of cities' bidding for future major sporting events.
- Additional forms of knowledge transfer aside from OCOG to OCOG transmission, included host city administration to host city administration and volunteering sector to volunteering sector streams, recognising that Games time lessons were not confined to the domain of OCOGs.
- However, wholesale knowledge transfer without taking into account local context was recognised as being counter-productive.
- The existing culture of volunteering in host cities and host nations must also be taken into account when planning volunteer legacy programmes.

Recommendations for Olympic Host Cities

Resources
Host cities should:
1. Provide dedicated budgets for volunteer legacy efforts. Sources could include ring-fenced funding from the OCOG budget, sale of assets, and sponsorship.
2. Any funding needs to be ongoing to support longer-term legacy projects.
3. Value and renumerate the expertise of voluntary sector contributions to Games planning processes as having similar importance to that of commercial consultants.
4. Educate OCOG staff on good practice in volunteer management and how to effectively engage with volunteers and the volunteering sector.

Structures and delivery mechanisms
Host cities should:
5. Ensure that effective structures (new or existing) are in place from the pre-planning stage of the Games to ensure that a volunteer legacy is delivered.
6. Establish responsibility for delivering the volunteer legacy, both in terms of infrastructure and human capital.
7. Develop partnerships and dialogue with existing volunteer infrastructure organisations such as peak bodies.
8. Establish a mechanism for legacy planning input from the existing volunteer sector.
9. Ensure that legacy plans will involve Games time volunteers and those inspired to volunteer after the Games, and are not solely focused on the sport and event sectors.
10. Develop appropriate technological support to facilitate the volunteer legacy.
11. Establish ownership and post-event use of the volunteer database, including ensuring the Games volunteer database has been appropriately compiled with necessary permissions from individual volunteers for use by legacy bodies.

Strategy
Host cities should:
12. Develop a vision of the post-Games volunteer legacy and embed this within the bid document.
13. Use the sustainable event legacy timeline (Table) to embed volunteer legacy throughout the event phases
14. Establish a body with specific responsibility for legacy planning and delivery, to work alongside the OCOG.

Knowledge transfer
Host cities should:
15. Establish processes for volunteering knowledge transfer between OCOGs, other major event organising committees from the host city and country, and the wider volunteering sector.

Recommendations for the IOC
Resources
The IOC should:
16. Require that candidate cities provide evidence of a ring-fenced legacy budget.

17. Invest in effective resourcing of volunteer legacy programmes.
18. Recognise the value of quantifying the volunteer contribution to the Olympic Games in terms of measuring the outcomes of the volunteer programme.

Structures and delivery mechanisms
The IOC should:
19. Undertake additional research to examine and critique the distinction between the OCOG's role in delivering the Games as opposed to legacy planning.
20. Clarify whether a host country's privacy laws will permit legacy planning involving the volunteer database.

Strategy
The IOC should:
21. Require that candidate cities outline their volunteer legacy plans in their bid document.
22. Ensure that these legacy plans have measurable targets and tangible legacy outcomes.
23. Encourage official sponsors to contribute to Olympic Games legacies as a form of Corporate Social Responsibility.

Knowledge transfer
The IOC should:
24. Ensure that the knowledge transfer programmes are applied cognisant of the volunteering culture in each host city.
25. Ensure that knowledge transfer agreements between host cities do not prevent knowledge transfer between the OCOG and the wider volunteering sector in the host city and country.
26. Develop resources to be used as an introduction to volunteering when starting an OCOG and to help guide future host cities on their 'volunteering journey'.

1   INTRODUCTION

Volunteers are rightly lauded as an essential element of the modern Olympics. In their Closing Ceremony speeches both the IOC President and Chair of the local Organising Committee for the Olympic Games typically celebrate the contribution of volunteers to delivering the Games and embodying the Olympic Spirit. At Sydney 2000, IOC President Juan Antonio Samaranch expressed his gratitude to "the most dedicated and wonderful volunteers ever" (Nixon, 2000, p. 5). In London, 12 years later, IOC President Jacques Rogge similarly paid tribute, "we will never forget the smiles, the kindness and the support of the wonderful volunteers, the much-needed heroes of these Games" (IOC, 2012a) and Sir Sebastian Coe, Chair of LOCOG, echoing the importance of the "thousands of volunteers [who] now have the right to carry the phrase 'I made London 2012' with them as a badge of honour" (Furness, 2012).

However, what happens after the Olympic Games leave town? How far can the enormous Olympic volunteer programme lead to ongoing benefits for the host community and ongoing volunteer-involving organisations? The enormous prestige, work and expense involved in hosting a Winter or Summer Olympic Games has led the IOC to establish the Olympic Games Impact (OGI) study – a process that measures the economic, social and environmental impact of hosting a Games on the host city and country. This concern has been mirrored by requesting host cities to detail their legacy plans in their bid document.

In the modern era, volunteers make an integral contribution to the operations and ultimate success of the Olympic Games (de Moragas, Moreno & Paniagua, 1999). Volunteering is interwoven into all stages of the Games event cycle. Innovative initiatives aimed at increasing sports and volunteer participation feature prominently in the bid books of prospective host cities. The call for Games time volunteers is a major milestone in pre-Games planning, with the volunteer programme often massively over-subscribed (Holmes & Smith, 2009; Lockstone & Baum, 2009). Post-event, volunteers are publicly acknowledged for their contribution and encouraged to continue their volunteering efforts locally as a social legacy of the Games (IOC, 2012b).

1.1   Project subject and objectives

The project aims to examine how Olympic and Paralympic Games' have transformed volunteering within host cities. It seeks to identify how Olympic volunteer programmes can lead to post-Games volunteer legacies for host cities. In particular, the project explores the extent to which there is engagement with the established **volunteering infrastructure** of a host city in order to achieve positive legacy outcomes. Volunteering infrastructure being the organisations and programmes in place to promote, support and manage volunteering; this can include volunteering peak bodies, volunteer resource centres, national governing bodies of sport, community organisations and local government. Individually and collectively these organisations have networks and expertise in volunteerism. Much of this volunteering infrastructure will exist before the Olympic event, and may be involved in the bidding process and build-up to the Games, supporting the delivery of a successful Olympic volunteer programme and event. Further volunteering

infrastructure may be created as a direct or indirect result of hosting the Games. In both cases, the volunteering infrastructure remains after the local Organising Committee for the Olympic Games (OCOG) has been disbanded. These infrastructure bodies may therefore facilitate a positive post-event legacy in terms of supporting ongoing volunteering long after the OCOG has ceased to exist.

The overarching objectives of the study are to identify:

    a) To examine how far can an Olympic volunteer programme lead to a sustained positive legacy of longer-term volunteer participation in the host city.
    b) To evaluate how the relationship between the volunteer programme and the host city's volunteer infrastructure facilitates realisation of this desired legacy.

Furthermore, the study seeks to contribute new knowledge to IOC priority research field 3:

> Key factors in the engagement of the host city and country governing bodies and population to contribute to the success of the Olympic Games and a sustainable positive legacy.

This research priority recognises that legacy delivery is not in fact under the mandate of OCOG's to deliver upon but that they must engage "with a myriad of partners and local stakeholders in order to deliver and host the Games, while leaving a lasting legacy" (IOC, 2013a, p. 5).

The study objectives are addressed using two comparative case studies: the recent case of London 2012 and the longer-term case of Sydney 2000. The study draws on the opinions of key informants from the organising bodies alongside stakeholders comprising the volunteering infrastructure of the host city, including volunteering peak bodies, volunteer resource centres, sporting governing bodies, community organisations and local governments. Their views on the positive and negative impacts of the Games on volunteering post-event are examined, in addition to the roles of the various stakeholders in planning and delivering the Games volunteer legacy. Recommendations are made regarding how the OCOG and host city stakeholders can better engage to ensure an effective and sustainable volunteer legacy, and how the IOC can support this.

1.2   Literature review

The literature on event volunteering has burgeoned in recent years, with most attention afforded to sporting and mega events, including the Olympic Games. Dominant themes have been event volunteer profiles, motivations and expectations (e.g., Farrell, Johnston & Twynam, 1998; Strigas & Jackson Jr, 2003; Twynam, Farrell & Johnston, 2002/03); volunteer experiences and satisfaction (e.g., Farrell et al., 1998); aspects of volunteer commitment (e.g., Cuskelly, Auld, Harrington & Coleman, 2004; Elstad, 2003; Green & Chalip, 2004) and event volunteering trends and management issues (e.g., Coyne & Coyne Sr, 2001; Smith & Lockstone, 2009).

Research on Olympic volunteers has predominately focused on their motivations (e.g. Bang, Alexandris & Ross, 2009; Dickson, Benson, Blackman & Terwiel, 2013;

Dickson, Benson & Terwiel, 2014; Fairley, Kellett & Green, 2007; Giannoulakis, Wang & Gray, 2008; Reeser, Berg, Rhea & Wilick, 2005). These studies highlight that the Games experience itself and being associated with the Olympic movement are key motivating factors (Dickson et al., 2014; Giannoulakis et al., 2008). While this body of research is interested in the experiences of the volunteers, there is a paucity of research on the management of Olympic volunteer programmes (Lockstone & Baum, 2009) or volunteer legacies generated by the Olympic Games (Nichols & Ralston, 2015).

Research interest in volunteer legacies began with studies examining how to encourage event volunteers to 'bounceback' and volunteer again at the same event (Coyne & Coyne, 2001; Elstad, 2003). More recently, studies have examined how an event volunteer programme can lead on to future volunteering in the host city as part of a community or social legacy (Auld, Cuskelly & Harrington, 2009; Doherty, 2009). However, social legacies, including volunteering participation, have received less attention compared to more tangible legacy elements (e.g., infrastructure development) and there have been few long-term post-event legacy studies (Dickson, Benson & Blackman, 2011).

An emerging research theme is the legacy potential for volunteering to produce broader social inclusion outcomes. Minneart (2012) examined the non-infrastructural impacts on socially excluded groups of seven Summer and Winter Olympic Games spanning from Atlanta 1996 through to Beijing 2008. She found that Sydney 2000 was the only Games in her sample to engender a legacy for socially excluded groups, however, it was a limited one. In terms of skills and volunteering outcomes, Sydney's initiatives were judged to "have brought opportunities for some" but to have been "mainly situated at the 'easier end' of the citizen participation ladder" (p. 368). Prospectively examining the legacy potential of the London 2012 Games for promoting social inclusion through volunteering, Nichols and Ralston (2011) drew lessons from the Manchester Event Volunteers (MEV) scheme. Interviewing participants from this long standing and widely acknowledged legacy initiative of the 2002 Manchester Commonwealth Games (Smith & Fox, 2007), Nichols and Ralston note that whilst there was a legacy of enhanced volunteer employability, they caution against narrowing the social inclusion agenda to solely focus on this aspect. Instead, Nichols and Ralston (2011) highlight the overall volunteer experience, and its associated opportunities to build social contacts, promote a positive sense of self-worth and provide opportunities to give back, as enhancing social inclusion.

In non-Olympic contexts, Nichols and Ralston (2012) also note interest in volunteers' post-event volunteering intentions (e.g., Doherty, 2009; Downward & Ralston 2006). Volunteering at a major event can result in a strong intention to volunteer at another event and within the community more generally. While these studies have some limitations (Nichols & Ralston, 2012), not least their measurement of intended rather than actual volunteering behaviour, they suggest that good volunteering experiences at an event may enhance positive legacy outcomes.

The aforementioned studies focus on the official Olympic or other event volunteer programmes, and are largely silent on the relationships between the event organisers and the wider volunteering infrastructure in the host location. However,

Benson, Dickson, Terwiel and Blackman's recent study (2014) did highlight the importance of a more proactive relationship between the OCOG and community groups in terms of planning for a legacy of host city volunteering. Whilst specifically focused on volunteer training as a legacy opportunity for the Vancouver 2010 Olympic and Paralympic Winter Games, Benson et al. suggest "that had there been more communication about planning for legacy before the Games between VANOC and the community groups represented…then the volunteer legacy potential may have been greater" (2014, p. 219).

The current study advances the extant research taking an holistic view of the totality of the volunteering infrastructure involved in facilitating a positive and sustainable volunteer legacy post-Games. Additionally, building on Benson et al.'s (2014) study, which conducted a workshop with community groups six months post-Games, by using two case studies of the Sydney 2000 and London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games, the current study provides an extended retrospective view on volunteer legacy in these host cities. This will be a vitally important contribution as post-event legacies are rarely evaluated over an extended period of time (Dickson et al., 2011).

1.3   The academic significance of the research project and its impact on the priority fields of research

While more recent Olympic Games have recognised the value of creating post-event volunteering to facilitate a social capital legacy (Dickson et al., 2011), there are limited studies that evaluate the social as opposed to tangible legacies of mega events. Only a few studies have focused on the post-event impacts of Olympic volunteering and sports event volunteering more generally. These almost exclusively focus on the perspective of the volunteers within the official programme. This exposes two gaps in knowledge. First, it fails to address the importance of host cities having the necessary volunteering infrastructure in place to facilitate a viable legacy for ongoing volunteering post-event. Understanding the relationships between the OCOG and community groups could contribute to enhanced legacy outcomes (Benson et al. 2014). Second, focusing on those involved in the Games volunteer programme and their subsequent volunteering, or at least volunteering intentions, fails to capture more ambitious legacy goals regarding enhanced volunteer participation across society more generally.

Planning for positive and sustainable Olympic legacies should take place before the event, involving "all important stakeholders who will be affected by – and benefit" (Ritchie, 2000, p. 160). The IOC acknowledge the importance of doing so in noting that "positive legacy does not simply happen by itself. It needs to be planned and embedded in the host city's vision from the earliest possible stage" and that "delivering legacy also requires strong partnerships between city leaders, the Games organisers, regional and national authorities, local communities" (IOC, 2012a, p. 58). There are suggestions however that this level of stakeholder engagement does not always occur (Minneart, 2012), and the lack of an organisation mandated with sustaining post-Games legacies in light of the disbanding of the OCOG may be a significant factor (Benson et al., 2014; Dickson et al., 2011; Nichols & Ralston, 2012).

By examining the post-Games volunteer legacies of two events, Sydney 2000 and London 2012, this study critically questions how far the Olympic Games lead to a sustained positive legacy of volunteering participation in the host city. By engaging with key representatives from the organising teams, as well as those within the wider host city (in sport, events, government, and the volunteering sectors), a more complex picture is provided of how volunteer legacies can be more effectively realised. The successes of the volunteer programmes in event delivery can be evaluated alongside the nature of the relationships between the OCOG and the volunteering infrastructure in the pre- and post-event periods.

The study contributes new knowledge as to how host cities can effectively plan for and put into practice the promotion of increased volunteer participation as a social legacy of the Games. It also supplements the limited number of studies that explore the OCOG – stakeholder nexus in terms of how and to what extent OCOG's engage with relevant stakeholders in order to leave lasting legacies, in this case, in respect of volunteering. Additionally, given post-event legacies are rarely evaluated over an extended time period (Dickson et al., 2011), with most studies measuring volunteering intentions in the immediate aftermath of the event (Doherty, 2009), the comparison of two cases, one in recent history, the other more distant, offers unique insights as to how the delivery of Olympic legacies has changed over time and in light of the pre- and post-legacy era.

2 CASE STUDIES: SECONDARY ANALYSIS

This section uses secondary data (e.g., OCOG and government reports, media articles, academic studies) to outline Sydney 2000 and then London 2012's volunteer programmes, their volunteer legacy planning, and the legacies associated with each event. The two case studies are then briefly compared. This provides a context to the discussion of the results in Section 4.

2.1 Sydney 2000

An introduction to the Games
Sydney was awarded the Games of the XXVII Olympiad on the 24th September 1993. The Sydney Olympic Games were held over 17 days from 15th September to the 1st October 2000 and featured 300 events across 28 sports (IOC, n.d.-a). The Sydney Organising Committee for the Olympic Games was known as SOCOG.

Positioning of legacy in relation to the bid and planning
Legacy was not a feature of Olympic bids in the early 1990s; not one of the 23 themes contained in the *Manual for Cities Bidding for the Olympic Games* (IOC, 1992) related to legacy. As such, there was no requirement for the Sydney 2000 bid to plan for a legacy. As Cashman states (2006, p. 19):

> "In terms of stated promises, it is interesting to note that Sydney's three-volume 1993 bid books, which advanced Sydney's case to stage the 2000 Games, were a product of their time. They elaborated Sydney's case for the Games, providing detailed plans for the staging of each sport, but they included little material on post-Games impacts and issues such as sustainability and long-term community benefits."

Cashman (2006) also notes that the Olympic Games Global Impact (OGGI) framework had not been developed by the 2000 Games (now called the Olympic Games Impact Study – OGI), so there was no OGGI analysis or official post-Games evaluation of legacy.

Positioning of volunteer legacy in relation to the bid and planning
While legacy was neither a requirement or focus, the official evaluation report of the Sydney Olympic Games does mention legacy several times, primarily in relation to the venues and sporting facilities. A volunteer legacy is mentioned only once, with the report stating that "…the Olympic Games will have a positive and long-lasting impact on the volunteer movement in Australia. Many people were volunteering for the first time, and it is hoped that many will continue to be involved in volunteering" (SOCOG, 2001a, p. 202). This suggests that there was no specific planning for a volunteer legacy after the event. Rather it was expected that the Games volunteers themselves would create a legacy independently by continuing to volunteer elsewhere. David Brettell (who was Manager of Volunteers and Venue Staffing at SOCOG), retrospectively noted that many of the paid staff working for SOCOG had a negative view of volunteers and needed to be educated about volunteering and what volunteers could do (Brettell, 1999) and this may have affected their ability to consider volunteers as part of any legacy planning.

Overview of the volunteer programme

The volunteer programme – GamesForce 2000 - was essential to the Sydney Olympic Games. There is some inconsistency regarding the number of volunteers at the Games, although figures are generally between 43,000 and 47,000, with the IOC (n.d.-a) stating 46,967 volunteers. Brettell (2001) is quoted saying that 62,000 people were 'touched' by the Olympic volunteer experience and this figure is mentioned elsewhere (Webb, 2001). This larger figure likely includes both Olympic and Paralympic volunteers, however the Paralympic volunteers or programme are rarely explicitly mentioned in the secondary sources on the volunteers. An exception is Darcy (2001) who argues that the Paralympic Games took a back seat to the Olympic Games in terms of organising the volunteer programme, which was a missed opportunity to engage with disability groups in the voluntary sector. In addition, disability groups experienced a drain on their volunteers as they chose to volunteer for the Olympic and Paralympic Games (Darcy, 2001). Others have also noted a displacement effect more broadly within community organisations (Lenskyi, 2002) which struggled to compete with the once-in-a-lifetime opportunity and incentives being offered to potential Olympic volunteers.

Within the volunteer programme, there were a group of 500 core volunteers – the Pioneer Volunteers – and then a mix of generalist and specialist volunteers. The profile of GamesForce volunteers was noted to be different from the typical public perception of volunteers as older, retired people (Flick, Bittman & Doyle, 2002) and this may have contributed to a more positive and diverse public image of volunteering. The volunteers at the Sydney Olympics were feted and, at the volunteer's parade at the end of the event, 100,000 people came to celebrate their contribution to the Games.

Recruitment and training processes

A pyramid approach to volunteer recruitment was used at Sydney, with recruitment and training taking places in stages. First, the Pioneer Volunteers were recruited between November 1996 and mid-1997. This core group of 500 volunteers assisted with early events, including Sydney's Royal Easter Show alongside test events. Pioneer volunteers also supported recruitment for the main body of GamesForce volunteers by giving talks to various community groups (SOCOG, 2001a).

Recruitment for specialist volunteers began in September 1997. This phase targeted organisations that could commit to providing a specific number of specialists including sporting federations, tertiary institutions, language schools, and voluntary organisations including St John Ambulance, the Australian Medical Association, Surf Life Saving clubs, and the Rural Fire Service (RFS). An information session was held for organisational representatives, allowing SOCOG to build up important relationships.

A community launch – a general call for individual generalist volunteers – took place on 9th October 1998. Information sessions were held in each Australian state capital city and larger regional cities outlining the volunteer roles available and the required commitment. A volunteer supplement was published in newspapers in New South Wales and Victoria; this gave detailed information on the roles and how to apply. Volunteers were recruited from across Australia (and some from overseas), although most came from the host state, New South Wales (SOCOG, 2001a).

Students were also targeted in recruitment and were involved in various ways as volunteers. 6,000 students were recruited from universities in New South Wales, and assigned roles that were mostly related to their study programme. For example, the volunteer recruitment interviews were conducted by Human Resource Management students from University of Technology Sydney, University of Western Sydney and TAFE NSW. These students enrolled on a newly created course which included a practical component of interviewing volunteers for the GamesForce Volunteer programme (Lynch, cited in Cashman & Toohey, 2002). Many other student volunteers received credit from their volunteering towards their study programme.

All training was conducted by TAFE NSW, a further education training provider. The Olympic and Paralympic Games volunteers were both trained together for the first time. For job-specific training, TAFE NSW developed 1300 modules, which were used in conjunction with job specific training videos. Additional leadership training was provided for team leaders and supervisors (SOCOG, 2001a).

Other associated volunteering programmes
As well as the SOCOG's GamesForce volunteers, the Olympic Roads and Transport Authority (ORTA) also undertook a managed volunteer programme, with specific recruitment drives (SOCOG, 2001). However, the focus in the secondary sources is on the Sydney Games volunteers and the legacies associated with the GamesForce programme.

Stakeholder engagement in volunteer programme and volunteer legacy planning
Planning for a volunteer legacy was not a requirement of the candidature process for the 2000 Games. The focus of SOCOG was ultimately on recruiting and delivering the volunteer programme at the event. Nevertheless, in the years leading up to the Games, SOCOG put time and effort into building relationships with community groups, sporting organisations, tertiary institutions, sponsors and corporates, community service groups, other volunteer associations and government agencies (Lynch, cited in Cashman & Toohey, 2002). However, this was to assist with volunteer recruitment for the event, rather than with legacy planning. For example, Brettell (1999) states that SOCOG formed partnerships with key stakeholders who could assist in providing volunteers with the specialist skills needed for the event, such as tertiary institutions and National and State Sports Federations. However, Cashman (2006) also noted claims that local councils were locked out of Games planning process, which may have hindered efforts by these councils to use the event for legacy planning in their areas.

As part of this engagement, SOCOG established a Volunteer 2000 Advisory Committee in November 1997, which included stakeholders from voluntary groups including Rotary, the Lions Club, the YWCA, YMCA and the RFS among others. This group met every three to four months and disbanded shortly after the conclusion of the Games. Hollway (1997), CEO of SOCOG, discussed the role of the Volunteer Advisory Group and its importance in connecting and reaching out to the community.

Volunteer legacies associated with the Games

The official evaluation report of the Sydney Olympic Games lists the importance of the volunteers in delivering the Games (SOCOG, 2001a). However, what volunteer legacies have emerged since the event that were either planned or unplanned?

The Spirit of Sydney volunteer group
While there was no official alumni group for the Sydney Olympic volunteers, volunteers themselves founded the Spirit of Sydney volunteer group. Cashman comments that "volunteers were the one Games group committed to 'keeping the [Games] spirit alive'" (2006, p. 38). This group have held reunions, regular get-togethers and are serial volunteers. Volunteering NSW has supported this group, and while the Spirit of Sydney website no longer appears to be as active, at one stage it was used to advertise other volunteer opportunities. The alumni were able to come together as part of the volunteer's reunion for the 2010 Sydney Olympic Games anniversary celebrations.

The Sydney Royal Easter Show
The annual Sydney Royal Easter Show volunteer programme was started in the lead up to the Olympics using Pioneer Volunteers. It was part of the pre-Olympic training of these volunteers. Pioneer volunteers continue to support the event (SRES, 2016), with many of the 400 Royal Easter Show volunteers being former Olympic volunteers.

TAFE NSW's volunteer training package
In a 1998 meeting the Volunteer Advisory Committee members suggested that the training programmes could form a legacy for future volunteering after the Games and recommended that SOCOG document the recruitment and training process (Volunteers 2000 Advisory Committee, 1998). TAFE NSW, a further education training provider, developed the volunteer training package specifically for the Sydney Games. It has since been used at other mega events as part of a knowledge transfer programme. Immediately following the 2000 Olympic Games, TAFE GLOBAL signed a commercial contract with the Athens Olympic Committee drawing on the experience gained by TAFE NSW in Olympic and Paralympic training. The contract stipulated that TAFE NSW would pass on its expertise to Athens in volunteer orientation, job-specific training, venue training and management training, including customer service and event leadership. In addition, four representatives from TAFE NSW spent eight months in Athens to develop the Master Plan and Action Plan for the training of volunteers for the 2004 Athens Olympic Games. Since 2004, TAFE NSW has also designed and delivered training materials for the 2006 Asian Games in Doha, the 2008 Beijing Olympics and the 2010 Shanghai World Expo (Australian Trade Commission, n.d.).

The Sydney Major Event Volunteer Pool (SMEVP)
In early 2001, a working group led up Sandy Hollway (SOCOG CEO) proposed the establishment of a Major Events Volunteer Pool (Hollway, 2001). It was expected that in supporting major events, the Pool would be drawn from "proven Olympic and Paralympic volunteers" though not restricted to those with Olympic experience. Initially it was proposed to use the volunteer database to recruit volunteers to the Pool, which would be managed by Volunteering NSW and "used in the marketing of Sydney/NSW as a place for the hosting of major events".

During 2001/2002, Volunteering NSW pilot tested the SMEVP, at its own cost at a number of major events and community events. A business case was later developed for the SMEVP in October 2002 (Volunteering NSW, 2002), which noted "since Volunteers 2000 [the Sydney Olympic Volunteer Programme], Volunteering NSW has experienced unprecedented demand from both event organisers and volunteers for an on-ongoing service of this type" (p.3). Subsequently, Volunteering NSW obtained seed funding from the NSW State Government of $93,000 over two years to operate the SMEVP.

There is secondary evidence that the SMEVP, later rebadged as 'EventCorps', operated until 2004, with no subsequent mention of the programme in the archives of Volunteering NSW (now The Centre for Volunteering NSW). During this period, the initiative assisted a number of major and community events including: *Special Olympics Swimming, Masters Swimming Championships, Centenary of Federation – Australia Day, The Royal Easter Show, AFL Games and New Year's Eve* (Volunteering NSW, n.d.). Interestingly, the SMEVP appears to pre-date the much lauded Manchester Event Volunteers model (Nichols & Ralston, 2011), seen as a successful legacy of the 2002 Manchester Commonwealth Games.

Promotion of volunteering more generally
The Sydney Olympics were followed in 2001 by the International Year of Volunteering (IYV). Combined, this supported overall promotion of volunteering in NSW and Australia. Brettell (2001) described the Olympics and Paralympics as a perfect springboard for the volunteering movement in Australia. This volunteer legacy included an increased profile of volunteering in media and community, particularly event volunteers; having more trained volunteers; introducing new cohorts to volunteering; the Volunteer Advisory Committee and its connections to the leaders of community and volunteering organisations; partnerships with university and student volunteers; and corporate volunteering (Brettell, 2001). However, the rhetoric from SOCOG was about promoting volunteering in sports organisations and events. It is debatable how far this promotion led to ongoing volunteering more generally. In 2006, Volunteering Australia, Australia's peak body for promoting volunteering, reported that the health of volunteer participation was a direct legacy of the Sydney Olympic Games, although the Australian Bureau of Statistics only reported a slight increase of 2% in sport volunteering from 2000 to 2006 (ABS, 2006).

A post-Games study of the impacts of the Sydney 2000 Olympic Games on volunteering in Australia supported the efforts to promote further volunteering. According to report by the Australian Sports Commission (2002, cited in Yu, 2004, p. 42), the hosting of the Games affected volunteering in Australia in a number of ways:
- "increasing the number of people volunteering;
- changing the image of volunteering to one that was fun and acceptable;
- increasing the number of organisations utilising volunteers; and
- increasing the number of volunteers utilised by organizations which had used volunteers prior to the Games."

Corporate volunteering
Corporate volunteering in Australia has grown significantly since the 2000 Games. Part of this growth could be linked to both the large proportion of corporate

volunteers involved in the Sydney Games, alongside the increased profile that corporate volunteering received. Brettell (2001) commented that he saw the future of volunteering within the corporate sector.

Delivering the volunteer legacy

The challenge of the Sydney Olympic Games - as with other Games – is that the organising committee quickly disbanded after the event. Nevertheless, SOCOG reported they had taken action to promote further volunteering after the Games; for example, contacting all volunteers and encouraging them to continue their efforts. Volunteers were also given contact details and information related to volunteer associations in their states/territories (SOCOG, 2001a). However, it was left to the individual volunteers to act and there was no further follow up, nor any specific organisation given responsibility for doing so. Complicating matters further, not all volunteers were captured in the volunteer database. Last minute requirements for additional volunteers meant that the recruitment and training process had to be fast-tracked (SOCOG, 2001a). Volunteers reported that they were emailed by SOCOG a couple of times after the Games, but there was no further follow up (Hodgetts, 2010).

Importantly, Brendan Lynch, SOCOG Programme Manager for Volunteer Recruitment, states the importance in hindsight of having a post-Games plan for the volunteers' database (Lynch, cited in Cashman & Toohey, 2002).

A potentially significant factor with the Sydney Olympic Games was that the 2001 was the designated United Nations International Year of Volunteers (IYV). Sandy Hollway, who had been CEO of SOCOG, led the IYV activities in New South Wales so this could be viewed as a direct volunteer legacy from the Sydney Games. However, the actual impact of the Sydney Games on the numbers of volunteers was inconclusive as the Australian Government's (2002) IYV evaluation reported both an increase in people seeking to volunteer post-Olympics and a decrease to pre-Olympic levels of volunteering. Focus groups conducted with both volunteers and non-volunteers from the Australian population showed that one-off Olympic volunteering was very different to ongoing community volunteering (Flick et al, 2002). Lynch (2005) also reported that a few years after the Sydney Games, there was no evidence of a wider volunteer legacy in Australia. He notes that volunteer organisations generally face a number of structural problems in recruiting volunteers, including the need for insurance and also poor funding (Lynch, 2005).

The NSW Government and Volunteering NSW showed some ownership of legacy, organising a series of fora for the launch of IYV, with one of these focused on what could be learnt from the Games. There were plans to establish a volunteer skillsbank at Volunteering NSW and, at the time, the Premier reported that they would be writing to all Games volunteers to ask them to register as part of this skillsbank. However, it is not clear if this happened. In addition, the Minutes of the Volunteer Advisory Committee notes that the NSW Government was in the process of facilitating a project to further progress volunteering and to determine the role of government in relation to this (Volunteers 2000 Advisory Committee minutes, 1998). The project was reported to be driven in conjunction with Volunteering NSW and the CEO of Volunteering NSW, Marie Fox commented that this initiative was partly an outcome of the Games.

The volunteer training programme and associated benefits for volunteers have been cited as a legacy of the Games (English, 2000). It was reported that the training had been shared with schools and libraries and university students were using the Games in their study programmes. David Riordan, Director of TAFE NSW followed on from this, stating that TAFE NSW wanted to share their experience with the voluntary sector over the next two years (Riordan, 2000). He also outlined how people could benefit from the training and experience of Olympic volunteers but that all depended on them making the move, i.e., local communities could recruit these volunteers but no advice was provided on how they could do this. There is no secondary information on how either this sharing of training or how local communities engaged subsequently with the Sydney 2000 volunteers.

Summary: Secondary analysis of Sydney 2000 and the volunteer legacy
The secondary data show that legacy planning was not a remit for the Sydney Games. However, SOCOG's engagement with the voluntary sector through their Volunteer Advisory Committee did enable volunteer organisations to become involved in planning the GamesForce 2000 programme, which led onto legacy initiatives. Key staff at volunteer organisations knew about innovations developed by SOCOG such as the comprehensive training package and were well-placed to capitalise on these innovations post-event. While the Sydney Games were a boost to volunteering in NSW and Australia, this was reinforced by IYV taking place the following year as interest and support for volunteering could be leveraged for the wider community sector.

2.2   London 2012

An Introduction to the London 2012 Games
London officially launched its bid for the 2012 Olympic Games in June 2003. The candidature file was submitted to the IOC on 15th November 2004 and the awarding of the 2012 Games to London was determined at the 117th IOC Session in Singapore on 6th July 2005 (LOCOG, 2013a). The hosting of the Games was over the 16 days spanning July 27th – August 12th 2012 and featured 302 events across 26 sports and 34 venues (IOC, n.d.-a). The London Organising Committee for the Olympic and Paralympic Games was known as LOCOG.

Positioning of Legacy in Relation to the Bid and Planning
Legacy was integral to the London 2012 bid (Scott, 2014). The 'Olympic Games Concept and Legacy' was 'Theme 1' of the 2012 Candidature Procedure and Questionnaire, where the bid addressed visions of legacy for the host city and region and detailed how Games hosting would complement the city's long-term planning strategy (IOC, 2004). As planning progressed, the UK Government articulated its legacy focus on making the UK a leading sporting nation; transforming East London, inspiring young people; establishing Olympic Park as a blueprint for sustainable living; and demonstrating the inclusiveness and visitability of London for residents and visitors alike (Department of Culture, Media and Sport, 2008). Subsequent legacy plans, following a change of Government in 2010, focused on the promotion of sport participation; economic growth; promotion of community engagement and participation; and urban regeneration (DCMS, 2010). Given the government focus on sport, it was not surprising that sport volunteering featured significantly as 2012 approached, with the suggestion that the Games would inspire people to make sport

happen at the local level, embedding the Olympic and Paralympic values in grassroots sport. Alongside Government and LOCOG, in January 2008, the Mayor of London's legacy commitments were published. These were to increase opportunities for involvement in sport; ensure benefits from new jobs, businesses and volunteering opportunities; transform the heart of east London; deliver a sustainable Games and develop sustainable communities; and showcase London as a diverse, creative and welcoming city (LOCOG, 2011).

Positioning of volunteer legacy in relation to the bid and planning
Volunteering was not explicitly referred to in Theme 1, legacy plans, of London's candidature file. Whilst a legacy for sport, the community, the environment and the economy were articulated, reference to volunteering in support of these efforts was not mentioned (London 2012 Ltd., 2004a). Nevertheless, London's pre-bid collateral did declare that "a London Olympic and Paralympic Games in 2012 would need volunteers; from greeting our international visitors to stewarding events, there would be an opportunity for everyone to become involved" (London 2012 Ltd., 2004b, p. 11). Specific references to volunteering emerged later, and LOCOG progress reports indicated that the Games would shape "a new culture of volunteering across the UK" (LOCOG, 2012b, p. 34). Nick Clegg, the Deputy Prime Minister was quoted as saying "the Games has long depended on the dedication of volunteers. At London 2012, we're looking not only to celebrate this Olympic spirit, but use it to get more people volunteering in future", (DCMS, 2012, p. 51).

Pre-Games policy documents and commissioned reports also highlighted the importance of "harnessing the volunteer programme alongside employment initiatives to enable local people (particularly hard-to-reach groups) to get involved in the Games, with a view to creating sustainable skills and employment in the long-term" (Experian, 2006, p. 3; see also DCMS, 2007). It was suggested that akin to the Manchester 2002 Commonwealth Games model (Nichols & Ralston, 2012), volunteers could serve 'Olympic apprenticeships' at local clubs, groups and societies in the run-up to the Games, "giving volunteers valuable practical experience as well as helping meet volunteering shortfalls" (Experian, 2006, p. 150).

Overview of the volunteer programme
The official commemorative book records that 70,000 volunteers - named Games Makers – across the Olympic and Paralympic Games; these were selected from 250,000 applicants (LOCOG, 2012a). Jean Tomlin, Human Resources Director at LOCOG stated that "our 70,000 Games Makers play a critical role in one of the biggest workforces in the UK, and they will play a central role in delivering a successful London 2012 Games" (DCMS, 2012, p. 50). It was also suggested that 40% of applicants for Games Maker roles were inspired to volunteer for the first time (LOCOG, 2013b), although a survey of London Olympic volunteers found only 20% of respondents were volunteering for the first time (Dickson et al., 2014). In relation to Olympic and Paralympic Games firsts, LOCOG (2013b, p.137) indicated that their programmes had:

- "The largest number of volunteers ever recruited and they provided the first volunteer programme sponsor [McDonalds];

- That volunteer applicants were told which functional area they were being interviewed for at the invitation stage, thereby reducing attrition at the offer stage;
- It was the first time the volunteer programme had been delivered completely online (communications, invitations, schedules, and so on)".

Recruitment and training processes

Recruitment for the official LOCOG Games Maker programme began in late 2010. LOCOG aimed to minimise attrition by using recruitment to establish clear and realistic expectations of what was involved. There were approximately 350,000 expressions of interest received for the volunteer programme (LOCOG, 2013b). In practice, a two-phase approach to recruitment was adopted; focusing first on disabled groups and sport specialists, then the general public. National roadshows across the UK helped to promote the volunteer programme, and nine regional recruitment centres were established in order to interview applicants face-to-face. The House of Lords Select Committee, which reported on the Olympic legacy in 2013, recommended that the methods used to recruit and train volunteers for London 2012 should be applied more widely. They saw the Games having provided an impressive example of what can be done to inspire volunteers, suggesting "lessons learned from this process should be built upon to support future events" (House of Lords, 2013, p. 17).

From the official LOCOG report (2013b), it was suggested that the recruitment of a large volunteer workforce provided first-time experience of a working environment for many young people, at a time when work was hard to come by.

Other associated volunteering programmes

In addition to the Games Makers, there were a number of associated volunteering programmes. The largest was the Team London Ambassadors established by the Mayor of London (Harris, 2012). This saw 8,000 volunteers located at airports, station concourses and tourist centres to welcome visitors during the Games (DCMS, 2012). In order to create cohesion, the Team London Ambassador programme was brought under the LOCOG volunteering umbrella. Ambassadors were given the same basic training and an identity consistent with the London 2012 branding, thereby extending the volunteer programme into the wider public domain of London and its transport arteries (LOCOG, 2013b). Ambassador programmes were also replicated outside of London in areas hosting Olympic events, for example, the Weymouth and Portland Ambassadors programme.

The Olympic Delivery Authority (ODA) (2012) also makes reference to Transport for London's Travel Ambassadors (Harris, 2012) and National Rail Travel Champions. The ODA claimed the diversity of volunteers across the Games Maker and other programmes were one of the great success stories of the Games, with visitors and media from across the world commenting positively on their welcome and knowledge.

Much was also made in LOCOG's pre-Games collateral around the Personal Best programme as a means of offering the long-term unemployed a pathway to Games time volunteering (LOCOG, 2007a, 2007b). The programme offered opportunities for 500 long-term unemployed people via the Personal Best scheme, a Government-

funded initiative which provided training to get unemployed people up to the basic skill level required to apply for volunteering (LOCOG, 2013b).

Finally, there was also evidence of corporate volunteering, as indicated by LOCOG (2011) who highlighted that London 2012's marketing partners would play an important part in delivering the Games through employee engagement, for example, volunteering activities.

Stakeholder engagement in the volunteer programme and volunteer legacy planning

Legacy was a core objective for the UK Government and the Mayor of London and LOCOG (2009) made reference to the importance of working closely with stakeholders in planning and delivering the legacy ambitions. Prior to the Games, Prime Minister David Cameron proudly declared that "the strength of London 2012 lies in the collaboration we've seen across organisational and political boundaries, and I am grateful to all of the outstanding people who are pulling together to make the Games happen" (DCMS, 2012, p. 6). The volunteer programme was considered a key driver of LOCOG's community engagement activity around the Games.

The IOC's final report on the 2012 Games suggested that throughout its engagement initiatives, LOCOG successfully drew on the experience and expertise of various Games stakeholders, including corporate and public partners, which were able to expand the reach of these programmes (IOC, 2013b). The official Games report also stated that the Games Maker programme had not only "introduced many people to volunteering for the first time" but had also "engaged existing volunteer groups so that they could go on benefiting from this new enthusiasm" (LOCOG, 2013b, p. 21). However, research on the legacy planning for the London 2012 volunteer programme reveals that although there were early plans for a post-Games volunteer plan involving representatives from the voluntary sector, this had been abandoned by 2011, when the LOCOG's focus was entirely on delivery of the Games (Nichols & Ralston, 2015).

Volunteer legacies associated with the London 2012 Games

Post-event, the volunteer programme was celebrated as a key success of the Games, and volunteering has been a prominent feature in discussions of legacy. Significant initiatives are described here.

Join In

The Join In programme was the official legacy volunteering programme from the London Games. Launched in May 2012 it received £1.5 million from the Big Lottery Fund to encourage London 2012 volunteers[1] into longer-term volunteering with local sports clubs. In an excerpt from DCMS (2012, p.79), Sir Charles Allen, Chair of the Nations and Regions Group at LOCOG and subsequent Chair of Join In, advocated that the real legacy was about more than just a few weeks of celebration. He indicated that through the Join In programme, the aim was to "use the excitement and passion generated by the Games to help turn community engagement into a national pastime", and in doing so those volunteering at London 2012 would make a commitment to volunteer beyond 2012.

---

[1] The programme is now also open to non-Olympic volunteers.

Team London volunteering programmes
Team London's programmes have continued as a volunteer legacy of the 2012 Games. For example, the Mayor's Young Ambassador Programme reported that 1,000 schools had signed up to the scheme and they were on target to reach 2,500 schools by 2017. Building on the volunteer legacy of the 2012 Games, "the Young Ambassadors programme forms part of the wider work of the Mayor's Team London volunteering programme, which has seen almost 90,000 Londoners help out across the capital over the last three years" (Spirit of 2012, n.d.-a). According to a Greater London Authority (GLA) report (2016, p. 14), the programme had "reached over 300,000 young people, inspired over 74,000 people to volunteer, raised over £60,000 for local causes, worked in over 1,500 schools, and engaged over 80 adult volunteers to support the programme". Team London has progressively introduced new volunteering initiatives in addition its flagship Ambassador programme, to which volunteers contribute 15,000 hours per year in welcoming visitors to London (GLA, 2016). Overall, it has been suggested that Team London does not appear to have the same narrow focus of Join In on sports and event volunteering.

Spirit of 2012
An independent trust was established in 2013 with £47 million from the UK's Big Lottery fund to establish programmes that seek to capture the "…spirit that radiated from the London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games…" (Spirit of 2012, n.d.-b). These include volunteer programmes designed to attract new people to volunteering, particularly young people and disabled individuals, but also to support current volunteers. Spirit of 2012 provides financial support for the London Young Ambassadors programme discussed above.

European Volunteering Capital 2016
A recent tangible legacy outcome linked to the 2012 Games was London being named as *European Volunteering Capital 2016*, a bid led by Team London and Greater London Volunteering (GLV). Boris Johnson, then Mayor of London, identified that this "stands as proof of the volunteer legacy created by our own Olympic summer of four years ago" (Greater London Authority, 2016, p. 7), and "helps to inspire the next generation of volunteers, making the vital link between volunteering and paid work and connecting our 100,000 volunteers to over 1,600 small charities".

Sport and event volunteering across the UK
Whilst the wider reach of London 2012 legacy initiatives was questioned (Field, 2012; House of Lords, 2013), there is evidence of volunteer legacy programmes occurring across the UK with examples including:
- Up to March 2013, the Suffolk 2012 Volunteer Legacy Project "facilitated over 2,300 hours of volunteering at more than 80 sports and cultural events across Suffolk and undertaken 1,266 hours of training" (Suffolk County Council, 2013, p. 2). Additionally, 400 new Sports Makers logged at least 10 hours of volunteering during this period.
- Community Games, the Olympic and Paralympic legacy programme operated by the County Sports Partnership Network (CSPN) and the YMCA, aimed at encouraging communities to participate in sports and arts activities. Since 2012 more than 4,000 Community Games have taken place, involving 82,000 volunteers (Allum, 2014). Lee Mason, chief executive of the CSPN is quoted

as saying "the legacy is still going strong two years on thanks to the volunteers keeping the Olympic spark alive through Community Games" (South Yorkshire Sport, 2014).

- Organisers for the 2014 Commonwealth Games in Glasgow were also given access to the London volunteer programme to facilitate knowledge transfer between the two events (Nichols & Ralston, 2015).

Delivering the volunteer legacy

Secondary sources have provided multiple perspectives on how the volunteering and wider Games legacies have been delivered. In addition to LOCOG's official reports (2013a, 2013b), other government documents (e.g., DCMS, 2012) and the IOC's final report (2013a), the two houses of the British Parliament also issued reports in 2013: the House of Commons Committee of Public Accounts *Post-Games Review* and a report by the House of Lords Select Committee on Olympic and Paralympic Legacy. Legacy has also been evaluated by academic researchers, including Dickson et al. (2011); Nichols and Ralston (2011); Harris (2012); Nichols (2012); Dickson and Benson (2013); Benson et al. (2014); Dickson et al. (2014); and Nichols and Ralston (2015).

The early responsibility for Games legacy delivery rested with a variety of organisations, communities and individuals, including: LOCOG; the ODA; the British Olympic Association and British Paralympic Association; Sport England and UK Sport; the Mayor of London; the Olympic Park Legacy Company; the five host councils; local authorities across the UK; the Games' sponsors and other businesses; and many third sector organisations operating at national and local levels (DCMS, 2010). Whilst later the Cabinet Office was appointed with a view to coordinating and assuring delivery of the legacy as a whole, in 2013 the House of Lords Select Committee on Olympic and Paralympic Legacy said they were unconvinced that the Government's oversight arrangements represented a robust way to deliver the legacy. It was suggested that there was confusion on the timeframes and targets involved in its delivery and a lack of clear ownership, with their report recommending that one minister be given overall responsibility for legacy, working with the devolved administrations to ensure UK wide coordination (House of Lords, 2013). One area where this was evident was with regards to the volunteer legacy. In their evidence to the House of Lords Select Committee, the National Council for Voluntary Organisations (NCVO) highlighted the delay amongst government departments in outlining contributions towards volunteering and its legacy, and that too long was taken to resolve these issues.

Additional criticisms were also raised specifically in relation to the delivery of a volunteer legacy. The House of Commons Committee report on Public Accounts (2013) were keen to see the Government building on the success of the Games Maker volunteering programme, but were not convinced that all was being done to learn and disseminate lessons and to encourage volunteering opportunities both within sport and beyond. Their report observed that the Cabinet Office missed the opportunity to capitalise on the success of the volunteer programme. The report congratulated LOCOG for organising the volunteer programme effectively, and made reference to programmes to support local sports clubs and their effective use of volunteers. It also praised the work of the Join In Trust to encourage volunteering more widely. However, the Committee were not convinced that enough had been

done to build a lasting volunteer legacy, and recommended "the Cabinet Office should publish a strategy for how it will build a lasting volunteer legacy both within sport and beyond, including measures of success" (House of Commons, 2013, p. 5). These concerns were echoed in the House of Lords report: "there was a real opportunity to create a comprehensive and inclusive programme building on the great success of the Games Makers, London Ambassadors, local authority volunteers and others, but that opportunity has been lost" (House of Lords, 2013, p. 85). They indicated that planning for the volunteer legacy should have started much earlier. As such, any organisation that would be charged with carrying this forward should have been established well in advance of the Games, and whilst the work developed by the Join In programme was highly commendable, it "had begun too late to have maximum impact" (House of Lords, 2013, p. 17).

In contrast, the Government's 2014 report detailing the long-term vision for London's legacy suggested that "by 2022: long-term increase in volunteer numbers has continued and, a culture of volunteering has been energized by the Games and is firmly embedded within communities across the country" (HM Government, 2014, p. 12). The IOC (2013a) also identified Join In in relation to emerging post Games legacy initiatives linked to volunteering. More generally, the IOC also recognised that the Spirit of 2012 legacy initiative had secured significant UK lottery funding in order to fund a series of legacy projects around the UK.

In relation to the post Games development of Join In, it was noted that the Cabinet Office, which had responsibility for government policy on volunteering as well as for coordinating the Games legacy more generally, would focus on capturing the volunteering spirit as a key part of the legacy. The House of Commons Committee report (2013) felt that there was "not a clear plan for capitalising on the contribution Games Makers can make to other volunteering initiatives" (House of Commons, 2013, p. 7), and whilst welcoming the intention to provide much needed support to sports clubs, it was not clear to them "how the positive volunteering experience of the Games Makers was being captured to help in this respect". The Chair of Join In, Sir Charles Allen, also indicated that UK sports clubs were often caught in complicated situations, where they receive boosts in sporting participation and interest, but simply did not have the resources to cope, and that Join In would aim to help address this issue (English Federation of Disability Sport, 2013).

The Parliamentary Committees' criticisms of the volunteer legacy were widely reported in the press (BBC News, 2013; Gibson, 2013). More generally, comments from within the voluntary sector expressed doubts about the realisation of a volunteer legacy. Kate Bowgett from the Association of Volunteer Managers was cynical about whether there would be a lasting positive impact for the voluntary sector, and questioned whether the motivation to volunteer for a mega sports event was the same as the motivation to volunteer for other roles, for example, at a homelessness day centre or to mentor children in care (Young-Powell, 2012). It was also apparent that not all Games Maker applicants or London Ambassadors were interested solely in volunteering opportunities connected with sport. In fact, in his evidence to the House of Lords Select Committee, Lord Coe identified that the motivation for volunteering at a major event such as the Olympic and Paralympic Games did not necessarily extend to wishing to become involved with a sports club on a regular basis (House of Lords, 2013).

Mike Locke from Volunteering England highlighted the importance of evaluation outcomes from the Games Maker programme, and stated frustration at the lack of a proper evaluation of the Olympic volunteering programme, and whilst some individual University researchers were undertaking research (e.g. Dickson et al, 2014; Nichols & Ralston, 2015) there was no funding for a full evaluation of the Games Maker programme (Young-Powell, 2012). There were also documented criticisms about the delay and time taken to transfer and utilise the London 2012 volunteer database, with LOCOG focusing instead on positively highlighting that "more than five million people were part of the London 2012 database, either through buying tickets, joining in, signing up or being a volunteer" (2013b, p. 120).

With specific reference to a post 2012 volunteer legacy, Justin Davis Smith (2012), then Chief Executive of Volunteering England, indicated that the 2012 Games offered a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to showcase the value of volunteering and leave a lasting legacy of engagement. However, for this to happen, the question of finance needed to be addressed. Davis Smith stressed that whilst volunteering would deliver social, economic and political returns, like any other sector of the economy, it required investment if those benefits were to be realised. Scott (2014) highlighted that among the casualties of public spending, cuts were made to several important baseline government surveys, including the Citizenship Survey which examined issues around community cohesion, civil renewal and social networks, including volunteering. That survey would have been central to assessing results for the area of social engagement, particularly with regard to the impact of the Games on delivering increases in social cohesion. Indeed, the methodology for the Department for Culture, Media and Sport's meta-analysis of Games impacts and legacies noted "evidence gaps are a critical risk across the legacy theme of promoting community engagement and participation" (DCMS, 2011, p. 19).

Summary: Secondary analysis of London 2012 and the volunteer legacy
Overall, while there is evidence for London-based and regional volunteer legacies associated with the Games, there has been criticism that the mechanisms and infrastructure needed to facilitate these outcomes were actioned too late in the piece (e.g., the database and new structures such as Join In), possibly leading to a reduction in the take up of volunteering in the immediate aftermath of London 2012. The fact that new infrastructure was created to facilitate the volunteer legacy (Join In) additionally gives the impression that the volunteering sector, with its existing management infrastructure (peak bodies and resource centres), may have been overlooked in this process. It appears overall that the sporting sector has benefited the most from any volunteer legacies achieved, facilitated by the narrow focus of many of the legacy initiatives such as Join In and the Sports Maker programmes. It is therefore questionable to what extent a 'new culture of volunteering for the UK' has been achieved.

2.3   Comparison of Sydney 2000 and London 2012

Table 1 provides a topline summary of the key similarities and differences discerned between the two cases, Sydney 2000 and London 2012, based on the secondary analysis.

Overall, there are several similarities between the GamesForce 2000 and 2012 Games Maker volunteer programmes. Both were widely recognised as being a key factor underpinning the success of their respective Games and both were innovative in seeking to advance Olympic volunteerism either in terms of programme design and/or delivery.

Unquestionably, the 12 years between the Sydney and London Games has seen an unprecedented focus on legacy as part of the Olympic agenda (IOC, 2007), which has followed through to London 2012 in terms of the increased pressure on the Games organisers and wider host city to deliver not only a successful Olympics but plan for the delivery of ongoing sustainable legacies.

There is greater evidence in terms of the Sydney case that SOCOG had actively engaged with the volunteering sector in relation to planning for the Games and that the legacies to arise from the Games were largely sector driven. The Volunteer Advisory Committee on the secondary evidence reviewed appears to have been an effective conduit for seeking the opinions of the sector and making them feel included. We note that this finding may be predicated on the fact that for the Sydney case, the project team had access to archival data and official correspondence (memos and correspondence from SOCOG), which given the recency of the London case were not publicly available (see the Methodology chapter for further details).

Table 1 – Comparison of Sydney 2000 and London 2012 Olympic Games volunteer programmes and legacies based on the secondary analysis

	Sydney 2000	London 2012
Numbers in the official volunteer programme	46,967 Games Force volunteers, plus Paralympic volunteers	70,000 Games Makers
Focus on legacy in candidature procedure	Not included as a theme	Theme 1
Focus on volunteer legacy in the host city candidature file	None	None
Focus on volunteer legacy in planning stage	Limited	Yes, but came late in the planning
Games time focus on volunteering	Volunteers widely lauded as a key factor to the success of the Games	Volunteers widely lauded as a key factor to the success of the Games
Interest in/scrutiny of the volunteer legacy	Low	High
Volunteering 'firsts' at the Games	First to integrate the Olympics and Paralympics volunteer programmes	First time to deliver the volunteer programme completely online and first to secure a sponsor for the programme
Use of existing volunteering infrastructure in planning and legacy	Good – headed by Volunteering NSW	Limited – in response new initiatives such as Join In were created
Driver of volunteer legacies	Volunteering sector driven	Driven by LOCOG/Mayor of London/Join In
Volunteer legacies – Common to both cases	Increased awareness and promotion of new/different forms of volunteering	

3 METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research design

This project uses a case study research design. The Summer Olympic Games hosted in Sydney 2000 and in London 2012 were selected as case studies for this project. Using two case studies to investigate the research questions enables the Olympic Games context to be taken into account (Yin, 1996). While the Sydney 2000 and London 2012 Olympic Games took place during different social and economic times and in different geographic locations, they also share contextual similarities. Both Australia and Great Britain are liberal democracies with strong volunteering cultures (Musick and Wilson, 2008). The timing of both Games is a significant factor in their selection for this study, with Sydney taking place before the establishment of the Olympic Games Impact study and London afterwards.

The methods adopted partially follow those set out in study of non-infrastructural legacies of the Olympic Games, which included a review of Sydney 2000 and was funded by the IOC. In adopting the case study approach, the research employed a mixture of data sources and data types to provide a complete picture of the phenomenon under study (Yin, 1996). Ethics approval was obtained from the institutions collaborating on this project to cover the primary data collection[2].

The study was designed in two phases. Stage 1 involved a comprehensive review of secondary data on the Sydney and London Olympic and Paralympic Games. This included academic research, policy documents, media reports, and other material produced by relevant organisations, particularly from the voluntary sector.

A series of search terms were used to identify relevant materials in library and Internet search engines[3]. Agreed upon by the project team, these included the terms: 'volunteer legacy', 'volunteer management', 'Games and Paralympic Games volunteer programme', 'Post-Games volunteering' and 'Local Organising Committee and volunteering', aligned to the relevant case study Games, e.g., volunteer legacy Sydney 2000 Olympics. These terms were exhausted for the Sydney case and whilst the intention was initially likewise to do so for London 2012, the greater focus on legacy surrounding this event meant that a substantial number of relevant resources were obtained using the search term 'volunteer legacy London 2012 Olympics' alone. Checks using the other search terms were undertaken but overall these did not reveal much in the way of additional material.

---

[2] William Angliss Institute (Project Number: 2016-01-1, Approval Date: 27 January 2016), Bournemouth University (Reference ID: 9024, Approval Date: 24 September 2015) and Curtin University (Reference ID: HRS4/ 2016, Approval Date: 24th March 2016).

[3] Google and Google Scholar were used as the primary search engines for the Internet searches, acknowledging that the majority of the London materials were obtained online. In terms of the Sydney search, generally the first 15 to 20 pages were reviewed for each search item and if deemed relevant, the materials were uploaded in a shared Dropbox folder for the project team to access. Some search terms proved to be more generic than desired, e.g., Volunteer Management Sydney 2000 yielded some general material regarding the volunteering organisations in Australia, management courses and information on Volunteer Resource Centres in NSW as well as broadly in Australia. Only materials deemed relevant to the study were retained and duplicates excluded throughout the process. In the case of London, 25 pages were reviewed using the 'volunteer legacy' term, with between five and 10 pages reviewed as checks of the additional search terms.

Additionally, material was accessed in the collections of the Olympic Studies Centre in Lausanne[4]. In the case of Sydney, the archives of The Centre for Volunteering NSW, the peak body for promoting volunteering in NSW, which was involved with the recruitment of GamesForce 2000 volunteers, were also searched for relevant materials[5].

Stage 1 had two aims. First, to create an underpinning background and history to each case study in order to address the following questions:
- How did the volunteer programme develop?
- Which stakeholders were involved at each stage of the event cycle?
- What planning was made for post-Games volunteering?
- How have volunteering and the volunteering infrastructure in each of the host cities developed since the Games?

Second, Stage 1 also used the secondary sources to identify relevant stakeholders that could be approached to take part on the primary data collection.

Stage 2 involved semi-structured interviews with representatives from:
- OCOGs.
- Sport governing bodies and community organisations.
- Policy-makers and government representatives at the local and national levels and official legacy bodies.
- Key staff at peak bodies for the voluntary sector and volunteer resource centres.
- Other stakeholders including university representatives, volunteers and researchers.

3.2 Primary data collection

In the case of London, interviews were conducted face-to-face, in Sydney there was a combination of both face-to-face and telephone interviews conducted. Participants were asked questions designed to reveal the following information[6]:
- To what extent were stakeholders involved in the planning and delivery of the Games volunteer programme?
- To what extent were stakeholders involved in the planning and delivery of the volunteer legacy?
- What steps were taken to ensure a post-Games volunteer legacy by the OCOG and the other stakeholders?
- What, if any, volunteer infrastructure legacy has the Games contributed to in the host city?

---

[4] In October 2015, A/Professor Leonie Lockstone-Binney visited scanned and digitised 463 pages of background materials specifically related to the bid process for Sydney 2000 and London 2012 (candidature files, progress and final reports) and volunteer manuals (e.g., The Games Maker Pocket Guide), which were pivotal to providing context for the case studies and would have been difficult to source elsewhere.
[5] This yielded various memos and communications from SOCOG to the Volunteering NSW, including the minutes of SOCOG's Volunteering Advisory Committee meetings, which given the passage of time, enabled an 'insider' insight into volunteer planning for the 2000 Games.
[6] A copy of the interview schedule is in Appendix 1.

Interview participants were recruited purposively to help answer the research questions. Participants were identified initially through the desk research undertaken in Stage 1 and in discussion with volunteering peak bodies in Australia (Volunteering Australia, The Centre for Volunteering NSW) and the United Kingdom (National Council for Voluntary Organisations - NCVO), whom offered their support to the project. Initial participants were asked subsequently to provide recommendations for further interviewees using the snowballing approach (Noy, 2008). Given the recency of the event, data collection for the London case was greatly facilitated with the assistance of the NVCO, which put the project team in direct contact with some prospective key informants.

Informants were mainly invited to participate by email, with at least one follow up request sent to non-responders. In total, 27 people agreed to participate in the study (16 participants for London and 11 for Sydney) and were interviewed at a time and location of their choosing. This number was achieved after concerted efforts by the research team to identify and contact relevant informants. The informants were able to provide expert input as many had senior roles in relation to the case study Games. In addition, the consistency of their responses enabled theoretical saturation to be reached (Lincoln & Guba, 1985), whereby no new insights would emerge from the conduct of additional interviews.

Appendix 2 details the anonymised profile of the London (R1-R16) and Sydney (R17-R27) respondents. As can be noted, most of the target stakeholder groups for the research were well-represented, with the exception of NSOs and local government in the case of Sydney, despite repeated attempts to reach these stakeholder groups. There are also no representatives from official legacy bodies for Sydney as no such organisations existed. Most informants were recruited because of their role during the Games and a few because of their current role.

3.3   Data analysis

The interviews were all recorded, transcribed and analysed thematically using qualitative template analysis (King, 2004). This form of analysis involves the use of an initial coding template made up of key themes from a sample of the interviews, which is further expanded and refined in an iterative coding process involving the full set of interviews (Brooks, McCluskey, Turley, & King, 2015). It is a set of techniques commonly used to represent relationships between themes in social science research (King, 2004).

The initial coding template was created using a preliminary list of themes extracted from the research questions and interviewers' notes. Based on the research questions, themes relating to the impacts of the Games on volunteer participation, legacy plans, recommendations for an effective post-Games volunteer legacy, and the factors that affect this legacy were created. From the interviewers' notes, key themes relating to resources, structures and delivery mechanisms, strategy, and knowledge transfer were included as overarching themes.

This initial structure was further populated using the first five interview transcripts. Specific themes were developed under overarching ones to build a hierarchical

structure of themes emanating from the data. This hierarchical structure formed the basis for the preliminary coding template that was used in the rest of the analysis. In analysing the full set of data, quotes that were relevant to existing themes were coded against those themes. For data that did not fit into existing themes, additional themes were created to enhance the richness of the analysis. These new themes were clustered with other related themes in the hierarchy, with broader themes encompassing narrower, more specific ones. New themes were created until the majority of data could be meaningfully coded against one or more themes in the hierarchical structure. The position of themes in the overall hierarchy was fluid and subject to revision in the course of analysing the full dataset.

Further refinements were made after the full set of interviews was coded. The coded data, represented by the hierarchy of themes, was distributed to the research team for comments over several iterations until the final template of hierarchical themes was determined. This hierarchy is used to frame the results and discussion in the following chapters.

4 RESULTS

In the analysis, the emergent themes were broadly segregated into two categories. Descriptive themes represented the opinions of interviewees in key areas relating to the general impacts of Games volunteer programme(s), their views of volunteer programmes pre- and during Games, as well as their perspective on volunteer legacies post-Games. Interpretive themes were then created for the lessons learnt for future Games proposed by interviewees, and were broadly categorised under the headings of Resources, Structures and Delivery Mechanisms, Strategy and Knowledge Transfer. The final hierarchy of themes is presented in Appendix 3. The themes were developed from analysing both cases, although there is some variability in emphasis of themes between the cases[7]. Section 4.1 presents the results on Sydney 2000 and Section 4.2 on London 2012, with respondent quotes used to support the findings[8]. The cases are then compared in Section 5.

4.1 Sydney 2000

Eleven interviews were conducted for the Sydney 2000 case study. Two key informants from SOCOG were interviewed, both of whom have gone on to involvement in subsequent Olympic Games and other mega events. Other stakeholders were represented by four CEOs of peak volunteering bodies at the national or state level, two representatives of non-profit organisations, a university representative, and two Pioneer Volunteers; of these, five respondents had been members of the SOCOG 2000 Volunteer Advisory Committee.

Impacts
Overall, respondents viewed the impacts of the GamesForce 2000 volunteering programme positively in terms of raising the profile of volunteering in NSW and Australia, making volunteering a more attractive and varied activity, countering media negativity in the lead up to the Games and unifying Australia behind the Games in 2000. The following respondent quotes attest to these positive effects.

> I don't think that there's ever been that acclamation of volunteering as a movement until the Sydney Olympic Games. [Peak Volunteering Body, R25]

> I think the impact was a better understanding probably in the broader community about what volunteers do and that a volunteer programme, as we all know, is the great leveller. [SOCOG, R17]

> I think the notion of volunteering changed after the Olympics and people saw that it wasn't just the traditional types of volunteering that people could do […]. So we all learned that there were so many ways that people could volunteer for the Olympic Games and get something really valuable out of it and actually use their own skills that they may be using in their work life, to contribute to volunteering and I think, certainly for me, that was a revelation. It was something that people didn't really know about before. We all sort of thought volunteering was going and visiting

---

[7] The fourth opinions theme 'Games Volunteer programme during the Games' is omitted from the Report as this was a minor theme in terms of the project objectives and data collected. In both Sydney and London there was positive evidence (from both the interviews and secondary data) that volunteers were integral to Games time operations.

[8] The respondent group is included with the quote; fuller details of each respondent's role are in Appendix 2, however the interviews were conducted on a confidential basis and the quotes have been reported in a de-identified fashion to maintain respondent confidentiality.

someone and do that in the local centre or whatever and […] that's a really great legacy, because it broadens what volunteering is. [Peak Volunteering Body, R19]

…also it helped people to start to think about volunteering in terms of finite amounts of time, rather than in indefinite involvement with volunteering, the people could do project based volunteering, or event volunteering, and it was a useful form of volunteering. [Peak Volunteering Body, R24]

Corporations who had been nibbling at the edges about whether they wanted to engage in corporate volunteering, very much took it on as something that they would like to do. So we now have considerably larger numbers of companies who are engaged in supporting and creating and having activities in volunteering through their companies. So in that respect the legacy has been very good. [Peak Volunteering Body, R26]

Respondents raised less negative impacts in relation to the Games time volunteering programme and these were focused around the uniqueness of Olympic volunteering overshadowing over forms of the activity.

…there was some resentment from long-term community volunteers to the focus on the Olympic volunteers that they'd been made to feel as though to some extent they'd been volunteering for years but they never got the recognition with their contribution [Peak Volunteering Body, R25]

Nothing ever quite gets up to that standard and people are always trying to achieve a similar vibe and recruitment effort and all of those things and it's a little bit harder the further away you get [from the Olympics]. [Peak Volunteering Body, R19]

In discussing the negative impacts, respondents often balanced this with reference back to positive outcomes; for example, a SOCOG interviewee reflected that while the Olympic volunteers had been feted in a way that other volunteers were not, the Games then brought attention to the importance of recognising the efforts of volunteers more generally:

It was interesting, I think, probably in the broader volunteer sector there might've been a bit of cynicism to say well I think a lot of the Olympic volunteers were referred as the 'two-week wonders' by the broader volunteer community. They got all this attention, all this adulation, street paraded, you know we've been volunteering for 20 years and no-one has even said thank you to us. You know there was that sort of conflict I suppose of emotion in the volunteer sector. And that's not a bad thing because it actually highlighted the problem that we're not recognising our volunteers well enough. We're probably not managing them well enough. We're taking them for granted and so I saw that as a positive. [R17]

Games volunteer programme before Games
A number of sub-themes emerged relative to the planning phase of the volunteering programme in lead up to the Games. Respondents indicated on the whole there were opportunities for the volunteering sector and other stakeholders such as universities and community groups to engage with SOCOG in relation to planning for the volunteer programme. Nevertheless, there were some initial reservations regarding the SOCOG and sector relationship. A SOCOG interviewee said:

The voluntary sector I think, and I'll just mention the very first conversation I had with the voluntary sector …and in the nicest, most diplomatic way possible they said "[*Name removed*], they've made a mistake in appointing you. Not as a person but

rather they should have appointed us to run the volunteer programme for the Games." So there was a healthy scepticism and, with hindsight, I think that would have been the biggest mistake of all because I don't think those organisations at that time were sufficiently professional to really embrace such a huge event like that so there was a healthy scepticism as to how it would work. [R18]

A peak volunteering body interviewee also reflected on the sector's involvement in the pre-Games period:

I would describe it as almost nil in the lead up to the Games, because SOCOG didn't allow that, there was no room. The volunteering sector across Australia felt quite excluded in the lead up to the Games, but there's a distinction between the lead up and the conduct of the Games itself. Because the conduct of the Games itself was so successful that the volunteering organisations could then build on the effect of that for themselves and for the development of volunteering across the country, but it would have been much more cohesive if they'd been able to work together from the start. [R26]

Despite these reservations, collectively the results indicated strong evidence of engagement between SOCOG and various stakeholders in regards to the volunteering programme. As an example, interviewees from both SOCOG and a peak volunteering body discussed the involvement of tertiary education providers in the pre-Games period:

We [SOCOG] worked very closely with the university sector, I think 22 universities we actually worked with, and those universities came on board to varying degrees. Some created a course called Olympics 101 basically, such as UTS, they were terrifically on board, and students could actually apply to do a specialist subject in that and obviously get course credits for it. Some allowed their students to use their 120 hours of practical requirement to do volunteer roles at the Games and some just promoted it as a good thing to do. [SOCOG, R17]

… SOCOG was really clever in engaging TAFE students who were studying in the HR area to actually do those [volunteer recruitment] interviews. [Peak Volunteering Body, R25]

Regarding the volunteering sector, a SOCOG interviewee discussed their engagement with charities in the build up to the Games (and they noted that charities are only one part of the voluntary sector):

There were, in round figures, 30 charities which I went to meetings of either a major conference to share what the plans were for running the volunteer programmes at the Olympics and/or their volunteer recognition functions, for example. I think in terms of… there are thousands of charities, as you know, but if you break it down to the top 50 then we would have got to 50% of the top 50 to share exactly what we were doing. [R18]

An interviewee involved in a number of non-profit sector roles, and who sat on the Volunteer Advisory Committee, also attested to the range and depth of the relationships between SOCOG and the volunteering sector:

I think it was pretty deep. There was just so many organisations involved, you know, Volunteering New South Wales, Volunteering Australia, all of those big ones that do either invite volunteers and then send them to various organisations, or things like

the Surf Lifesaving and Rural Fire Service, and those sorts of ones that use a lot of volunteers all the time. [R27]

Volunteer legacy planned by OCOG, government and/or others[9]

While legacy had not been a requirement or focus in the planning of the Sydney Olympic Games, the interview data suggested that the voluntary sector were viewed as being at the vanguard of promoting any volunteer legacies, rather than SOCOG or the government.

One SOCOG interviewee noted that "even though I didn't start with a brief to generate a legacy" he "committed personally" as, referring to the volunteering peak bodies, he "knew it [legacy] was important for them" [R18]. The second SOCOG respondent also noted that legacy was important to key individuals within the organisation, but not those involved in the operational aspects of the Games or volunteer programme:

> [SOCOG] CEO, Sandy Hollway, spent a lot of time thinking about legacy and very much took part in the legacy projects post-Games, you know particularly in the International Year of Volunteers (IYV). So he was a great advocate for it. Probably more of the operational type people within the [SOCOG] organisation saw it as this is what we need to do to get the job done, so just get it done, get the right numbers and we'll be happy. So there probably weren't a lot of people focused on legacy from what I could see at the time. [R17]

Those from the non-profit and volunteering sector also felt that it was they who had proactively taken leadership regarding legacy. One peak volunteering body interviewee returned to this a number of times:

> It was planned by the sector itself. I would say there really wasn't anything that was planned by SOCOG by way of continuing legacy. Although I would give SOCOG full credit for the actual conduct of the preparation training and so on of the volunteers for the Games. But they put a large full stop on the last moment of the Games. [R26]

> In Australia there is a national body on volunteering and there is state and territory state volunteer centres in each state and territory. There are also resource centres in each state and territory. Those organisations were not used sufficiently. They weren't used after the Games either, in terms of SOCOG organising it, or anybody to do with the Games, but we decided as a body that the experience had been so good of the Games and of the volunteer experience for the volunteers was absolutely excellent, they loved it, and SOCOG conducted all that superbly in the end. So we were very impressed with what they did and we wanted the legacy to carry forward. [R26]

The interviewee went on to note the lack of legacy planning and funding:

> We didn't have any funding to carry the legacy forward and actually neither did they, because as soon as the Olympic Games were over everything at SOCOG in relation to the volunteering shut down. So there wasn't a legacy plan. So Volunteering Australia and the state and territory volunteer centres, picked it up and to the limited ability that we had, we promoted heavily, as heavily as we could on a nil budget, we promoted volunteering as a step forward for Australia, we didn't have to say very

---

[9] For the London 2012 case study, the legacies planned by the OCOG/government and others will be discussed separately, however the lesser focus of legacy planning in Sydney means these are considered together here.

much, it was evident. The media did a great deal, they did a great job in supporting and encouraging and interviewing and talking about the volunteer engagement. [Peak Volunteering Body, R26]

Another peak volunteering body CEO also spoke about the lack of planning and that "other than the corporate legacy I think the other legacy was more accidental than intended" [R25]. A further peak volunteering body respondent also recognised the role of the volunteers themselves in driving legacy from the grassroots:

There were a few formal reunion type activities if you like and they were very well received and then there was also and there has been an informal gathering of those volunteers over the years and that continues to today, but it's not really… it's more self-motivated than initiated by the government or the IOC or whoever. It's really an internal, grassroots kind of movement and those people still meet to this day in smaller groups, depending on what their activity was at the time. [R19]

Management of volunteer legacy
A SOCOG interviewee felt that they set a benchmark for Olympic volunteer programmes that others have followed:

The big legacy that Sydney had, as far as volunteer programmes goes, was it set the benchmark for every other Games that has come since and people still say that, so the lessons we learnt from Sydney, we refined, we passed on through the knowledge transfer. [R17]

However, the second SOCOG interviewee highlighted the scope of the volunteer legacy relative to other Games legacies:

I think what you're asking in terms of the main advantage, issues like environment, infrastructure post the Games versus volunteering and where did volunteering fit in the priority. Bottom of the list. That doesn't mean it's totally lost but there's no question, when any senior people would go out and talk to the community broadly that question, the major things they would emphasise would be ongoing infrastructure, support structures, environmental… environmental got a lot of profile. Volunteering, as it is in life generally, people pay lip service to it sometimes and other times they give it more profile. [R18]

A SOCOG interviewee noted the boost, albeit temporary, in volunteering in Australia after the Games, was aided by the 2001 IYV:

I think we saw, particularly with the IYV, a lift in volunteer numbers generally as a result of the feeling that the Sydney experience provided. But as you probably heard at the conference now, you know numbers are falling. That boost probably lasted three or four years. [R17]

Examples of volunteer legacies highlighted by other interviewees included the corporate volunteering programme and the GamesForce volunteers getting involved in other events:

So one of the very first legacies that came out of the Olympic Games from my perspective was the contribution to the corporate volunteering in particularly in New South Wales. [Peak Volunteering Body, R25]

The other thing that has happened post-Olympics, many of the volunteers signed up for the Royal Agricultural Society and they volunteer every year still for the Royal Easter Show, so there's a core group of those people who are continuing on and have then encouraged other people to join in. [Peak Volunteering Body, R19]

A peak volunteering body interviewee noted that "we had volunteers coming to us in droves after the Games who wanted to do it again" [R25]. She went on to discuss the importance not only of IVY but also the Centenary of the New South Wales Government in 2001. They talked to the NSW Government about developing a special event volunteers initiative:

There were a combination of things [events] that volunteers were able to engage and this time the New South Wales Government bought them uniforms for being volunteers in the…for the parades and things like that. […] It was something about being a band of brothers if you know what I mean? So that… it stayed alive for a couple of years but I think it died away […] So that was kind of a direct legacy. [R25]

Both SOCOG and the peak volunteering bodies noted the boost in volunteering numbers lasted only a few years. However, a Pioneer Volunteer (who had been suggested as an interviewee because of their subsequent involvement in other events and Olympic Games) recognised a longer term legacy was increased interest in event volunteering more generally:

…there's been the World Masters Games in Sydney and a few things and I don't think they've had any trouble getting volunteers for those events and that's the legacy from the Sydney Olympic Games. And I presume […] when we have the Commonwealth Games in the Gold Coast that because it's a major sport, major sporting event, that people will want to get involved [in 2018] and have the memories the Sydney Olympics being so good. [R21]

The lack of mechanisms for facilitating volunteer legacies post Sydney 2000 was a theme discussed by several respondents, including a representative from the non-profit sector who had been a member of the SOCOG Volunteer Advisory Committee:

I think we just assumed that people would still be carried away, would automatically go and join or as an organisational issue…there wasn't enough consideration given I think to try and get them. […]

To a great extent, that was left to either the individuals or to Volunteering New South Wales who had the record, but I don't think they had the facilities or the capacity to follow it up, because I know that a lot of people finished the Games and went back to their usual things and never thought any more about it. […]

…so the opportunity was there and I think we missed it and I think I'm very disappointed about that. [R22]

There was also a feeling that some potential legacies had not eventuated, such as a peak volunteering body interviewee commenting on the volunteer training programme that had been developed and the non-profit sector organisations had hoped to subsequently use:

… other thing that we were definitely interested in was the access to training that we thought a lot of volunteer building organisations would be able to use […] they were the things that never actually eventuated. [R24]

More broadly, the experience gained in event and volunteer management, and the transfer of that knowledge to subsequent events, was also recognised as a legacy by a SOCOG respondent:

> One of the other markers I think too is when you look at subsequent organising committees and the number of Australians that move on and on and on and you don't get that from other organising committees. That's part of the legacy as well, the event experience and the event management experience and I think the expertise that keeps getting refined. I think part of that is just the way that we like to work with organisations, we don't come in and tell them how to do it, we come to add value and respect their culture and find a way of making it work for them. [R17]

Lessons learnt

Four themes emerged in terms of lessons that respondents felt had been learnt and could be seen as recommendations to the IOC and future Olympic hosts for promoting a post-Games volunteer legacy. These being inclusive of the existing volunteering infrastructure in the host city/nation related to Resources, Structures and Delivery Mechanisms, Strategy, and Knowledge Transfer.

Resources

Despite the significant length of time since the Sydney 2000 Olympics, respondents still recognised the value of effective resourcing for driving legacy programmes. A SOCOG interviewee also recognised the importance of funding for the volunteering sector to deliver legacies:

> And then of course some of that [legacy activities] would probably have to come with some sort of resourcing to do that. So if the IOC wants to see this happen properly, they need to invest in it as well. [R17]

Structures and delivery mechanisms

Interviewees recognised that having effective structures (new or existing) in place from the pre-planning stage of the Games was important to ensuring that a volunteer legacy was delivered upon. For example, a SOCOG representative said:

> I think, just as we said, the action identification of who is responsible for legacy, both infrastructure and human, I think is good, would be a really important move. And that might not necessarily be some… might not be part of the OCOG, you know the organising committee, it might be an external organisation, like Commonwealth Games Association or like a peak volunteering body, I think early identification of that and having them in the tent very early in the piece. […] you would want that body [such as a volunteer advisory group] or that person sitting around the table at every meeting. [R17]

Sydney did have a Volunteer Advisory Committee, as noted by an interviewee who had been a member and noted that in terms of legacy:

> Well that was the intention of that committee. So when it met, we were talking about being able to have some of the tools that had been developed. And so I mean we definitely thought of legacy in terms of being able to build on the enthusiasm and interest that people had developed during the Games. [R24]

Although there had been engagement with the voluntary sector in the lead up to the Sydney Games, there were further recommendations on how legacy structures might involve and integrate with the volunteering infrastructure of host cities. A peak volunteering body representative was one of a number who emphasised working more with or through existing organisations and those with volunteering expertise rather than setting up new structures:

> I think one of the real legacies would have been to look around and to look at what organisations existed, and how if you worked more closely with them, or worked through them, rather than setting up completely new infrastructure. I suppose in retrospect, I think well, they just brought in people to run the volunteering who knew absolutely nothing about volunteering, really. And so it was left up to a lot of organisations to try and explain what volunteering was, and then to just try and make themselves relevant in that whole process. And so I think future, if people want volunteering to, if they want the legacy to be volunteer involvement, and for people to renew their enthusiasm for it, or for it to be involved in something that's really useful for the place where people are volunteering then they should use what exists, and help strengthen that rather than just setting up parallel structures. [R24]

A SOCOG representative appeared to recognise this criticism and recommendation, while noting that, at the time, they did not feel the sector necessarily had the capabilities to operate at the level required:

> More significantly engage with the voluntary sector and look far more closely at the professional resources that they now have. Frankly, 18 years ago they were not there, the industry has professionalised enormously. I guess that's a recommendation built in there. And underneath all that is a higher level of respect for the voluntary sector itself and the need to engage seriously with them to ensure that there are… almost a plan. I suppose that's what I'm getting to, a plan for the creation of legacies, not just as an outcome of the delivery of the event or the Games but rather with the cooperation of the sector and active engagement by the sector then that becomes a significant starting point for delivering the event. [R18]

Both SOCOG and peak volunteering body respondents did agree that the privacy laws in Australia at the time of the 2000 Games resulted in a missed opportunity in being able to pass on the volunteer database to facilitate ongoing volunteering efforts:

> …strictly speaking we couldn't hand that database over to anybody at the end of the Games because we didn't have permission to do that from the volunteers under the new legislation. [SOCOG, R17]

> And hopefully they [*future events*] could think about that [*privacy laws*] beforehand. That would be something to think about beforehand so that that was an option for people, cause otherwise you are missing some opportunities, I think, there. [Peak volunteering body, R26]

Instead, SOCOG had to work around the legislative restritions, relying on encouraging volunteers to contact peak bodies and other volunteering organisations direct:

> So work had to be done to almost go out and promote and say if you're a City Volunteer, here are a list of organisations to contact. In those days, of course, it was mail outs mainly so we, as part of the thank you process, we got that information out

to people to say if you would like to continue your volunteering, here are some organisations that you might like to be in touch. And one of the key ones for Sydney was Volunteering New South Wales as it was in those days. So we sort of passed the baton I suppose to organisations like that who would continue. [SOCOG R17]

Strategy
Several interesting lessons were highlighted by the Sydney respondents aligned to the theme of Strategy. In relation to the bid, one peak volunteering body representative believed that "every country that bids for the Games should be invited to present the section of their bid which describes what they would do about volunteering" [R26]. They identified the International Association for Volunteer Effort (IAVE) as the organisation who could lead or support a recommendation to the IOC on "the bid that they considered to have the strongest detail about what they would do with volunteers".

Interviewees felt that lessons from Sydney that could be applied to other Games included the successful aspects of legacy, notably the strategies of engaging tertiary providers in the volunteering programme and developing a corporate volunteer programme:

> …a recommendation for the IOC would be that each OCOG works on a similar programme as I did through the universities, looking for volunteers, but then trying to create the same sort of legacy in the society for that societal change. [University, R20]

> If there was something solid that IOC could do then it would be to do what Sydney did in ensuring that the partnering of organisations embedded a corporate volunteering programme. That was almost a requirement. [Peak Volunteering Body, R25]

In relation to the education programme, a SOCOG representative who had subsequently been involved in the Sochi Winter Olympics noted that this model of university engagement had been attempted.

The importance of having clear legacy plans with tangible outcomes and measurable targets in place was also highlighted, for example, by this peak volunteering body representative:

> So my advice for any host city would be you're going to really benefit from the contribution that your volunteer programme will make to these Games, so plan for how that benefit can have a lasting impact and what that might look like. Have something tangible whether it's volunteer standards, whether it's a volunteer training programme, whether it's a foundation that has a manual you know a contribution of planning something tangible and being that contribution. [R25]

Knowledge transfer
The importance of knowledge transfer was highlighted by the Sydney respondents in terms of documenting the successes and failures of Olympic volunteering programmes and also in terms of the personal transfer of knowledge via volunteers themselves. A Pioneer Volunteer interviewee that had gone on to volunteer at other Summer Games suggested that learning from previous events should not just rely on the organising committee but also "groups like Volunteering Australia or Volunteering

New South Wales […] those organisations can give you feedback as to how well they've implemented, both at Games time and since, and how they have maybe missed the boat in some respects as well" [R21]. They also saw a role for the volunteers themselves, "who maybe would like to contribute to the next and the next and the next Olympic Games…For them to go and help train volunteers or to be involved in some development programme for each new Olympic Games".

Interestingly, despite the IOC recording that the Atlanta 1996 Olympic Games had 47,466 volunteers (IOC, n.d.-c), a non-profit representative who had been on the SOCOG Volunteer Advisory Committee commented that they had a "blank slate" in terms of knowledge transfer:

> I think we had one huge disadvantage and that was, because we followed Atlanta where there was no volunteering at all, so we had a blank sheet to start from really, because they were run as a professional, by a professional organisation, rather than volunteers, so that made it a little more difficult because we had to make up the rules as we went, but I don't know that we would have changed a great deal anyway. I think the basic concept was fantastic. The planning that went into it in the first place was really good. [R22]

However, it was recognised that knowledge transfer must be applied cognisant of the existing volunteering culture in the next host city. The SOCOG representative who discussed targeting the university sector at the Sochi Olympics noted:

> The volunteer programme [was put] into about 15 or 20 universities in Russia hoping that the university sector would keep the volunteer programme alive, and students would continue to volunteer because volunteerism wasn't a common thing in their culture. And that's been the challenge with some of our, the learnings from the western, I suppose cities that host the Games, we try and plan, transplant them on a country that doesn't necessarily have volunteering within its culture, you have to find another way of doing that. [R17]

A Pioneer Volunteer – who had been involved at Athens, Beijing and London - also reflected on the importance volunteering culture in each host city:

> But again, one of the challenges you deal with internationally rather than just Australia because Australia does have a volunteering culture, is that these countries do have different cultures so to try and impose maybe your volunteer mentality, a volunteer coach culture on them is a challenge. But I think if the Olympic Games are going to be a success, then I think they really do need to pass on this knowledge. [R21]

4.2   London 2012

Sixteen interviews were conducted for the London 2012 case study. One LOCOG key informant was interviewed. Five of the interviewees were involved in legacy bodies and one was a government representative, while some of these had previously held roles involved in supporting the delivery of the Games. Other stakeholders included a key informant from the national peak volunteering body,

three senior representatives of volunteer resource centres, three representatives of national sports organisations, a university representative, and a researcher.

Impacts

Like the Sydney case, there was favourable comment from the London respondents in terms of the 2012 Olympics Games Maker and associated volunteering programmes raising awareness of volunteering in society in all its forms, including in organisations already involving volunteers. The LOCOG interviewee felt:

> The importance of volunteers to all organisations has gone up on the agenda [*of organisations' boards*]. So there is a legacy there, and this is something that's quite tangible. People talk about volunteering. […] There are areas in the UK who now perceive volunteers in a very different way. [LOCOG, R13]

A consequence national sporting organisations discussed was how this has impacted on the positioning and recruitment of volunteers:

> [we] used to try and avoid using the word "volunteering" because it's not cool and it's not sexy […] But there's far less fear of that now and I think people are much more open about promoting a volunteer opportunity because the awareness of the benefits of being involved in volunteering for you as a professional or as a person is really positive now. [National Sports Organisation, R16]

The different volunteering experience of the Olympics was also used to recruit volunteers, and particularly attract new people into volunteering; for example:

> We wanted to make a conscious difference in terms of, rather than just focus the same people who were already in volunteering, we wanted to very consciously recruit people who hadn't been, because we felt that that was our legacy to the third sector… we consciously wanted to bring younger people in, we wanted to demonstrate that volunteering could actually be different and it didn't need to be a full time thing. [Legacy Body, R3]

The increased awareness of volunteering was driven by unprecedented media coverage, as noted by representatives of both the official legacy body and the peak volunteering body:

> Having worked in the volunteering space for the best part of 25 years I don't think we'd ever seen volunteering so talked about, such front page news as we did during the Games itself […] There was a constant stream of good news stories about volunteering and the role it was playing, both in terms of the delivery at the Games but also in terms of just the feel good factor, making the country feel good about itself, people really feeling that volunteering was adding something different, that it was connecting people, that it was bringing people together for a couple of weeks during that great summer. [Peak Volunteering Body, R6]

> It's incredibly hard to get positive stories about volunteering in the press […] and so it really brought a new momentum. [Legacy Body, R10]

The same legacy body interviewee [R10] pointed out that in the Games build up, the recruited volunteers gave "a pool of people" who can be your voice in a city where people are getting grumpy", for example over negative media coverage of event preparations.

In London, volunteer resource centre representatives had criticisms that only a narrow range of volunteering was profiled in relation to the Olympics, namely events and sports volunteering (although it was noted that sports volunteering is different to events, and "sports clubs actually need people coming in and helping them with coaching and those kind of things" [R4]). As another volunteer resource centre interviewee pointed out:

> If you want to create a legacy, 70,000 people cannot stand outside somewhere with a foam finger on, pointing all year round. They need to take food to people who are stuck at home because they're housebound, they need to need to go into schools, they need to do environmental challenges in their community. [R7]

There were also concerns that other volunteering experiences post-Games could not live up to the hype of Olympic volunteering. The legacy body representatives recognised this and noted that Olympic Games volunteering could be seen as "glamour volunteering":

> And the other side of volunteering is that those who are in it for the long haul, and completely dedicated, and those who, they love it, and they contribute a lot, and they enjoy it. [R15]

The government representative expanded on this:

> There was also almost a bit of a kick back, with the thousands of people who volunteered day-in day-out, they never get the kind of kudos that the Games Makers got. [R9]

Additional criticism and counter-criticism was raised as to the reach of the Games Maker programme and its representativeness across the UK. LOCOG detailed how they attempted to engage people across the host nation:

> We actively sought volunteers from all over the United Kingdom and so selection centres were held in England, Scotland, Wales, and Northern Ireland and the same experience was provided wherever people were interviewed. It was agreed that across the nations and regions that proportional representation would exist so that the final number of volunteers selected would reflect the UK as a whole. [R13]

However, a peak volunteering body informant reported on differing regional perceptions outside London:

> There was a sense in which some parts of the country and some people who would've liked to otherwise get engaged weren't able to do so.

> You certainly got some impression from some places in the north of England that they didn't really see that same volunteering buzz that we were claiming was clearly there in London. [R6]

Games Volunteer programme before Games

The interview data yielded mixed evidence for the engagement of the existing volunteer sector and other interested stakeholders in the volunteering programme prior to the Games. Like SOCOG's Volunteering Advisory Committee, LOCOG established a similar conduit for engaging with the voluntary sector. The role of the

Advisory Group was acknowledged in relatively favourable terms. The LOCOG interviewee explained:

> The members of the volunteer advisory group were gathered from a group of key influencers across the voluntary sector.

> They were keen to ensure that they were able to participate and share their experience and LOCOG were also very clear that volunteers needed a strong positive identity. The result provides resounding recognition of how everyone ultimately buckled down to work well together, to deliver an outcome that everyone could all be proud of. [R13]

Legacy body respondents also acknowledged LOCOG's attempts to build relationships with the voluntary sector and wanting to facilitate a volunteer legacy; for example:

> I think LOCOG were very engaged in not just wanting it to be we're here to deliver the show and then go. […] So there was a volunteer advisory working group that [*named removed*] had with lots of people from the sector. [R10]

However, another legacy body interviewee (who had also been involved in LOCOG) presented a different perspective on engagement with the voluntary sector:

> We communicate in quite a different way, we're not… with respect, the clammy hand of the third sector. [Legacy Body, R3]

Regarding the university sector [R12], there was some evidence of LOCOG engagement in relation to volunteering. However, there were more critical views shared by the voluntary sector, national sporting organisations and other stakeholders regarding their level of engagement with LOCOG more generally in relation to the volunteering programme. When a national sporting organisation offered to advertise volunteering roles through their clubs and volunteers, they felt:

> The message [from LOCOG] was, "We're OK, obviously we get where we're at, inundated with volunteer stuff, leave us alone to get on with it", [that] was really the message that we got. [R16]

One interviewee reflected on how various volunteering bodies and organisations acted as intermediaries between LOCOG and the wider sector as LOCOG "didn't really have that many roots into the sector themselves". He went on to:

> Think about how much money we could've and perhaps should've charged LOCOG in terms of consultancy costs […] That was a bit of a bugbear in that they were quite happy to go to some of the big accountancy firms and pay a lot of money for advice and consultancy on particular aspects of their programme, including some of the volunteering stuff. But they didn't seem able to grasp that the sector would've benefited and perhaps even strengthened the contribution we could make if there was more of a commercial arrangement between the advice that we were giving to them.

Ultimately the interviewee's organisation believed they had to be involved regardless:

> …at the end of the day rather than walking away we felt it was far too important an opportunity for volunteering not to be part of those conversations that we enthusiastically continued to get involved. [R6]

A volunteer resource centre had a similar experience, especially when others (often the private sector), were "failing to deliver and then a last minute call to us to get the volunteer centre to run all the training for them" [R7]. They saw this as:

> …panicked engagement rather than genuinely valu[ing] it. There were times where it did feel genuinely valued and there were times where it felt like we desperately need someone to dig us out of this hole.

Volunteer legacy planned by OCOG and/or government

Commentary on the legacy initiative Join In was the main focus of interviewees regarding the London 2012 volunteer legacy planned by LOCOG and the government. There were several views put forward that the legacy planning for Join In and other initiatives were not clearly planned from the outset. A volunteer resource centre interviewee had raised questions about what volunteer legacy would be:

> But there never seemed to be clear thoughts on what the legacy was for volunteering in this area and what it was funded and what the sort of evaluation process of that was afterwards as well. So it seemed a little vague to be perfectly honest. [R4]

Similarly, a national sporting organisation interviewee felt the legacy initiatives only developed after the event:

> I think that there were initiatives that came out afterwards with Join In or Sports Makers and that sort of stuff, that was put on us as a [sport] governing body to take on and to deliver, and to work with Join In and that sort of thing. But it was all definitely post event rather than pre or during [R16]

A government respondent recognised the good intentions of LOCOG and the government but also acknowledged that legacy "was quite an afterthought":

> But I do think they [LOCOG] did feel a responsibility to kind of hand things over in a good way. They weren't just kind of right we're done now, bugger off, we'll leave you to it. There was a desire to try and set up as strong a legacy as possible. […] I don't think they had a mandate. [R9]

A legacy body interviewee also suggested legacy "is often a reaction to the actual event that is good, bad, unexpected" [R15]. The government representative used the example of Join In to illustrate the late legacy planning at times:

> …it certainly came very late. It was very much a feeling of, again pardon my French, 'oh fuck it', we better think about this now, we better have something. [R9]

There was mixed support for the success of Join In as a legacy initiative. More positive commentary included recognition from respondents from LOCOG and a legacy body regarding the aims and successes of Join In, particularly in the sports sector:

> There are currently 5.6 million volunteers in Sport in the UK and sport is the largest single sector of volunteering. Join In inspired 100,000 new volunteers a year and

aims to specifically retain and grow this customer base through connecting people to clubs and campaigns. Many of the Games Makers remained within the sporting sector as that was the interest that drew them to the Games, and because of the work that Join In does, this is where we have most evidence of volunteering. [LOCOG, R13]

The second most popular reason [why Games Makers volunteered] was "I wanted to do something to engage in my community and transform my community" and I think that social action piece is the bit [… that] Join In have tried to focus on; that you did that at the Games and actually you can carry on doing that at a local level […There have been] some notable successes in keeping those people engaged and engaging them in delivering community sport which is a key part of the [Olympic] legacy. [Legacy Body, R2]

The peak volunteering body interviewee highlighted the importance of Join In as an explicitly planned volunteer legacy:

As I understand it, it was the first such…volunteering legacy organisation that's been set up after the Games and I think that was symptomatic of that renewed interest, or growing interest in the volunteering legacy, which perhaps sets 2012 apart from other previous Games. [R6]

More critical commentary of Join In focused again on the narrowing of focus to sports and events volunteering, while acknowledging reasons for this specialisation. The peak volunteering body interviewee articulated the sector's response:

It's fair to say that its focus was narrower than some people wanted from a volunteering legacy organisation in that it focused on sports volunteering rather than volunteering per se and some people felt that in itself is a missed opportunity. But given the magnitude of trying to deliver something in a sports field with funding being so tight, I think that was a sensible decision, even though I understand why some people feel that it was too limited in terms of its ambitions. But, you know, its work, I think, has been well received. [R6]

The government representative pointed to Join In's "original aspiration was probably to start with sport volunteering and then maybe to move into other stuff" [R9]. They noted that Join In's subsequent focus on sport volunteering was probably wise:

I think they did suffer a bit from kind of everyone thinking well who are you Join In, you think you've sort of got the answer to everything and I think they suffered a little bit in the sector.

Two volunteer resource centres discussed this tension from the volunteering sector perspective:

Join In I think is a nice brand, they seem like nice people. [However] They seem quite distinct from the rest of the voluntary sector and not as engaged. [R7]

But there's no partnership and there's no direct relationship with Join In. [R5]

Both interviewees also felt that Join In overlapped with existing volunteering infrastructure (including volunteer resource centres); for example:

So creating things like Join In, what you do, but there's an existing voluntary infrastructure and that's where people know to go to, to find out about volunteering. They don't… you can put a lot of money in investment into developing a new brand and a new thing but people are already going to the existing and there was no investment in that existing infrastructure for all those enquiries. [R7]

Despite the focus on sports volunteering, even the national sporting organisations found challenges working with Join In, with one noting:

I think for club-based sports you really need to have the communication with the clubs first to get them ready to welcome new volunteers. And I feel like we missed that step a little bit. […]

I'm not convinced that they have as much of an impact as they hoped to across NGB's and across grassroot sports. [R16]

Volunteer legacy planned by others

As the secondary analysis suggested (Section 2.2), a range of organisations had a stake in the official and unofficial volunteer legacy programmes of the London 2012 Olympics. Much of the discussion focused on the Team London Ambassadors programme, and in many instances it was directly compared to the Games Maker programme. There was a view that Team London had made greater efforts to utilise the existing volunteering infrastructure in its planning and ongoing legacy.

Overall, most comments relating to the Team London were positive. The Mayoral support for the Ambassador programme was praised by the volunteering and sports interviewees, as was their use of technology to support the engagement of volunteers (e.g., in speed – or micro – volunteering as well as volunteering at sporting events and visitor attractions). The peak volunteering body interviewee reflected this:

I'm not sure if that's really captured the public imagination in the way that they wanted. But I think they've nevertheless done some interesting work more generally in terms of taking volunteering forward in London, making connections with companies in the capital, encouraging their staff to volunteer, linking in with programmes to engage young people out of work and volunteering as a way of building up their employability skills. So I think there is some quite good stuff that the London team could be proud of in terms of the legacy. [R6]

The Team London Ambassador programme had developed "the legacy programme right up-front" and it "had a number of different elements to it that were all relative to the host city volunteer programme as distinct from [the] OCOG programme" [R11]. This included an economic measure as:

We want to be able to prove that the taxpayers' money that's gone into the funding of this programme has paid out. […] Broadly speaking, for every pound we spent on the London Ambassador programme, London got back £2.70.

The same interviewee explained how the programme explicitly set out to:

…use the existing infrastructure that was in place to help with recruitment and training. So rather than design and create new recruitment centres, [the programme]

use[d] the volunteer centres to help us get that done. […] Every single volunteer centre we worked with and we went out to all of them, were brilliant.

A volunteer resource centre respondent reflected that, in comparison with LOCOG's legacy activities (e.g. Join In):

The Mayor's Office has been more open to engaging with us about how they developed that programme. And they recognised the volunteer centres have a quite a good reach into more marginalised communities than the capital. [R7]

A number of other volunteer legacy initiatives and efforts were discussed. The three national sporting organisations each identified specific volunteer legacy initiatives. For example, five years before the Games one sport had "developed a pretty comprehensive plan of all the different ways that we wanted to utilise the home Olympic Games to be of benefit to the sport" [R14]. Since the Games, they had seen a large increase in young people playing their sport:

Now we've been able to do that because we've had loads more volunteers involved in our clubs who are creating more opportunities and the existing volunteers, they've been inspired to be part of something and they wanna create these opportunities so I… you know, we chose to use it as an opportunity and I think a number of other sports did also but there's also some sports who I don't think really did.

The Spirit of 2012 was also mentioned, such as their funding of a sport's volunteer-led youth project [R16]. However, the peak volunteering body interviewee, while noting that Spirit of 2012 is "beginning to fund some interesting work" [R6], also pointed out that:

…the amount of time it's taken to get up and to reorganise and to get its funding priorities worked out and then to administer the funds has led some people to think that sort of missed a trick a bit.

This is an issue "you want to capture the spirit whilst it's still really fresh". [R6]

Management of volunteer legacy

In terms of legacy management, the London respondents raised similar issues to their Sydney counterparts, including calling into question the legacy effect on volunteering rates post-event. Volunteer resource centre and national sporting organisation interviewees noted limited impacts were being seen in terms of volunteer numbers; for example:

There's only 23% of clubs in our sport that said that new volunteers joined after the London 2012 Olympics. [National Sports Organisation, R16]

I think as a volunteer centre I've not seen anything majorly, had any kind of impact on major increase in numbers coming through to us. [Volunteer Resource Centre, R4]

The peak volunteering body interviewee also reflected that the impact on volunteering numbers had been mixed:

I think we all had really high hopes that…because volunteering was so high profile during the Games that we would be able to really capture that legacy afterwards and

keep some of that spirit of 2012 going and more people would be wanting to carry on volunteering afterwards. And I think immediately afterwards there's some evidence of that happened but I think the sense is that it's tailed off a bit since then and despite the work of organisations, like Join In, which I think have a done a good job, I don't think we've managed to fully capture the legacy. […] I do feel that there was a missed opportunity in terms of really embedding volunteering into the sort of life blood of the nation following 2012. [R6]

Respondents felt there had been a greater focus on other legacies compared to one for volunteering; for example, the government interviewee acknowledged:

The physical regeneration legacy was probably the most planned because obviously they set up a mayoral corporation and then you had a part to do something with. I think the rest of it was probably a bit more ad hoc. [R9]

Lack of mechanisms for facilitating a volunteer legacy were also highlighted by the London respondents, particularly in respect of timing. A volunteer resource centre interviewee discussed how they:

…had a core group of people [Games Makers] trained and inspired to do more. But then there was a flat period after the Games where nothing was in place and there was no sort of structured method of them continuing what they'd done already. [R5]

This challenge of finding roles for volunteers was also noted by a national sporting organisation respondent:

Having spoken to Join In local leaders, they're always looking for things for people to do and… they volunteer for volunteering's' sake and that's very… that's a very difficult sell for sports clubs. [R16]

An interviewee who was involved as a volunteer felt "as far as I personally was concerned the follow-up was really bad and totally wasted opportunity to draw people into volunteering" [Researcher, R8]. They noted the (mistaken) assumption that people volunteered "because you were interested in sport", which meant that "the idea now of capturing something which is generic volunteering was silly".

As with Sydney, there was evidence of volunteers creating and managing their own legacies. A national sporting organisation interviewee knew of a "massive community" of Olympic volunteers ("there is a real bond") some of whom had then volunteered at the 2014 Commonwealth Games in Glasgow. [R14]

Lessons learnt
The interviewees identified a range of lessons for future Olympic Games; these are discussed in relation to Resources, Structures and Delivery Mechanisms, Strategy, and Knowledge Transfer.

Resources
Perhaps not surprisingly given the greater focus on legacy delivery for London 2012 (as compared to Sydney hosted in the pre-legacy era), there was greater commentary from interviewees on the importance of effectively resourcing legacy efforts. Despite this recognition, several respondents noted the lack of a dedicated

budget for 2012 legacy efforts and the difficulties of sourcing funding, particularly recurrent funding, post-event. This was clearly an issue more generally, not just for the volunteer legacy. One respondent involved in legacy planning at a high level noted that:

> I think the one regret, or the benefit of hindsight [of the Government's Legacy Committee was it] didn't actually have a dedicated budget for legacy. So we had lots of good ideas, lots of things we could do, but actually we ended up trying to scrabble around to do it rather than build it in. [Legacy Body, R3]

This was echoed by the government interviewee who noted that:

> One of the struggles we had generally was about persuading departments to spend money on legacy… So I think there wasn't, in my experience, there wasn't distinct budgets for legacy planned from the start. [R9]

In London, the peak volunteering body interviewee felt that LOCOG hadn't been open about how much it cost "to deliver a fantastic Games programme" and this limited the sector's ability to lobby for legacy funding:

> Because if they [LOCOG] had been more upfront with that [the costs], I think we could've used those figures and used that argument to take into the legacy period to say, 'look this isn't free, it's great value for money, we can do some great cost benefit analysis here but you do need to invest the £10 million, or whatever it is that we're guessing it might have cost to deliver the volunteering programme if you want something on that size and scale for the future.' [R6]

There were related lessons offered regarding investment in existing infrastructure and utilising the resources of corporate partners more in order to fund legacy. Legacy body interviewees had various ideas about how the IOC and OCOGs could leverage existing relationships to better fund and support legacy. These included:

> We would really like it if the IOC took a CSR responsibility approach to this and said to all the top sponsors, one percent of your contribution will go towards legacy stuff. That might be quite powerful, because it would guarantee some money. And then you could leverage even more, because you could say to governments, if you want a volunteering legacy for this, there's going to be X million from our sponsor pool, but you've got to match it, and then you can have some. And that might actually help. [R15]

> I'm sure a lot of those Olympic partners would be interested in legacy. So almost even if there was a forum to talk about these are the sorts of things that we think that we could achieve out of this legacy, these are the sorts of costs and are people interested and have like some proposals to put to almost as… and give them first refusal because they're… especially when they're the Olympic sponsors, might be quite a good way to do it and to attract more money. [R10]

Using the example of the Games Makers sponsor, McDonalds:

> You could possibly argue that if you'd gone to McDonald's and said actually you're gonna get two bites of the cherry right? You're gonna have your name stamped all over the Games Maker programme and if you fund us a little bit more money for the next five years after the Games are over, they might be quite interested in that. [R11]

Returning to the tensions between supporting existing infrastructure over developing new initiatives, a volunteer resource centre representative felt that new organisations would disappear once funding ran out.

> ...investigat[ing] existing infrastructure, existing organisations, there would be an ongoing capacity, knowledge and awareness within the sector that would last beyond a period of contract. [R7]

Further recommendations under the Resources theme related to the importance of quantifying the value of Olympic volunteering programmes.

Structures and delivery mechanisms
The London respondents were more cognisant of the distinction between OCOG's delivering the Games as opposed to actual legacies. In light of this acknowledgement, there were strong arguments that a separate body responsible for legacy should be instituted. As the LOCOG respondent recognised:

> In staging and delivering a successful Games, inevitably as the deadline for delivery gets closer, the tension between balancing the needs of the Games at the time and the fulfilment of legacy promises becomes fraught. The very nature of any OCOG is to successfully deliver their event. With the benefit of hindsight, it would have been good to have an operational team of people working alongside the delivery team, extracting what was necessary to build a more robust and pervasive legacy across all areas. [R13]

The peak volunteering body interviewee also recognised "the tensions involved in delivering such an enormous event and the legacy planning" [R6]. He argued that, while the two need to be connected, that:

> My experience and reflections on London is that if we're serious about legacy we've got to have an organisation or a body of people that are primarily or exclusively focused on legacy rather than worrying about delivery issues.

Again, there were calls for legacy structures to involve as much as possible the existing volunteering infrastructure in host cities with a view to facilitating long-term relationships. The different approaches of LOCOG's Games Maker programme and the other volunteering programmes (especially the Team London Ambassadors) was again noted. By engaging with local volunteer centres the Ambassador programme was seen to have "much greater buy-in and much greater connection to the existing volunteering institutions that then helped to spread the good word and that sense of enthusiasm" [R6]. This peak volunteering body interviewee saw this as a "more radical and a braver approach" and contrasted this with the LOCOG approach: "they decided to go with sort of larger tried and tested delivery organisations where they could have more of a sort of a command, a control relationship with".

While there was understanding of the risk of putting the Games volunteer programme out to the voluntary sector to deliver:

> I do think that their failure to fully engage the sector in terms of delivery meant that that real sort of spirit wasn't quite disseminated as much as it could've been. [R6]

It was suggested by the CEO of one national sports organisation that engaged with the 2012 volunteer programmes that OCOGs should be encouraged to engage not only with Olympic Federations but directly, and in more depth with the individual sports bodies. The interviewee reflected that while LOCOG did this, and held regular updates for the different sports to attend, upon arrival:

> LOCOG would bring in six or seven different people from different departments to update on ticketing, to update on venue plans, to update on whatever, and I would sit there in those meetings and my entire mindset was about where is there an opportunity for us to engage here? And then I would make sure that post those meetings, anything that was an opportunity for us we would go and say, "We're here, we can help with that", which is how we kind of got in the door with the whole volunteering stuff. Now…. if we're gonna really maximise the whole volunteering legacy piece, you need all sports to try and respond that way. [R14]

One legacy body interviewee acknowledged the importance of "working within an existing infrastructure and not creating something new" [R15] and another spoke specifically about Team London's post-Games programmes:

> They've got a lot of power and lot of reach, and their programme, We Are Ambassadors, has a very ambitious aim, to raise the awareness and develop the volunteering potential of children and young people in every London state school. Now they probably won't quite hit that, but they've got to 2,000 schools already. That's really impressive.

The pre- and during Games period was highlighted by one volunteer resource centre interviewee as a missed opportunity to build on some of the connections being made, suggesting "because it was such a time limited experience a lot of it didn't lead to lasting relationships between key sector bodies" [R7]. As such, whilst it was identified that there was engagement between volunteer centres, for example, through the delivery of training for volunteers involved during Games time, there were not clearly identified long-term programmes to be further developed and built upon, and the same respondent reflected "there wasn't that longevity of relationship which meant anything could succeed and I think that dropped off quite quickly after the Games times".

Like Sydney, issues relating to the volunteer database were again highlighted in respect of London 2012, notably with respect of the delay of handover of this data for subsequent purposes. It was suggested by one interviewee, who managed a volunteer research centre, that given the challenges that the Sydney Games had previously faced that "London would have learned from their experiences, and they could have thought and planned it a lot more so there wasn't this massive delay and losing momentum to engage people" [R4]. The Government interviewee recognised:

> There was a bit of concern as there was a bit of a hiatus immediately after the Games so there was lots of too-ing and fro-ing about what became known as the LOCOG database. I actually ended up being slightly bizarrely on a panel that decided where the LOCOG database was going to go in the end, and I think it did take about six or seven months after the Games, so there was a fair amount of that period that anybody who was interested kind of stopped being interested. I mean actually they were still getting stuff and they were still being communicated with, so I'm not really sure if we really lost that many people. [R9]

Representatives from the voluntary sector were perhaps more critical, with one volunteer resource centre interviewee reflecting:

> There were tens of thousands of people who were held on a database somewhere that no-one had access to and all of our experience would suggest that if someone is interested and motivated, we need to capture that right there and do something with it, and letting it drift for months with absolutely no contact or engagement in the volunteering they could've done in their local community was a massive loss for London. I think it's a massive loss for some of our most vulnerable systems who could have really benefited from that engagement. Some people are really passionate, prepared to give their time and wanted somewhere to channel their energies and no-one seemed to think about what was going to happen to them. Or if they were thinking about it, that thinking wasn't communicated more widely and it didn't lead to any action. So I think there was a loss of momentum and enthusiasm. [R7]

Strategy

Perhaps again, because London 2012 was promoted as an Olympic and Paralympic Games of the legacy era, a number of respondents recommended that legacy should first and foremost be planned from the bidding stage, and supported with clearly articulated plans for volunteer legacies. One legacy body interviewee was adamant that there was a need to "build the responsibility into the bidding process across the host nation, the host city, and the OCOG to say we expect, we want to have a Legacy, not just for volunteering, but we want to have a social legacy" [R3]. The same respondent articulated the need for:

> A specific plan that when the government and the OCOG are signing up to that, they commit to it. I think I would specifically ask them to tell you how much money they're putting into that, so there's a structure and there's funding that ensures that it's delivered over time.

A respondent from a different legacy body recognised that during the planning stage when a city bids, greater clarity is required on what will occur after the Games finish, and the respondent, reflected that host cities:

> …will invest money in the following departments. We'll set them up. We won't wait 'til the eleventh hour, we'll set them up right at the start and we'll have them shadowing or however you end up designing it. [R11]

A peak volunteering body interviewee supported this view and indicated there was evidence that the IOC were acknowledging the increasing importance of the social legacy that incorporated the volunteer legacy when commenting:

> There was a real wake up and an increasing recognition that if we were to deliver something out of the enormous expense that goes into running these events then we need to focus on the social as well as the economic and that's a huge potential social and participation legacy that I think is there to be grasped. So I think we're moving in the right direction. However, I think that there's still some way to go in terms of really understanding what it is that's going to enable us to deliver that once the inevitable euphoria of the Games itself has disappeared. I think we could argue that probably 18 months to two years on after the Games people were still talking about the Games Makers and people were still sharing their experiences. And that was all

great for a couple of years but I think we need more than that. We need some more institutional structures and strategies, we need some more recognition of the investment required, I think, if we're going to deliver something meaningful over and beyond that immediate post Games euphoric period. [R6]

With regards to social legacies and strategic planning, one legacy body representative identified that many Games Makers were not involved in sport, and reflected that there were "volunteer vicars, pastors, volunteers showing people the way round the streets, there were people doing first aid, and not necessarily anything to do with the sporty side" [R15]. The respondent also suggested there are clear strategic roles for host cities, government, the IOC and Olympic sponsors, recognising that:

> The caravan shouldn't just move on like that, because you'll never get another chance, and there'll come a time when cities say we can't afford to do this, and you won't be able to point to benefits, sustainable benefits. No one ever can, I've spoken to various IOC conferences, and no one can ever point to sustainable benefits, because no one's ever there to see them through.

Knowledge transfer
Despite London 2012 Games participating in the Olympic Games Knowledge Management (OGKM) programme (IOC, 2014), borne out of the Sydney 2000 Games, generally mechanisms for knowledge transfer were not clear and transparent to all the London interviewees. As such, they made a range of recommendations for improving knowledge transfer, many of which focused on perceived process gaps, particularly in terms of the transfer of knowledge between other stakeholder groups, not limited just to the work of OCOGs.

One legacy body interviewee acknowledged:

> I think what we've done quite well is passing on what we did to other OCOGs, a lot of knowledge transfer, so for me, a major consideration is how do we see this as a baton race, and how do you pass it forward. [R3]

In contrast, another legacy body respondent commented:

> No one from the IOC ever came and asked me for the learnings on the [*name removed*] programme. So they never went anywhere. And they probably thought that LOCOG had got them all. [R11]

Another interviewee identified that "OCOG to OCOG material is not always particularly user-friendly... but at least it's there", and they then questioned "are there reports that the IOC should ask the host city to write, to transfer to the next host city?; and are there materials that they should ask the host city to share? We have got so much stuff" [Legacy Body, R10]. To emphasise the importance of knowledge transfer programmes, the peak volunteering body representative recognised:

> I think it goes back to knowledge transfer. There's a need for a real clear statement and description and narrative about the steps that were taken and the way in which programmes was developed and implemented with full costings. I think that would be hugely powerful for future Games organisers, but also for future legacy discussions. Because, that's been missing in terms of the post Games dialogue. Everybody holds

up the 2012 programme, volunteering programme as being a landmark in terms of volunteering profile and recognition but nobody follows through what it means in terms of management, leadership, investment, support. [R6]

In addition, there was also recognition of the digital opportunities for future knowledge transfer processes, and the LOCOG representative supported this with the following recommendation:

I would suggest the development of a 'Guide to Digital Volunteering', which could be used as an introduction to volunteering when starting an OCOG. It could even be in the form of 'the do's and don'ts, or the things to be aware of' when organising a volunteer programme. In its basic form, it could be used to explain the 'volunteer journey'. [R13]

Like the Sydney case study, several respondents acknowledged the importance of contextualising the lessons learnt from previous Games in relation to the unique conditions of each new host city. Two legacy body respondents reinforced this point, with both articulating similar perspectives:

It's a bit like if I went to Japan now and unpacked all the (name removed) Programme and said to them, "It's brilliant. Just do it all". That is (a) misguided and very arrogant. I think you have to start with what are the city's objectives, what is the city trying to do through the Games and post Games? [R11]

You know we have been volunteering for generations which is very different from when I've spoken to Sochi, to Tokyo, or to Rio. So you know every city has to put their own context on it which is incredibly important. In London we have had a lot of people approach us about how should they recruit, how should they do this, how should they do that. There's lots of lessons they can learn from us, but the context is very different in London. [R10]

5. DISCUSSION

This section integrates the findings from the primary data collection (Section 4) with the secondary sources (Section 2) in order to comprehensively compare and contrast the two cases of Sydney 2000 and London 2012. It should be noted the primary and secondary data lend different strengths to the overall case study evaluation and comparison. The secondary data analysis assisted greatly with describing the scope of each volunteering programme, the key players involved and aided in identifying the volunteer legacies associated with each Games. The primary data analysis provided an insider perspective to the Games and the associated volunteer legacies, particularly in regard to the recommendations for future best practice. There are many similarities between the two cases, but also some key differences, which will be discussed at the conclusion of this section, with both cases compared using phases of the sustainable event legacy timeline.

5.1 Impacts, legacies and stakeholder engagement

Impacts
Informed by the interview data, there was a mix of opinion from respondents as to whether the impacts of the Games volunteering programmes were positive. The majority of interviewees were of the opinion that the profile of volunteering was raised as a result of the publicity generated during the Games. This was positive in that volunteering was once again seen as an attractive activity to participate in due to the positivity surrounding its media coverage, as well as the energy and exuberance felt in the host cities during the Games. In addition, Sydney respondents considered that Games volunteering broadened the scope of volunteering in people's minds, encouraging them to look out for and participate in episodic and event volunteering, a newer concept in 2000 compared to 2012 (Handy, Brodeur & Cnaan, 2006). Sydney respondents also felt that corporations were more inclined to participate in corporate volunteering once they saw the positive impacts of Games volunteering, providing a boost to another newer form of volunteering (Merrill, 2006).

On the other hand, there was also the view that volunteering during Games time led to uneven profiling of select forms of volunteering, particularly in the case of London. Informants suggested that sports and events were the primary beneficiaries of any legacy, whereas other areas did not realise as much benefit. In his evidence to the House of Lords Select Committee (2013), Lord Coe did acknowledge that not all Games Makers would want to become involved with volunteering at sports clubs. Even within sports volunteering, there were opinions that this was the glamorous side of sports volunteering that was being profiled, and not the day-to-day trench-digging required of regular sports volunteers.

Volunteer programme before Games
In regard to LOCOG, while there was a working group to drive the objectives of the volunteer programme, there was the perception amongst respondents that voluntary organisations were left largely unengaged. The respondents felt this lack of engagement was a strategy specifically employed by LOCOG to attract people who had never volunteered, which they saw as a legacy to the nation. The lack of engagement with volunteer organisations became an issue of contention when contrasted with the use of paid consultants, as (a) volunteer organisations felt that

their contributions should have been better valued, and (b) consultants were not seen as having expert knowledge relevant to volunteering and volunteer infrastructure. Instead, some volunteer organisations worked with other non-LOCOG programmes (such as Team London) to leverage off existing volunteering infrastructure. It was also acknowledged that LOCOG worked with other non-volunteer organisations (such as Podium for FE & HE) to deliver their volunteer programmes.

The secondary evidence from Sydney suggests a deeper level of engagement was facilitated between the sector and SOCOG by way of the Volunteer Advisory Committee, however, this forum was primarily focused on delivery rather than legacy outcomes.

The importance of training was emphasised in the case of both Games, though there was less positivity about the London Games than Sydney. The Sydney respondents saw the emphasis and excellence of Sydney Games's volunteer training as a lesson learnt from the preceding Atlanta Games at which the volunteer programme was neglected. Indeed, the secondary analysis indicated that one of the key legacies of the Sydney Games was the exporting of TAFE NSW's volunteer training package to other mega and major events (Australian Trade Commission, n.d.). Unfortunately, while the training package was transferred to other events including the Athens Olympic Games, it was not made available to volunteer organisations within Australia.

Games volunteering was used both as a recruitment tool to encourage new volunteers to get involved and as a reward for people who had been long-time volunteers. Hence, some respondents were of the opinion that good training programmes went beyond specific roles during Games periods to include skills that would transfer and be useful to other volunteering opportunities. While the London respondents concentrated more on volunteers' roles during the Games, the Sydney respondents tended to discuss the training in relation to taking care of volunteer motivation, engagement, fulfilment and legacy.

Volunteer legacy planned by OCOG and/or government
Overall, respondents felt that there was a lack of clarity in regard to the legacy directives from both LOCOG and SOCOG. Neither OCOG ultimately were in charge of implementing their legacies and indeed it was not their job to do so (IOC, 2013b).

In the case of Sydney, the respondents indicated that any legacy initiatives were largely bottom up and driven by the voluntary sector and the volunteers themselves (Cashman, 2006). This view is supported by the secondary analysis with post-event initiatives such as the SMEVP highlighted as a post-event response by the NSW peak volunteering body to capture and retain the skills of Olympic volunteers for ongoing event volunteering (Hollway, 2001).

Join In was articulated by London interviewees as being the key initiative planned to manage the volunteer legacy. However, interviewees called into question the clarity of Join In's legacy directives, its focus (is it just sports volunteering?) and its reach into areas beyond London. Furthermore, some interviewees were of the opinion that Join In came too late in the planning process as a reaction to the impending end of

the Games, rather than being a fully thought out and planned legacy initiative. Certainly, these comments resonated with the findings of the House of Commons Select Committee that the implementation of Join In was not instigated early enough (House of Lords, 2013).

Volunteer legacy planned by others
Team London, Sport England, Spirit of 2012, selective National Governing Bodies for Sport, and CSPs were the key organisations that were mentioned in relation to volunteer legacies for London in both the secondary analysis and interviews. In particular, Team London's initiatives were highlighted in terms of building a volunteering app to facilitate participation, and the variety of volunteer programmes they offered in order to build skills and improve youth employability outcomes. The insider perspective of the interviewees also identified that Team London had engaged more heavily with existing volunteering infrastructure (e.g., VRCs) in the conduct of their programmes. Local areas had also leveraged the Games volunteering programmes to encourage connections and continued volunteering, particularly in regions that hosted Olympic events (e.g., Weymouth and Portland Ambassadors programme).

The two sectors in Sydney that leveraged off the Sydney Games to create legacies were universities in NSW and the volunteering sector, namely, Volunteering Australia/The Centre for Volunteering NSW and local VRCs. The former sought legacies based on their work with the Olympic community and their students' employment prospects. The latter promoted volunteering aggressively in the absence of SOCOG-initiated volunteer legacies, which were largely due to the privacy laws of the time that prohibited the distribution of volunteers' contact details on the Olympic database to other volunteer organisations, and also in conjunction with the 2001 IYV.

Management of volunteer legacy
Findings from both the secondary and primary analysis for London suggested opportunities had been missed (House of Lords, 2013) to fully capitalise on the volunteer legacy of the 2012 Games. London interviewees mentioned that they did not see an increase in post-Games volunteering, which some attributed to LOCOG's focus on an asset legacy rather than a social one. Furthermore, there was a sentiment that the legacy should positively impact more than just the host city or select sports. Anecdotes suggested that volunteers were sometimes also managing their own legacies by forming their own networks for meet-ups similar to Sydney volunteers.

In regard to Sydney, some volunteers actively managed their own legacies by having regular meet-ups, and by participating in further volunteering at future Games or with other organisations, as the findings of the secondary analysis suggested, for example, in relation to the Royal Easter Show. Volunteer organisations also felt that the lessons they had learnt in terms of volunteer management and training could qualify as legacies of the Sydney Games.

Across both the London and Sydney interviewees, there was an assumption that the feel-good effects of volunteering at each of the Games would lead to continued volunteer involvement through the self-directed initiative of the volunteers. However,

interviewees pointed out there were a lack of mechanisms and resources available to deliver these enthusiastic Games volunteers to suitable roles.

5.2   Lessons learnt

Resources
In regards to resources, both the London and Sydney interviewees emphasised the importance of identifying funding sources to resource legacy initiatives. Some of the potential funding sources mentioned were the OCOG's budget, government's budget, proceeds from the sale of Olympic assets, or a fixed allocation of sponsorship money into a legacy fund, the latter suggestion more prominently raised by the London respondents. The interviewees recognised that funding was required to run legacy programmes, but found it hard to obtain this funding after the Games, thereby highlighting the importance of securing dedicated budgets for legacy initiatives upfront. The length of time for which this funding was available was also raised as an issue, as a long-term volunteer legacy would require some form of recurrent funding. These issues were also identified in the secondary analysis, particularly for the London case, with Davis Smith (2012) noting that like any other sector, investment was required to realise a lasting legacy for volunteering.

Interviewees also suggested the quantification of the value of Olympic volunteer programmes was required in order to convince governments to provide legacy funding.

Structures and delivery mechanisms
All the interviewees were unanimous in recognising the temporary nature of OCOGs as restricting their capacity to delivery legacies. Furthermore, there was widespread recognition that it was not the primary responsibility of OCOGs to do so. The two key alternatives suggested were government and a separate, independent organisation set up specifically to manage volunteer legacy, working in tandem with the OCOG.

There was also recognition that the organisation that eventually managed volunteer legacy would have to work closely with existing volunteer organisations. This was in order to make use of and feed into their existing volunteering infrastructure with a view to facilitating continued volunteer involvement.

Both London and Sydney interviewees commented that the delivery mechanisms to facilitate volunteer legacy were absent immediately post-Games. In the case of Sydney, the implementation of then privacy laws prevented volunteers' contact information (gained at application stage) from being disseminated to volunteer organisations. Volunteering Australia, Volunteering NSW and VRCs circumvented this circumstance by aggressively publicising for volunteers in order to leverage off the positivity of the Sydney Games.

The London interviewees also thought that LOCOG had not made decisions around what to do with volunteers' contact information, thereby delaying any possible follow-up with volunteers for a few months instead of allowing relevant volunteer organisations to contact them immediately post-event. In both cases, the need to follow up quickly post-Games was considered imperative to ride the wave of positivity and goodwill that resulted from the Games time volunteering programmes.

Strategy

In formulating legacy strategies, interviewees from both the London and Sydney Games agreed that the earlier the volunteer legacy was factored into the planning process, the more benefits could be realised. It was suggested that candidate cities need to plan their volunteer legacy prior to bidding, and incorporate volunteer legacy as part of their bid.

Clarity in legacy planning was an issue that was emphasised throughout. Most organisations that eventually created their own legacies thought that although legacy was repeatedly mentioned pre-Games, the actual plans and outcomes for legacy were not clearly articulated by OCOGs or government. The articulation of any legacies needed to be clear and transparent, with specific and measurable targets set so that progress could be monitored. In addition, any organisation set up specifically to manage volunteer legacy should then be held to account for those legacy objectives and should add value to the existing volunteer landscape (i.e., not duplicate existing resources).

Knowledge transfer

Generally, the official mechanisms for knowledge transfer, whilst initiated by Sydney and in place for London, were not overly clear and transparent to the interviewees, particularly those informing the London case. All respondents agreed that knowledge transfer was as important not just for the next Olympic Games, but also in terms of cities' bidding for future major sporting events. Respondents identified additional forms of knowledge transfer aside from OCOG to OCOG transmission, which included host city administration to host city administration and volunteering sector to volunteering sector streams, recognising that Games time lessons were not confined to the domain of OCOGs.

In spite of this, the interviewees also cautioned that wholesale knowledge transfer without taking into account local context would be counter-productive. The aim of the knowledge transfer programmes should therefore be centred around the learnings from previous successful and unsuccessful programmes, across all stakeholder groups, and not a direct transfer of practices without regard to the characteristics of host cities. In particular, the existing culture of volunteering in host cities and host nations must be taken into account in relation to planning for volunteer legacy programmes.

5.3   Summary: Comparison of Sydney 2000 and London 2012

Using Holmes, Hughes, Mair and Carlsen's (2015) sustainable event legacy timeline, the many commonalities across the two cases (identified from the primary and secondary analysis) can be considered from bid through to legacy phase (Table 2). The few differences, which were mostly at the planning and legacy phases, are also presented.

Table 2: Event Volunteer Legacy timeline: Comparison of Sydney 2000 and London 2012

Event Phase	Commonalities	Differences
Bid	• No explicit focus on volunteer legacy	

Event planning	• Both Games established a volunteer advisory committee/steering group to inform the volunteer programme
	• Some recognition of the importance of planning for the volunteer legacy, but various aspects that could have been improved:
	  o No organisation given responsibility for management of the volunteer legacy
	  o Legacy activities focused on planning the asset legacy rather than other legacies, such as volunteering
	  o Need for clear and measurable plans for the volunteer legacy programme identified
	  o Need to allocate ongoing funding to implement a volunteer legacy programme identified
	  o Quantifying the value of volunteer work at the Games highlighted as strengthening the case for funding
		• Involvement of existing volunteer organisations
		Sydney: Volunteer organisations consulted and kept involved by SOCOG
		London: Volunteer organisations felt left out of the LOCOG's planning process, but more involved in the non-LOCOG Olympic-related programmes

Event delivery	• Programme operation is the focus rather than legacy • Volunteers a crucial element in the delivery of both Games • Volunteers experienced enormous pride and enthusiasm	

Transition	• Great enthusiasm for volunteering after the Games, but neither event was able to capitalise on this adequately
	• Challenges in the post-event period included:
	  o Ownership of the volunteer database and contact information
	  o Knowledge transfer processes between OCOGs and the OCOG and host city seen as important but unclear
	  o Knowledge transfer needs to take into account the volunteering culture of the host city and nation	

Legacy	• The Games raised the profile of volunteering and volunteer roles • Involving existing volunteer organisations seen as important for delivering volunteer legacies but not effectively used in either case	• Post-Games volunteering Sydney: small but temporary boost London: little increase • Clarity of legacy directives Sydney: Not a key focus London: Join In main legacy organisation but ability to manage legacy questioned • Legacies led by non-OCOG bodies: Sydney: led by volunteer sector/ volunteer resource centres London: led by Team London, sport organisations, volunteers or local volunteer organisations

Bid phase

For both Sydney and London, there were no legacies articulated for volunteering at bid stage. Legacy was not a theme that Sydney needed to address as a candidate city for the 2000 Games.

Planning phase

Both Games established a volunteer advisory committee/steering group to drive the volunteer programmes. However, interviewees from both cases identified aspects of volunteer legacy planning that could have been improved.

In both cases, the OCOG was focused on the planning and delivery of the Games, not the legacy and no other organisation was given sole responsibility for legacy at the planning stage. Suggestions for who could have led volunteer legacy planning included the government, volunteer organisations, and the creation of an organisation solely responsible for the volunteer legacy. The legacy planning that took place focused on asset legacies and neither event was deemed to have defined legacy plans regarding volunteering, although this is understandable in Sydney's case where legacy was not part of the bid or candidature process.

Continuing from the bid phase, it was seen as important that legacy was a key element in the planning phase of the event. Volunteer legacies were discussed to varying degrees (less for Sydney, more so for London), but lacked actual concrete plans. Clear and measurable plans were preferred by participants as they could have provided clarity regarding the legacy, which could have been incorporated into the design of Games volunteer programmes, while measurable targets could support the case for longer-term funding. The importance of funding was highlighted more broadly. Interviewees were of the opinion that ongoing funding rather than start-up funding was imperative to any planned volunteer legacy programmes. They recognised that programmes could not be sustained without recurrent funding, and that it was easier to secure funding at the planning stage rather than after the Games had concluded.

Bringing volunteer legacy planning into this phase would have facilitated readiness for any post-Games legacy initiatives to be launched immediately after the event. An example provided was developing the technology required (such as platforms for matching volunteers and opportunities), so this was in place and ready to implement before the euphoria of the Games wore off in the minds of the volunteers.

A key difference between the two events was the OCOG's engagement with existing volunteer organisations. SOCOG actively consulted with and involved national, state and territory volunteer organisations. At London, existing volunteer organisations felt left out of the planning process, particularly in relation to LOCOG's lack of engagement. Non-LOCOG Olympic-related programmes such as Team London were perceived as being more receptive towards the involvement of volunteer organisations.

Event delivery

In the delivery phase, the focus was on the event and operating the volunteer programme rather than on legacy. In both Games, volunteers were acknowledged as a crucial element in the delivery of the event, with volunteers demonstrating

enormous pride and enthusiasm in their roles. The uniforms helped create and reinforce their identity.

Transition phase
In the immediate aftermath of the Games, there was great enthusiasm for volunteering, but interviewees in both cases felt that this was not capitalised upon adequately. Challenges in the post-event period included restrictions regarding the ownership of the volunteer database and contact information. In Sydney the distribution of volunteer contact information was hampered by existing privacy laws; in London, there was a delay in determining who should maintain the database going forward. Knowledge transfer was seen as important but the transfer process was not clear to all respondents or inclusive of all stakeholder groups. Knowledge transfer needs to include both transfer between OCOGs and the OCOG and host city and country. It was also emphasised that wholesale knowledge transfer without considering the volunteer culture of host cities would not succeed.

Legacy phase
It is in the legacy phase that noticeable differences were seen between the two cases, with legacies being sector driven in the case of Sydney (bottom up approach) and instituted by more formal bodies in the case of London (top down approach).

Undoubtedly, both Games raised the profile of volunteering, and broadened the people's view of what constitutes volunteer activities and roles. The involvement existing of volunteer organisations in delivering volunteer legacies was also emphasised by both London and Sydney interviewees. In general, it was hoped that by working with volunteer organisations, planning for the influx of willing volunteers post-Games, this would allow volunteer organisations to plan their capacities proactively.

Despite not being planned pre-Games, Sydney's legacy was centred around the development of volunteer skills to benefit volunteer organisations. In London, the legacy was unclear. Although Join In was seen as the key legacy organisation, its ability to manage that legacy was called into question.

6   CONCLUSIONS

Volunteers are increasingly heralded as key to the success of the Olympic Games. In the post 2000 legacy era, it is not surprising that increasing emphasis is being placed on host cities to leverage off the goodwill of the Games in order to create sustained legacies of volunteer participation.

OCOGs, primarily as the delivery mechanism of the Games, must increasingly work with local stakeholders to leave a lasting legacy (IOC, 2013a) in recognition of the finite nature of these bodies. The underpinning notion of this study was that organisations already managing volunteers in host cities, the volunteering infrastructure, are best placed to manage such legacies going forward given their existing networks and expertise in volunteer management. The volunteering infrastructure is defined as the organisations and programmes in place to promote, support and manage volunteering; including volunteering peak bodies, volunteer resource centres, national governing bodies of sport, community organisations and local government.

Currently, there is limited evidence as to the extent to which OCOGs engage with key stakeholders to drive legacy outcomes. In the volunteering space, only one recent study (Benson et al., 2014) was found that noted the potential of volunteer training as a legacy opportunity for the Vancouver 2010 Olympic and Paralympic Winter Games, may have been greater if there had been further engagement between the OCOG and community groups about legacy planning.

Expanding upon the preliminary evidence of Benson et al. (2014), the current study sought to specifically explore how Olympic volunteer programmes can lead to post-Games volunteer legacies for host cities through engagement with the established volunteer infrastructure in host cities. Two Summer Olympic Games were used as case studies for this purpose: the recent case of London 2012 and the longer-term case of Sydney 2000.

6.1   Revisiting the objectives

In concluding, we revisit the overarching objectives of the study:

a) To examine how far can an Olympic volunteer programme lead to a sustained positive legacy of longer-term volunteer participation in the host city.

In both cases, there was secondary and primary evidence to support the contention that an Olympic volunteer programme can lead to a sustained and positive legacy of volunteering participation in the host city, however, the impact of this legacy over the longer-term may be questioned.

In the case of Sydney, in the pre-legacy era of the Olympics, there are examples of continued legacies to this day (e.g., volunteering at the Royal Easter Show, the continued export of TAFE NSW's volunteering programme). Respondents indicated that the main boost in volunteer participation lasted between three to four years and this is borne out in the secondary data with the Australian Bureau of Statistics reporting only a slight increase of 2% in sport volunteering from 2000 to 2006 (ABS,

2006). The extended timeframe of the Sydney case suggests that three to four years is the optimum period for maximising post-Games legacies.

In the more recent case of London, their legacy story may be still unfolding, as the Government suggest, "a lasting legacy from the London 2012 Olympic & Paralympic Games has always been a long-term goal. Just as the Games took ten years to win, plan and deliver, so legacy must be seen as a ten-year project to realise lasting change" (HM Government, 2014, p. 4). Regardless, under the more critical eye of the post-legacy era, there is evidence of volunteer legacies already, mostly localised to the sports and events sectors. If the UK Government is serious about its extended legacy focus, then the longer-term effects of these will need to be re-evaluated towards 2022.

b) To evaluate how the relationship between the volunteer programme and the host city's volunteer infrastructure facilitates realisation of this desired legacy.

The secondary and primary evidence collected in these case studies reveal different approaches by SOCOG and LOCOG. SOCOG had put a mechanism in place pre-Games, the Volunteer Advisory Committee, which effectively engaged volunteering peak bodies, volunteer-involving organisations and community groups in planning for the Games time volunteering programme. Though legacy, and a volunteer legacy specifically, was never part of SOCOG's remit, it is possible that this structure, if resourced, could have carried forward post-event to champion a volunteer legacy. Instead, it was left to the volunteering sector itself to undertake this role and promote volunteering, drawing on the euphoria surrounding the success of the Games and the "the most dedicated and wonderful volunteers ever" (Nixon, 2000, p. 5).

This bottom-up approach, contrasts with the top-down approach of London. The collective evidence suggests that there was a lack of clarity and delays involved in planning for a volunteer legacy of the 2012 Games. It was not clear whose responsibility it was to drive the legacy, and respondents, confirming the secondary analysis, considered that initiatives such as Join In came too late in the process and were too localised to sports and events in their focus. On LOCOG's part, in seeking to engage with key stakeholders to leave a lasting volunteer legacy, there was some evidence of deliberate disengagement with the voluntary sector in this process, as a strategy, in part, to recruit people new to volunteering. Team London, run out of the Mayor of London's office, was viewed comparatively as engaging more deeply with the existing volunteering infrastructure.

Our conclusions tentatively propose that greater engagement between OCOGs and the host cities' volunteer infrastructure could better facilitate the realisation of volunteer legacies. Taking an evidence based agenda forward, given both cases shared contextual similarities (e.g., the countries are liberal democracies with strong volunteering cultures), it would be worthwhile expanding the study to investigate these issues in non-westernised settings. Tokyo in 2020 and Beijing in 2022 would seem ideal cases for such a study going forward.

6.2   Limitations

The limitations of the current study employing two case studies to explore the volunteer legacies of two Olympic Games, Sydney 2000 and London 2012, and the extent of engagement by volunteering infrastructure stakeholders in the creation of those legacies, must be acknowledged.

Firstly, while the impact of the Games may have had an impact beyond the physical boundaries of the two host cities, for the purposes of this study, the fieldwork was limited to London and Sydney as this is where any impact would have been the greatest.

The nature of the study as a qualitative investigation means that the findings cannot be generalised beyond the two cases studied but lessons can be learnt for future Olympic Games. Certainly, informants from both case studies recognised that their experiences may not easily be translated to other host cities, particularly those without existing volunteering cultures.

There were challenges in identifying interviewees in the case of Sydney, given the passage of time and as such the number of informants for this case is lower than for London. However, we are confident that based on the consistency of the responses of those interviewed, that the point of theoretical saturation was reached (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

As was the case in Minnaert's (2012) multi-Games study, which collected data over an extended timeframe, it proved more difficult to source key informants for the Sydney case study. Many of the potential informants identified by the secondary analysis could not be traced and/or their contact details could not be located. Minnaert (2012) also called into question the validity of the responses to her study, citing the difficulties of either insufficient or too much time having passed to make meaningful judgements based on the data collected. Certainly, the greater positive responses of the Sydney respondents may indicate some response bias was at play, with the more positive aspects of the event retained in memory over time.

Given the support of the NCVO in facilitating access to respondents for the London case, and more generally, the senior profile of interviewees across both cases, some of the respondents could potentially be viewed as 'establishment figures' (Cho & Bairner, 2012). There were instances when respondents were reluctant to comment on the more negative, perhaps unrealised aspects of legacy, moving beyond the official line.

Ultimately, it may be queried that in conducting this comparative study, whether like for like was compared in selecting the cases of the Sydney 2000 and London 2012 Olympic Games. Preuss (2007) critiques the practice of benchmarking event legacies in highlighting that each mega event is unique, complex, dynamic and affected by a range of global and localised factors. In recognition, the conclusions drawn from the current study need to be set against the backdrop of the bidding process for each of the Games and the prominence given to legacy from bidding, through to Games delivery and beyond. In the case of London 2012, legacy was a requirement of the bidding process, while for Sydney any legacy in the case of volunteering was certainly not mandated by the IOC at bidding stage and if anything, was a supplementary outcome of the Games.

Nevertheless, by directly comparing two Olympic Games our findings reveal opportunities for volunteer legacy planning and delivery for future host cities. Our findings and recommendations will enable hosts to harness the skills and enthusiasm of their communities both during and after the event to bring lasting benefits to both individuals and society.

7   RECOMMENDATIONS

These recommendations aim to provide direction as to how both future OCOGs and host cities might best engage with any existing volunteering infrastructure in order to plan for and realise a sustainable and positive post-event volunteer legacy, and how the IOC can support this.

7.1   Recommendations for Olympic Host Cities

Resources
Host cities should:
1. Provide dedicated budgets for volunteer legacy efforts. Sources could include ring-fenced funding from the OCOG budget, sale of assets, and sponsorship.
2. Any funding needs to be ongoing to support longer-term legacy projects.
3. Value and renumerate the expertise of voluntary sector contributions to Games planning processes as having similar importance to that of commercial consultants.
4. Educate OCOG staff on good practice in volunteer management and how to effectively engage with volunteers and the volunteering sector.

Structures and delivery mechanisms
Host cities should:
5. Ensure that effective structures (new or existing) are in place from the pre-planning stage of the Games to ensure that a volunteer legacy is delivered.
6. Establish responsibility for delivering the volunteer legacy, both in terms of infrastructure and human capital.
7. Develop partnerships and dialogue with existing volunteer infrastructure organisations such as peak bodies.
8. Establish a mechanism for legacy planning input from the existing volunteer sector.
9. Ensure that legacy plans will involve Games time volunteers and those inspired to volunteer after the Games, and are not solely focused on the sport and event sectors.
10. Develop appropriate technological support to facilitate the volunteer legacy.
11. Establish ownership and post-event use of the volunteer database, including ensuring the Games volunteer database has been appropriately compiled with necessary permissions from individual volunteers for use by legacy bodies.

Strategy
Host cities should:
12. Develop a vision of the post-Games volunteer legacy and embed this within the bid document.
13. Use the sustainable event legacy timeline (Table) to embed volunteer legacy throughout the event phases
14. Establish a body with specific responsibility for legacy planning and delivery, to work alongside the OCOG.

Knowledge transfer
Host cities should:

15. Establish processes for volunteering knowledge transfer between OCOGs, other major event organising committees from the host city and country, and the wider volunteering sector.

7.2 Recommendations for the IOC

Resources
The IOC should:
16. Require that candidate cities provide evidence of a ring-fenced legacy budget.
17. Invest in effective resourcing of volunteer legacy programmes.
18. Recognise the value of quantifying the volunteer contribution to the Olympic Games in terms of measuring the outcomes   of the volunteer programme.

Structures and delivery mechanisms
The IOC should:
19. Undertake additional research to examine and critique the distinction between the OCOG's role in delivering the Games as opposed to legacy planning.
20. Clarify whether a host country's privacy laws will permit legacy planning involving the volunteer database.

Strategy
The IOC should:
21. Require that candidate cities outline their volunteer legacy plans in their bid document.
22. Ensure that these legacy plans have measurable targets and tangible legacy outcomes.
23. Encourage official sponsors to contribute to Olympic Games legacies as a form of Corporate Social Responsibility.

Knowledge transfer
The IOC should:
24. Ensure that the knowledge transfer programmes are applied cognisant of the volunteering culture in each host city.
25. Ensure that knowledge transfer agreements between host cities do not prevent knowledge transfer between the OCOG and the wider volunteering sector in the host city and country.
26. Develop resources to be used as an introduction to volunteering when starting an OCOG and to help guide future host cities on their 'volunteering journey'.

We recognise that several of the recommendations to emerge from this study focused on volunteering legacies have been previously raised by the IOC in relation to legacy management more generally and our findings further reinforce the IOC's recommendations. For example, in the Final Report of the IOC Coordination Commission, Games of the XXX Olympiad, London 2012, the following recommendation was noted, "OCOGs and their partners to allocate and protect a dedicated budget to support engagement programmes" (IOC, 2013, p. 42).

8. REFERENCES

Allum, K. (2014). Beyond the Games - How volunteers are helping to create a long lasting sporting legacy. Retrieved from http://www.communitygames.org.uk/content/beyond-games-how-volunteers-are-helping-create-long-lasting-sporting-legacy

Auld, C., Cuskelly, G., & Harrington, M. (2009). *Managing volunteers to enhance the legacy potential of major events*. Oxfordshire: CABI.

Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS). (2006). Voluntary work, Australia. Canberra: ABS.

Australian Government (Department of Family and Community Services). (2002). International Year of Volunteers 2001 evaluation report. Canberra: Commonwealth of Australia.

Australian Trade Commission (Austrade). (n.d.). *Australian education and training capability: Major sporting events*. Sydney: Australian Trade Commission (Austrade).

Bang, H., Alexandris, K., & Ross, S. D. (2008). Validation of the revised volunteer motivations scale for international sporting events (VMS-ISE) at the Athens 2004 Olympic Games. *Event Management, 12*(3-4), 119-131.

BBC News. (2013, 10 April). MPs warn on London 2012 volunteering legacy. Retrieved. *BBC News.* Retrieved from http://www.bbc.com/news/uk-england-london-22187333

Benson, A. M., Dickson, T. J., Terwiel, F. A., & Blackman, D. A. (2014). Training of Vancouver 2010 volunteers: A legacy opportunity? *Contemporary Social Science, 9*(2), 210-226.

Brettell, D. (1999). Sydney Olympic and Paralympic Games 2000. In M. de Moragas, A. Moreno & N. Puig (Eds.), *Volunteers, Global Society and the Olympic Movement*. Lausanne: International Olympic Committee.

Brettell, D. (2001). The Sydney volunteers. *Olympic Review, 42*, 37-43.

Brooks, J., McCluskey, S., Turley, E., & King, N. (2015). The utility of template analysis in qualitative psychology research. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 12*(2), 202-222.

Cashman, R. (2006). *The bitter-sweet awakening: The legacy of the Sydney 2000 Olympic Games*. Sydney: Walla Walla Press.

Cashman, R., & Toohey, K. (2002). *The contribution of the higher education sector to the Sydney 2000 Olympic Games*. Sydney: Centre for Olympic Studies, University of NSW.

Cho, J.-H., & Bairner, A. (2012). The sociocultural legacy of the 1988 Seoul Olympic Games. *Leisure Studies, 31*(3), 271-289.

Coyne, B. S., & Coyne Sr, E. J. (2001). Getting, keeping and caring for unpaid volunteers for professional golf tournament events. *Human Resource Development International, 4*(2), 199-216.

Cuskelly, G., Auld, C., Harrington, M., & Coleman, D. (2004). Predicting the behavioral dependability of sport event volunteers. *Event Management, 9*(1-2), 73-89.

Darcy, S. (2001). The Games for everyone? Planning for disability and access at the Sydney 2000 Paralympic & Olympic Games. *Disability Studies Quarterly, 21*(4), 70-84.

Davis Smith, J. (2012, 20 April). 2012 could be the year of the volunteer – but investment is key. Retrieved from http://ivo.org/post/2012-could-be-the-year-of-the-volunteer-but-investment-is-key-5487689f9108686207659586

DCMS. (2007). *Our promise for 2012: How the UK will benefit from the Olympic Games and Paralympic Games*. Retrieved from UK: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/77719/Ourpromise2012.pdf

DCMS. (2008). *Before, during and after: Making the most of the London 2012 Games*. London: Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS).

DCMS. (2010). *Plans for the legacy from the 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games*. London: Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS).

DCMS. (2011). *Meta-evaluation of the impacts and legacy of the London 2012 Olympic Games and Paralympic Games, Summary of reports 1 and 2: Scope, research*

questions and strategy and methods. London: Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS).

DCMS. (2012). *Beyond 2012: The London legacy story*. London: Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS).

de Moragas, M., Moreno, A. B., & Paniagua, R. (1999). The evolution of volunteers at the Olympic Games. In M. de Moragas, A. B. Moreno, & N. Puig (Eds.), *Global society and the Olympic movement* (pp. 133-154). Lausanne: International Olympic Committee (IOC).

Dickson, T. J., & Benson, A. M. (2013). *London 2012 Games Makers: Towards redefining legacy*. London: Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS).

Dickson, T. J., Benson, A. M., & Blackman, D. A. (2011). Developing a framework for evaluating Olympic and Paralympic legacies. *Journal of Sport & Tourism, 16*(4), 285-302.

Dickson, T. J., Benson, A. M., Blackman, D. A., & Terwiel, F. A. (2013). It's all about the Games! 2010 Vancouver Olympic and Paralympic winter games volunteers. *Event Management, 17*(1), 77-92.

Dickson, T. J., Benson, A. M., & Terwiel, F. A. (2014). Mega-event volunteers, similar or different? Vancouver 2010 vs London 2012. *International Journal of Event and Festival Management*, 5(2), 164-179.

Doherty, A. (2009). The volunteer legacy of a major sport event. *Journal of Policy Research in Tourism, Leisure and Events, 1*(3), 185-207.

Downward, P. M., & Ralston, R. (2006). The sports development potential of sports event volunteering: Insights from the XVII Manchester Commonwealth Games. *European Sport Management Quarterly, 6*(4), 333-351.

Elstad, B. (1996). Volunteer perception of learning and satisfaction in a mega-event: The case of the XVII Olympic Winter Games in Lillehammer. *Festival Management and Event Tourism, 4*(3-4), 75-83.

English Federation of Disability Sport. (2013). Go Local calls for London 2012 volunteers - one year on. Retrieved from http://www.efds.co.uk/news/1744_go_local_calls_for_london_2012_volunteers-_one_year_on

English, N. (2000, 23 July). IYV Forum: Volunteering - The Olympic Legacy. Retrieved from http://pandora.nla.gov.au/pan/21633/20020108-0000/www.communitybuilders.nsw.gov.au/builder/what/english.html

Experian. (2006). *Employment and skills for the 2012 Games: Research and evidence*. London: Experian.

Fairley, S., Kellett, P., & Green, B. C. (2007). Volunteering abroad: Motives for travel to volunteer at the Athens Olympic Games. *Journal of Sport Management, 21*(1), 41.

Farrell, J. M., Johnston, M. E., & Twynam, G. D. (1998). Volunteer Motivation, Satisfaction, and Management at an Elite Sporting Competition. *Journal of Sport Management, 12*(4), 288.

Field, P. (2012, 17 September). Pivotal, inspirational, essential: Is Manchester more motivated to help after London 2012 volunteers' success? Retrieved from http://www.mancunianmatters.co.uk/content/170966524-pivotal-inspirational-essential-manchester-more-motivated-help-after-london-2012

Flick, M., Bittman, M., & Doyle, J. (2002). *The community's most valuable (hidden) asset: Volunteering in Australia*. Sydney: University of New South Wales.

Furness, H. (2012, 13 August). London 2012: 'We lit up the world' says Lord Coe. Retrieved from http://www.telegraph.co.uk/sport/olympics/london-2012/9471489/London-2012-We-lit-up-the-world-says-Lord-Coe.html

Giannoulakis, C., Wang, C.-H., & Gray, D. (2009). Measuring volunteer motivation in mega-sporting events. *Event Management, 11*(4), 191-200.

Gibson, O. (2013, 19 April). MPs warn legacy of London 2012 volunteers is 'fizzling out'. Retrieved from http://www.theguardian.com/uk/2013/apr/19/legacy-london-2012-fizzling-out

GLA. (2016). *Team London impact report*. London: Greater London Authority (GLA).

Gratton, C., & Preuss, H. (2008). Maximizing Olympic impacts by building up legacies. *The International Journal of the History of Sport, 25*(14), 1922-1938.

Green, B. C., & Chalip, L. (2004). Paths to volunteer commitment: Lessons from the Sydney Olympic Games. *Volunteering as leisure/leisure as volunteering: An international assessment*, 49-67.

Handy, F., Brodeur, N., & Cnaan, R. A. (2006). Summer on the island: Episodic volunteering. *Voluntary Action, 7*(3), 31-46.

Harris, M. (2012). London's Olympic Ambassadors: A legacy for public policy implementation? *Voluntary Sector Review, 3*(3), 417-424.

HM Government. (2014). *The long term vision for the legacy of the London 2012 Olympic & Paralympic Games*. London: HM Government.

Hodgetts, D. (2010, 18 September). Sydney 2000 Volunteers. A decade of wasted legacy? Retrieved from https://danyahodgetts.com/2010/09/18/sydney-2000-volunteers-a-decade-of-wasted-legacy/

Hollway, S. (1997, November 26). Unpublished correspondence regarding the establishment of the Volunteers 2000 Advisory Committee. Sydney: SOGOC.

Hollway, S. (2001, March 6). Major events volunteer pool (unpublished memorandum). Sydney: Premier's Department New South Wales.

Holmes, K., Hughes, M., Mair, J., & Carlsen, J. (2015). *Events and Sustainability*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Holmes, K., & Smith, K. A. (2009). *Managing volunteers in tourism: Attractions, destinations and events*. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.

House of Commons Committee of Public Acccounts. (2013). *The London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games: Post-Games review*. London: House of Commons.

House of Lords Select Committee on Olympic and Paralympic Legacy. (2013). *Keeping the flame alive: The Olympic and Paralympic legacy*. London: House of Lords.

IOC. (1992). *Manual for cities bidding for the Olympic Games*. Lausanne: International Olympic Committee (IOC).

IOC. (2004). *2012 Candidature procedure and questionnaire: Games of the XXX Olympiad in 2012*. Lausanne: International Olympic Committee (IOC).

IOC. (2007). *Olympic charter*. Lausanne: International Olympic Committee (IOC).

IOC. (2012a). "Happy and glorious": London bids farewell to the Games. Retrieved from https://www.olympic.org/news/-happy-and-glorious-london-bids-farewell-to-the-games

IOC. (2012b). *Olympic legacy*. Lausanne: International Olympic Committee (IOC).

IOC. (2013a). *Factsheet, Roles and responsibilities during the Olympic Games*. Lausanne: International Olympic Committee (IOC).

IOC. (2013b). *Final report of the IOC Coordination Commission: Games of the XXX Olympiad, London 2012*. Lausanne: International Olympic Committee (IOC).

IOC. (2014). *Olympic Games: Legacies and impacts*. Lausanne: International Olympic Committee (IOC).

IOC. (n.d.-a). Sydney 2000 Summer Games Olympics - results & video highlights, viewed 13 June 2016, https://www.olympic.org/sydney-2000

IOC. (n.d.-b). London 2012 Summer Olympics - results & video highlights, viewed 13 June 2016, https://www.olympic.org/london-2012

IOC. (n.d.-c). Atlanta 1996 Summer Olympics – results & video highlights, viewed 13 June 2016, https://www.olympic.org/atlanta-1996

King, N. (2004). Using templates in the thematic analysis of text. In C. Cassell & G. Symon (Eds.), *Essential guide to qualitative methods in organizational research* (pp. 11-22). London: SAGE.

Lenskyj, H. J. (2002). *The best Olympics ever? Social impacts of Sydney 2000*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Newbury Park: SAGE.

Lockstone, L., & Baum, T. (2009). The public face of event volunteering at the 2006 Commonwealth Games: The media perspective. *Managing Leisure, 14*(1), 38-56.

LOCOG. (2007a). *Everyone's Games*. London: London Organising Committee of the Olympic and Paralympic Games (LOCOG).

LOCOG. (2007b). *Nations and regions: Making the most of the London 2012 Games*. London: London Organising Committee of the Olympic and Paralympic Games (LOCOG).

LOCOG. (2009). *National Olympic Committee progress report, October 2009*. London: London Organising Committee of the Olympic and Paralympic Games (LOCOG).

LOCOG. (2011). *A blueprint for change, Sustainability report, October 2009*. London: London Organising Committee of the Olympic and Paralympic Games (LOCOG).

LOCOG. (2012a). *London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games: The official commemorative book*. London: London Organising Committee of the Olympic and Paralympic Games (LOCOG).

LOCOG. (2012b). *Ready, Progress report for the 124th IOC session, London, 21 July*. London: London Organising Committee of the Olympic and Paralympic Games (LOCOG).

LOCOG. (2013a). *London 2012 Olympic Games official report, volume 1*. London: London Organising Committee of the Olympic and Paralympic Games (LOCOG).

LOCOG. (2013b). *London 2012 Olympic Games official report, volume 3*. London: London Organising Committee of the Olympic and Paralympic Games (LOCOG).

London 2012 Ltd. (2004a). *London 2012 candidate city, candidate file, volume 1*. London: London 2012 Ltd.

London 2012 Ltd. (2004b). *Make Britain proud: London 2012 candidate city.* London: London 2012 Ltd.

Lynch, B. (2001). Lessons from the Olympics. In J. Noble & F. Johnston (Eds.), *Volunteering visions*. Sydney: The Federation Press.

Lynch, B. (2005). Sydney's Olympic volunteers: Lessons and legacies. *ASSH Studies*, *17*, 95-100.

Merrill, M. V. (2006). Global trends and the challenges for volunteering. *The International Journal of Volunteer Administration, 24*(1), 9-14.

Minnaert, L. (2012). An Olympic legacy for all? The non-infrastructural outcomes of the Olympic Games for socially excluded groups (Atlanta 1996–Beijing 2008). *Tourism Management, 33*(2), 361-370.

Moreno, A. B, de Moragas, M., & Paniagua, R. (2000). The evolution of volunteers at the Olympic Games. In M. Moragas, A. de, Moreno & N. Puig (Eds.), *Volunteers, Global Society and the Olympic Movement* (pp. 133-154). Lausanne: International Olympic Committee.

Musick, M. A., & Wilson, J. (2007). *Volunteers: A social profile*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Nichols, G., & Ralston, R. (2011). Social inclusion through volunteering: The legacy potential of the 2012 Olympic Games. *Sociology, 45*(5), 900-914.

Nichols, G., & Ralston, R. (2012). Lessons from the volunteering legacy of the 2002 Commonwealth Games. *Urban Studies, 49*(1), 169-184.

Nichols, G., & Ralston, R. (2015). The legacy costs of delivering the 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games through regulatory capitalism. *Leisure Studies, 34*(4), 389-404.

Nixon, S. (2000, 6 October). The best things in life are free, especially dedicated volunteers. *Sydney Morning Herald,* p. 5.

Noy, C. (2008). Sampling knowledge: The hermeneutics of snowball sampling in qualitative research. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology, 11*(4), 327-344.

ODA. (2012). Delivering transport for the London 2012 Olympic Games. London: Olympic Delivery Authority (ODA).

Preuss, H. (2007). The conceptualisation and measurement of mega sport event legacies. *Journal of Sport & Tourism, 12*(3-4), 207-228.

Reeser, J. C., Berg, R. L., Rhea, D. J., & Willick, S. (2005). Motivation and satisfaction among polyclinic volunteers at the 2002 Winter Olympic and Paralympic Games. *British Journal of Sports Medicine, 39*(4), e20-e20.

Riordan, D. (2000, 23 Jul). IYV Forum: Volunteering - The Olympic Legacy "Reviewing the Olympic Experience". Retrieved from http://pandora.nla.gov.au/pan/21633/20020108-0000/www.communitybuilders.nsw.gov.au/builder/volunteering/riordan.html

Ritchie, J. B. (2000). Turning 16 days into 16 years through Olympic legacies. *Event Management, 6*(3), 155-165.

Scott, C. (2014). Legacy evaluation and London, 2012 and the Cultural Olympiad. *Cultural Trends, 23*(1), 7-17.

Shipway, R. (2007). Sustainable legacies for the 2012 Olympic Games. *The Journal of the Royal Society for the Promotion of Health, 127*(3), 119-124.

Smith, A. & Fox, T. (2007). From 'event-led' to 'event-themed' regeneration: The 2002 Commonwealth Games legacy programme, *Urban Studies*, *44*(5/6), pp. 1125–1143.

Smith, K. A., Lockstone-Binney, L., Holmes, K., & Baum, T. (2014). *Event volunteering: International perspectives on the event volunteering experience*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Smith, K. A., & Lockstone, L. (2009). Involving and keeping event volunteers: Management insights from cultural festivals. In T. Baum, M. Deery, C. Hanlon, L. Lockstone, & K. A. Smith (Eds.), *People and work in events and conventions: A research perspective* (pp. 154-167). Oxfordshire: CABI.

SOCOG. (2001a). *Official report of the XXVII Olympiad Volume One: Preparing for the Games.* Sydney: Sydney Organising Committee for the Olympic Games (SOCOG).

SOCOG. (2001b). *Official Report of the XXVII Olympiad Volume Two: Celebrating the Games.* Sydney: Sydney Organising Committee for the Olympic Games (SOCOG).

South Yorkshire Sport. (2014). Community Games commends volunteers for keeping the London 2012 spark alive. Retrieved from http://www.sysport.co.uk/news-jobs-events/news/community-games-commends-volunteers-for-keeping-the-london-2012-spark-alive

Spirit of 2012. (n.d.-a). 1,000 schools sign up to Team London Young Ambassadors Scheme, viewed 27 April 2015, http://www.spiritof2012trust.org.uk/1000-london-schools-sign-team-london-young-ambassadors-scheme

Spirit of 2012. (n.d.-b). About | Spirit of 2012, viewed 13 June 2016, http://www.spiritof2012trust.org.uk/about

SRES. (2016). SRES Event Volunteers Information Booklet. Sydney: Royal Agricultural Society of NSW.

Strigas, A. D., & Jackson Jr, E. N. (2003). Motivating volunteers to serve and succeed: Design and results of a pilot study that explores demographics and motivational factors in sport volunteerism. *International Sports Journal*, 7(1), 111-123.

Suffolk County Council. (2013). *Suffolk's legacy from the London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games – One year on*. Suffolk: Suffolk County Council.

Twynam, G. D., Farrell, J. M., & Johnston, M. E. (2002). Leisure and volunteer motivation at a special sporting event. *Leisure/Loisir, 27*(3-4), 363-377.

Volunteering NSW. (n.d.). *The legacy of the Olympics*. Sydney: Volunteering NSW.

Volunteering NSW. (2002). *Sydney Major Events Pool business case*. Sydney: Volunteering NSW.

Volunteers 2000 Advisory Committee. (1998). *Minutes of the Volunteer Advisory Committee (1 Dec 1998).* Sydney: Sydney Organising Committee for the Olympic Games (SOCOG).

Webb, T. (2001). *The collaborative Games: The story behind the spectacle*. Annandale: Pluto Press.

Yin, R. (1996). *Case study research methods*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE.

Young-Powell, A. (2012, 8 Aug). Best bits: The Olympic legacy for the voluntary sector. *Voluntary sector network blog, The Guardian*. Retrieved from

http://www.theguardian.com/voluntary-sector-network/2012/aug/07/best-bits-olympic-legacy-volunteering.

Yu, M. (2004). *The economic and social impacts of hosting selected international games*. Hong Kong: Research and Library Services Division, Legislative Council Secretariat.

APPENDIX 1 - INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Introduction
Aim: To help respondent feel comfortable, inform them as to what to expect
- The interview will last for a maximum of 1 hour.
- Information and opinions will be used for research purposes only.
- State that the project is funded by the IOC's Advanced Olympic Research Grant programme and that a report detailing the findings of the study will be made available to the IOC mid-2016.
- State that answers interviewees provide will be aggregated and that specific respondents will not be mentioned in the final report and subsequent publications.
- Reiterate that the interview will be recorded.

Background & Warm Up
Aim: To gather background information about respondents
- Respondent introduces him/herself:
  - Name
  - Current role/s
  - Role relating to either Sydney 2000 or London 2012
  - How they came to be involved in this role and the Games?

Impacts on Host City Volunteering
- How would you describe the impact of the Games volunteer programme on the host city in the lead up to and during the Games?
- From your perspective, what were the key impacts (positive and negative) of the Games on volunteer participation in the host city post-event? Have you views changed about this impact over the course of time since the event?
- Were the more positive of these impacts proactively planned for? If so, how did they occur? (Prompt if needed: driven by SOCOG/LOCOG, government, arising at grassroots level)
- In your view, what priority was given by the Local Organisation Committee (SOCOG, LOCOG) to creating a legacy of volunteer participation in the host city post-event in comparison to other Games legacies (Prompt if needed: social, economic, environmental and infrastructure legacies)?

Engagement with the Games and the OCOG
(Adapt the reference point of the question according to the respondents background – representing a volunteering peak body, volunteer resource centre, sport governing body, community organisation, local government, university)

- How would you describe the involvement of your organisation (at the time of the event) in relation to the Games and the Local Organisation Committee (SOCOG, LOCOG)?
- How would you describe the involvement of the [volunteering sector, sport governing bodies, community organisations, local governments, universities] in general relation the Games and SOCOG/LOCOG?

- What was your sense at the time as to whether SOCOG/LOCOG was actively seeking to engage volunteering organisations to plan for a legacy for volunteering post-event?
- What, if any, official initiatives did SOCOG/LOCOG and the Government of the time put in place to encourage post-event volunteering? Describe the success of these initiatives.
- What, if any, initiatives did other stakeholders [volunteering peak bodies, sport governing bodies, community organisations, local governments, universities] put in place to encourage post-event volunteering? Describe the success of these initiatives.
- To what extent were SOCOG/LOCOG and other interested stakeholders prepared to manage and resource the Games post-event volunteering legacy?
- In what ways, if any, could SOCOG/LOCOG and interested stakeholders better engage to ensure an effective and sustainable post-event volunteering legacy?
- What recommendations would you make to the IOC to ensure the organisers of future Olympic Games take advantage of the volunteer management resources already in place in the host-city when planning for Games operations and an associated legacy for volunteering post-event in the host city?
- What recommendations in general would you make for host cities seeking to create a legacy for volunteering post-Games?

Post-interview information
- Any final comments?
- Can you recommend any other people [from volunteering peak bodies, sport governing bodies, community organisations, local governments, universities] with expertise and informed opinion we might approach to be interviewed for this study?

THANK & CLOSE

APPENDIX 2 – INTERVIEWEE PROFILE

	Sydney *Role in relation to Sydney 2000 Olympic Games*	London *Role in relation to London 2000 Olympic Games and/or legacy period*
Organising Committee (roles not listed to maintain confidentiality)	R17 – SOCOG R18 – SOCOG	R13 – LOCOG
Policy-makers, government representatives and official legacy bodies		R2 – Legacy Body R3 – Legacy Body R9 – Government Legacy Unit R10 – Local Government Legacy Body R11 – Local Government Legacy Body R15 – Legacy Body
Sport governing bodies and community organisations	R22 – Non-profit organisation* R27 – Non-profit organisation*	R1 – National Sports Organisation R14 – National Sports Organisation R16 – National Sports Organisation
Peak volunteering bodies and volunteer resource centres	R19 – Peak volunteering body R24 – Peak volunteering body* R25 – Peak volunteering body* R26 – Peak volunteering body	R4 – Volunteer Resource Centre R5 – Volunteer Resource Centre R6 – Peak volunteering body R7 – Volunteer Resource Centre
Others (e.g., volunteers, university representative, researchers)	R20 – University R21 – Pioneer volunteer R23 – Pioneer volunteer	R8 – Researcher R12 – University engagement

* Member of SOCOG Volunteer Advisory Committee

APPENDIX 3 - DATA ANALYSIS TEMPLATE

	Theme	Sub-themes
Opinions		
1	General positive impacts	• Raised the profile of volunteering • Made volunteering an attractive and more varied activity • Provided positive voice against negativity about the Games • Became a unifying point for the country
2	General negative impacts	• Raised the profile of sport and/or event volunteering only • Raised people's expectations of what a volunteering experience should look like • Giving the wrong impression of sports volunteering
3	Games volunteer programme before the Games	• Involvement with existing volunteer organisations (London = lack of involvement; Sydney = closer involvement) • Partnering with other organisations to offer volunteering opportunities • Non-OCOG involvement with existing volunteer organisations • Using major event volunteering as a reward for regular volunteering • Using major event volunteering as a means to recruit people who have not tried volunteering
4	Games volunteer programme during the Games	• Sense of volunteer identity: Unclear distinction between what constitutes a paid role versus a volunteer • Ensuring that volunteers are adequately supported to perform their role
5	Planned volunteer legacy by OCOG and/ or Government of the time	• Generally unclear legacy directives from the government or OCOG • Understanding the needs of the volunteer sector as a means of informing legacy directives
6	Volunteer legacies delivered by non-OCOG organisations	• London: Team London, Sport England, Podium, Country Sports Partnerships, Spirit of 2012, DCMS, local areas • Sydney: Volunteering Australia/state & territory VRCs, universities in NSW, local areas
7	Management of volunteer legacy	• Little to no sustained increase in rates of volunteering • Post-event focus is more on asset legacy than volunteer legacy • Lack of mechanisms to facilitate continued volunteering involvement
Lessons Learnt		
1	Resources	• Identify funding sources for a sustained legacy • Quantification of volunteer programmes is needed to measure legacy
2	Structures and delivery mechanisms	• It is unclear as to who is responsible for delivering the legacy and following up on any targets – the general consensus is that it is not OCOG • Create an organisation solely responsible for legacy • Involve existing volunteer organisations and their knowledge/infrastructure • Manage post-Games supply and demand of volunteer

		opportunities carefully
		• Data (especially sensitive data such as volunteers' contact information) needs to be properly managed to facilitate the volunteer legacy from the start
		• Build the technology required to facilitate the volunteer legacy anticipated
		• Ensure timely follow-up to capitalise on volunteers' positive experiences
3	Strategy	• Legacy must be factored into planning from the bidding/early stage
		• Create clear plans for the volunteer legacy
		• Create measurable targets to maintain the legacy
4	Knowledge transfer	• Structure to facilitate volunteer programme knowledge transfer are lacking
		• Wholesale knowledge transfer without understanding the character of a city leads to unsuccessful programmes