














## RESEARCH NOTE

### PROPOSITIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ENHANCING THE LEGACIES OF MAJOR SPORTING EVENTS FOR DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES AND INDIVIDUALS

SHUSHU CHEN,\*  MARY QUINTON,\*  ABDULLAH ALHARBI,\* HELEN X. H. BAO,†  
 BARBARA BELL,‡ BARNABY CARTER,\* MICHAEL B. DUIGNAN,§ ANDREW HEYES,\*  
KYRIAKI KAPLANIDOU,¶  MARIA KARAMANI,\*  JACQUELINE KENNELLY,#   
THEMIS KOKOLAKAKIS,\*\*  MARK LEE,†† XIAO LIANG,\*  BRIJ MAHARAJ,‡‡   
JUDITH MAIR,§§  ANDREW SMITH,¶¶  LORRAINE VAN BLERK,##   
AND JET VELDUIZEN VAN ZANTEN\* 

\*School of Sport Exercise and Rehabilitation Sciences, University of Birmingham, Birmingham, UK

†Department of Land Economy, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK

‡Department of Sport and Exercise Sciences, Manchester Metropolitan University, Manchester, UK

§University of Paris 1 (Pantheon-Sorbonne), Paris, France

¶Department of Sport Management, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL, USA

#Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Carleton University, Ottawa, Canada

\*\*Sport Industry Research Group, Sheffield Hallam University, Sheffield, UK

††School of Computer Science, University of Birmingham, Birmingham, UK

‡‡School of Agricultural, Earth and Environmental Sciences at the University of Kwazulu-Natal (UKZN),  
Durban, South Africa

§§UQ Business School, University of Queensland, St. Lucia, Australia

¶¶School of Architecture and Cities, University of Westminster, London, UK

##University of Dundee, Dundee, Scotland, UK

---

This consensus statement is the outcome of comprehensive collaboration through an international working group on the disparities in the legacies of major sporting events, specifically for communities and individuals from disadvantaged backgrounds (CIDBs). The workshop brought together scholars to discuss current challenges and develop four propositions and recommendations for event leveraging, policy stakeholders, and researchers. The propositions included (1) the nature of “disadvantage” needs to be recognized and the specific targeted CIDBs in each event context must be carefully identified or clearly defined; (2) CIDBs should be considered as an integral part of the whole event hosting cycle to ensure legacy inclusivity; (3) dedicated

Address correspondence to Dr. ShuShu Chen, School of Sport, Exercise & Rehabilitation Sciences, University of Birmingham, Birmingham, UK, B152TT. E-mail: [s.chen.5@bham.ac.uk](mailto:s.chen.5@bham.ac.uk)

event leverage, sufficient financial backing, and resource commitments for CIDBs are needed; and (4) it is critical to establish a system of legacy governance for CIDBs. The recommendations aim to inform change in practice and ensure lasting positive legacies for the communities that need them most.

**Key words: Disadvantage; Major events; Inequality; Leverage; Legacy; Community**

---

## Introduction

The attraction of hosting major sporting events commonly rests on the assurance of long-term legacies and benefits for the community. Yet, an expanding body of research suggests that these gains are not uniformly allocated; rather, communities and individuals from disadvantaged backgrounds often experience the impact in a disproportionately negative manner (Maharaj, 2015; Minnaert, 2012; Pereira, 2018; Van Blerk, 2011). Given the significant financial and social commitments involved in staging these events, the uneven distribution of legacies intensifies existing social inequalities, warranting critical examination.

This consensus statement is the outcome of comprehensive collaboration through an international working group focused on the disparity in the legacies of major sporting events, specifically for communities and individuals from disadvantaged backgrounds.

We call for action to ensure *positive legacies for all* from hosting major sporting events. This call stems not only from our years of research work in this context but is also supported by two comprehensive literature reviews: one of academic articles and another of bid documents and evaluation reports from past major sporting events. A recent review of the literature (Liang et al., 2022, in press) established that the promised benefits seldom reach communities and individuals from disadvantaged backgrounds. These groups often find themselves further marginalized due to suboptimal event planning and legacy management, which fail to capitalize on potential opportunities for these communities.

Furthermore, our review of past bid documents and evaluation reports underscores a repeated focus on the potential advantages for disadvantaged communities and individuals (Chen et al., 2022). These

promises frequently serve as a cornerstone for the justification behind hosting such expansive events. Despite this, there exists a marked disconnect between these pledges and their real-world execution. This gap transcends academic discourse to become an urgent social issue that requires immediate and multifaceted attention.

Several compelling reasons fuel this sense of urgency. Firstly, each event that concludes without specific initiatives aimed at disadvantaged communities not only represents a missed opportunity but also a failure to act as a catalyst for meaningful social change. Secondly, there is an inescapable ethical imperative: using the promise of benefits for disadvantaged communities to secure hosting rights engenders a moral responsibility to fulfill these commitments.

Additionally, the resources earmarked for these large-scale events are both finite and time sensitive. Any delays or inaction not only risks the misallocation or even squandering of resources intended for disadvantaged communities but also endanger long-term public trust. A failure to act promptly could erode public faith in the organizing bodies, thereby weakening support for future events or initiatives intended to serve the broader community.

## Definitions

We agreed to use the term “disadvantaged” and specifically followed a broad conception of “disadvantaged” outlined by Bonevski et al.’s (2014), meaning those individuals who are “socially, culturally or financially disadvantaged compared to the majority of society” (p. 2). In the context of major sporting events, similar to the terms “marginalized,” “socially excluded,” and “underrepresented,” “disadvantaged” individuals, acting as an umbrella term, denotes the groups of populations

that are from various vulnerable backgrounds, such as those least skilled (Smith & Fox, 2007), living in deprived areas (Maharaj, 2015), from low socioeconomic backgrounds (Wang et al., 2015), or being socially excluded from societies in a variety of ways (Jones & Stokes, 2003; Minnaert, 2012).

Communities can be both place based and where people share a community identity or affinity. A community may experience disadvantage because of the complex interaction between its residents (Vinson, 2007) and the effects of its social and environmental context stemming from broader systemic problems (e.g., weaker social networks, relative lack of opportunities, and poorer access to healthcare) (Maharaj, 2015; Pereira, 2018). Communities that are disadvantaged can experience a complex web of economic, health, and environmental factors that make it difficult for people living in certain areas or situations to achieve more positive life outcomes in comparison to their nondisadvantaged peers.

If we consider event hosting as a form of intervention, two significant layers of barriers emerge: systemic inequality and individual inequality. Individual inequality relates to the uneven distribution of resources or opportunities among people, influenced by personal factors such as educational background, skill sets, or social connections (Sen, 1999). On the other hand, systemic inequality is rooted in societal frameworks, including legislation, policies, and social customs, which perpetuate disparities across various demographic groups (Massey, 2007). In addition to individual inequality, systemic inequality can also significantly limit outcomes for individuals and families in disadvantaged locations (Tanton et al., 2021).

However, such a nuanced understanding of inequality has not yet been incorporated into event research. The current academic discourse, when focusing on marginalized groups, often employs the terms “vulnerable” and “excluded,” without clearly specifying the forms of disadvantage these groups experience. This lack of clarity is problematic when aiming to improve the lives of communities and individuals from disadvantaged backgrounds, as each form of inequality requires its own set of customized policy interventions and strategies (Higgins, 2010). Hence, we adopt the term “disadvantaged” because its differentiation of individual and systemic disadvantage aligns with the principles underpinning inequality. We consider this recognition to be

a foundational step in inviting more robust academic inquiry and policy discussions.

On the other hand, we also recognize the complexities involved in employing the term “disadvantaged” (Duncan & Corner, 2012), particularly given its varying interpretations across different social, cultural, and event-hosting contexts. It is therefore crucial to note that the conceptual underpinnings of “disadvantage” are fluid and can differ significantly depending on a multitude of factors.

To keep this article concise and easily readable, we have chosen to use the acronym CIDBs (communities and individuals from disadvantaged backgrounds) as a shorthand reference for this diverse group. This choice is purely heuristic and aimed at reducing the repetition of a cumbersome phrase throughout the article.

#### Overall Aims

While the hosting of major sporting events may yield benefits for CIDBs—potentially through trickle-down effects spurred by regional redevelopment—some scholars argue that these communities often remain underserved (Pappalepore & Duignan, 2016; Pereira, 2018). This happens either because of a lack of attention to this matter (in terms of prioritizing legacies for CIDBs) or a lack of know-how (i.e., how to ensure there are legacies for CIDBs after the events).

This consensus statement aims to shed light on the issues at hand, and advance policymaking to maximize inclusivity for CIDBs in major sporting event hosting, rather than assigning blame to any parties. We recognize that the operation and nature of major event hosting may lead to a “black box” scenario. Although in some cases organizing bodies genuinely recognize the social issues endemic to local populations and have aimed to deploy large-scale interventions (such as major events) to solve those issues, the emerged outcomes after the hosting of major events might not necessarily match with the original intentions. Thus, the statement also aims to propose some solutions in an attempt to maximize the legacies of major sporting events for CIDBs.

#### Consensus Development Process

A consensus statement is a summary of the opinions of a panel of experts and has been used in other

fields (e.g., Henriksen et al., 2020). The primary aim is to establish consensus based on expert opinion when evidence is underdeveloped and to challenge existing praxis. Adopting an inductive approach to theory building (Patton, 2002), the consensus process involved two stages upon the arrival of the initial draft recommendations. First, a systematic review of existing literature was conducted, which then informed an empirical study of one major sporting event working with CIDBs. Key lessons learned were drawn from this qualitative study, which were presented to a panel of experts for discussion. The expert panel consisted of scholars with diverse specializations, including but not limited to urban planning, sociology, sport policy, and management, each with substantial years of experience in their respective fields and having conducted specific work relevant to this group of populations in the context of major sporting events. Their names were sought as informed by the systematic review exercise mentioned above. This process led to the final panel of experts, listed alphabetically:

- Helen Bao (Ph.D.) is a Professor in Land Economy at the University of Cambridge, UK.
- Barbara Bell (Ph.D.) is a former Senior Lecturer at Manchester Metropolitan University, UK.
- Mike Duignan (Ph.D.) was an Associate Professor at the Rosen College of Hospitality Management, University of Central Florida, USA; currently at University of Paris 1 (Pantheon-Sorbonne), France.
- Kyriaki Kaplanidou (Ph.D.) is a Professor in Sport Management at the University of Florida, USA.
- Jacqueline Kennelly (Ph.D.) is a Professor in Sociology at Carleton University, Canada.
- Themis Kokolakis (Ph.D.) is an Associate Professor in Sport Economics at Sheffield Hallam University, UK.
- Brij Maharaj (Ph.D.) is a Professor in Geography at the University of Kwazulu-Natal, South Africa.
- Judith Mair (Ph.D.) is an Associate Professor in Event Management at the University of Queensland, Australia.
- Andrew Smith (Ph.D.) is a Professor in Urban Experiences at the University of Westminster, UK.

- Lorraine van Blerk (Ph.D.) is a Professor in Human Geography at the University of Dundee, Scotland, UK.

The panel of experts were invited to attend a whole-day workshop (hybrid) at the University of Birmingham (UK) on September 14, 2022. This workshop, followed by a series of email exchanges and comments on the drafts, has led to a formal consensus developed. The recommendations were then presented to CIDBs as well as representatives from the event Organizing Committee, local authorities, national sport governing body and sport organizations, and charities at a summit event in Birmingham for further discussion and feedback, resulting in the final propositions/recommendations presented here.

The aim of this comprehensive exercise was not only to discuss current challenges but also to develop actionable propositions and recommendations. Collectively, we agreed on the following positions and respective recommendations to guard the event legacies for CIDBs for future event hosts, host city government, and community-based groups/organizations as well as researchers. The drafted consensus statement was also shared with other nominated experts on the topic of event management. (Asian experts were invited to review the statements to bring in experts' perceptions across different geopolitical boundaries.)

#### Propositions and Recommendations

*Proposition One: The Nature of "Disadvantage" Needs to Be Recognised and the Specific Targeted CIDBs in Each Event Context Must Be Carefully Identified*

Currently, CIDBs seem to be a buzz word used by event stakeholders when bidding for event hosting, without being defined clearly in terms of the types of disadvantages and specific locations. This lack of clarity is problematic, as major events are international, relocating from one city to another, meaning that CIDBs are characterized differently for each major event. Moreover, as Duignan et al. (2023) argued, while (traditionally defined) the event's local stakeholders appear to be central and feted at the beginning of major event bids and

project plans, as the planning period advances and the operational mandates overshadow initial promises, vulnerable communities and citizens can find themselves side-lined and lacking possession of all salience attributes. Therefore, somewhat ironically, one may argue these initially defined stakeholders cannot be defined as a stakeholder at all by the live staging period and beyond. The authors recommend utilizing a stakeholder salience lens to analyze shifting salience over time, applicable to all stakeholder groups, but particularly CIDBs. Therefore, who the CIDBs are at a specific location, in the context of a specific event, should be clearly defined in bid documents and legacy plans.

### *Recommendation One*

The bid team should work collaboratively to define who the relevant CIDBs are in a given context. It is essential to establish a baseline understanding of the current status of the defined CIDBs (e.g., infrastructures, accessibility to facilities), and this should happen before submitting a bid so that follow-up event planning and leveraging are informed by this defining process. Also, prior to bidding for a major sporting event, it is crucial to conduct a preevent evaluation to identify potential negative impacts on CIDBs. This evaluation should be accompanied by corresponding mitigation measures designed to minimize any adverse effects.

The bid team and local authorities need to develop a comprehensive understanding of structural inequality (historically) that exists in their city and recognize that different support (policy and practices) should be offered depending on the specific legacy needs of CIDBs.

### *Proposition Two: CIDBs Should Be Considered an Integral Part of the Event Throughout the Hosting Cycle to Ensure Legacy Inclusivity*

Event legacies are multifaceted (Preuss, 2015)—ranging from economic (e.g., jobs, employment) and social and health [e.g., sport/physical activity participation, sense of belonging, civic pride (“feel-good” factor), community cohesion and well-being], to environmental benefits (infrastructure improvement and access to facilities)—and these

various forms of legacies have been reported to be relevant to CIDBs (Minnaert, 2012) as well.

We recognize that legacy for CIDBs combines both positive (e.g., increased job opportunities, urban and environmental transformation for enhancing accessibility and mobility) and negative (e.g., increases in property rental, loss of houses where the event facilities are built) outcomes, includes both tangible (e.g., new/upgraded sports facilities and urban infrastructure) and intangible (e.g., civic pride, community cohesion) effects, and happen before, during, and after the event (Chen et al., 2023).

However, past events have failed to establish legacies’ inclusively in terms of providing equal access to opportunities and resources for CIDBs (Maharaj, 2015; Pereira, 2018). For example, people from low-income backgrounds in Rio de Janeiro reported no enhanced accessibility to sports facilities because of improvements to the host city’s transport during and after the 2016 Rio Summer Olympics (Pereira, 2018). The reason is that the reorganization of bus routes in fact increased the connections between the city center and sports venues but reduced the bus routes in sparsely populated and less connected communities, where low-income people often lived.

Legacy commitments for CIDBs, when actions were taken, focused on those delivering short-term (e.g., construction-related jobs) and intangible legacies (e.g., zero tolerance to discrimination, skills development). Furthermore, existing evidence from event management also reveals that legacies for CIDBs happened at the expense of the reduction of other benefits, often in the forms of displacement, substitution, exclusion, and segregation (Kennelly & Watt, 2011, 2012; Van Blerk et al., 2018; Wang et al., 2015).

A possible explanation for this occurrence as shared by some scholars (Pappalepore & Duignan, 2016; Van Blerk et al., 2018) is inadequate consultation with CIDBs in key decision-making. As a consequence, their needs are neither identified nor incorporated into legacy planning. For example, Pappalepore and Duignan’s (2016) study of the London 2012 Games revealed that, while business opportunities increased during the Games, local small creative organizations located in the deprived areas of London were not consulted by



governments at the legacy planning and had very little knowledge of these opportunities, and those small organizations therefore perceived the Games as having limited economic impacts. They experience difficulties in event engagement, feel excluded by the event, and have limited awareness of legacy opportunities and resources.

Furthermore, it is imperative to approach the issue of community participation with sensitivity and nuance. The inclination to include members of disadvantaged communities in committees or governance structures, while well-intentioned, can inadvertently veer into the realm of patronization. Assumptions about these communities' willingness or eagerness to engage in such roles can impose an external narrative that may not align with their own aspirations or self-perceptions. Therefore, any efforts to include these communities in decision-making processes should be undertaken with careful consideration, ideally involving consultative methods that genuinely seek to understand their perspectives and needs.

#### *Recommendation Two*

To enable legacy inclusivity throughout the event hosting process, CIDBs should be included as an integral part of legacy planning, delivery, and evaluation.

After securing the hosting rights, it is crucial for the event leveraging team to incorporate inclusivity into the planning process from the outset. Comprising key individuals, the event-leveraging team is tasked with formulating plans for the event's lasting impact and ensuring that such leveraging is deeply integrated into the local community (Chen & Misener, 2019; Misener et al., 2015). Working in close collaboration with the bid team, the event leveraging team also consults with other relevant stakeholders at both national and local levels. This collaborative approach ensures that the event's planning and execution align with wider objectives and address the needs of the community.

The inclusiveness involves two levels of exercises (also relevant to Recommendation Four): 1) the event leveraging team work closely with charities, NGOs, and governmental committees to conduct specific initiatives based on the context of different host regions; 2) the event leveraging team

work closely with "experts by experience" (namely, people who experience a particular or multiple types of disadvantage, and who are trained and compensated to be involved in stakeholder consultations). In practice, it is recognized that communities might be amorphous, and it is not always clear who is entitled to represent, the event leveraging team can adopt approaches such as coproduction to work together *with* rather than *for* experts by experience, which has been suggested by other research to be useful when working with groups of populations affected by poverty and social exclusion (Cumming et al., 2022; Van Geertson et al., 2017).

The legacy should be planned before, during and after the event.

- For planning: An early-on consultation with the targeted CIDBs is needed (Pappalepore & Duignan, 2016; Pereira, 2018). Detailed plans to achieve the legacy goals should be tailored to the needs, abilities, and available opportunities of the CIDBs. This includes systematic, detailed plans (relevant to awareness enhancement, skills, and knowledge development) in which the legacy routes (rationales, inputs, mechanisms, outputs, and outcome measurements) should be made clear. For example, if "affordable housing" is promised, ensure the definition used by event organizers and community authorities is aligned with social housing for those living in deepest need, not "affordable" set at 80% of market rents (as happened in London) (Kennelly, 2016).
- For delivery: Policymakers at the host city level should actively seek ways to include CIDBs in the Games, whether that be through contributing to the delivery of Games-related contracts, invitations to ceremonies and festivals, or other forms of event engagement. This collaboration would also help to develop citizenship, collective identities, and social solidarity. Major sporting events are not an effective means of increasing sport participation in the general inactive population, according to Weed et al. (2015). To promote sport among disadvantaged communities, precise planning is necessary, considering factors such as leisure, family life, finances, time, and family structures. Detailed plans that account for these factors are emphasized by Kokolakakis and Lera-López (2022).

- For evaluation: Clear and measurable legacy goals should be set up and transparently monitored (Chen & Henry, 2020), ensuring that legacies for CIDBs are a fundamental part of the legacy plan that cannot be sacrificed in favor of other benefits. Whenever feasible, it is advisable to employ independent evaluation and monitoring practices to ensure unbiased and comprehensive assessments. Moreover, making the final evaluation reports publicly accessible not only enhances transparency but also allows for broader societal engagement and scrutiny. For instance, comprehensive evaluation initiatives such as the meta-evaluation conducted for the London 2012 Olympics serve as exemplary models (DCMS, 2013). These publicly available reports enable stakeholders and the general public to understand the impacts and legacies of such major events, thereby contributing to a more accountable and inclusive event management process. We recommend that some areas of monitoring and evaluation should be set up before the Games to prevent negative legacies from occurring. For example, existing literature points out that streets were cleared and those experiencing homelessness and other vulnerable people were policed to be ready for the events (Kennelly, 2022). We recommend establishing some arms-length monitoring mechanisms to monitor the policing situation to prevent the emergence of the displacement effect. Moreover, any Games legacy generated for CIDBs should be reported in the final evaluations, highlighting any achieved or failed promises. This is not to suggest we should only focus on measuring and counting; however, reporting on agreed goals is essential to ensure accountability and ongoing attention to those originally stated.

*Proposition Three: Dedicated Event Leverage, Sufficient Financial Backing, and Resource Commitment for CIDBs Are Needed*

Hosting a major sporting event is said to generate various benefits for cities and nations. However, more recent studies argue that only events with the strategic intent to create opportunities and planning for legacies—termed “event

leverage”—can bring about desired outcomes for local communities (Chalip, 2004; Misener et al., 2015; Smith & Fox, 2007). Legacy is different to leverage. As explained above, while legacy can be planned and unplanned event outcomes, leverage efforts and their planned activities or processes that are strategically designed to bring about benefits or impacts beyond the delivery of event outcomes are more relevant here to CIDBs. CIDBs should be positioned as a main area for leveraging as they are not necessarily central to legacy. A good example is the Glasgow 2014 Commonwealth Games’ 1,100 Host City Volunteers program (Rogerson et al., 2018), which was set up particularly to engage disabled people, older people, and those living in more deprived areas. Major event legacies for CIDBs can benefit from leverage, meaning that using strategically designed activities and initiatives, targeting CIDBs, can bring about benefits beyond the delivery of the events. More recently, Lu and Misener (2023) have shown that leveraging partnerships established after major sporting events is crucial to ensure accessibility of facilities and pathways for people with disabilities. This is necessary to enable them to achieve their full potential in sport and recreation.

While the CIDBs welcome events and express a desire to see their communities flourish through event hosting, it is rare to see that happening in practice. Past research points to a list of risk factors that have resulted in a failed generation of positive legacies for CIDBs, including primarily a lack of adequate financial (dedicating funding support), human and intangible (providing information on potential legacy opportunities and resources), and environmental (changing the accessibility to essential services) resources and programs (Minnaert, 2012; Pappalepore & Duignan, 2016; Pereira, 2018) to address inequality and support community and individual strengths.

*Recommendation Three*

Consistent with the suggestions published by Spirit of 2012 (a UK-based inquiry chaired by Sir Tom Hughes-Hallett into the evidence of sport, arts, and community development as a result of event hosting) (Spirit of 2012, 2023), we suggest that

strategic actions to fully maximize opportunities stimulated by event hosting should be planned and implemented via ongoing and iterative consultation with CIDBs. Our experience working with these communities has highlighted that recognizing their existing strengths is an essential part of achieving positive change. This could be supported by entities embedded within the communities. Local community activists/community-based organizations are well placed to act as “legacy conduits” in sharing knowledge of community needs, as well as helping to promote the Games, facilitating engagement, and maximizing legacy leverage. Through these events, it is possible to tailor legacy initiatives to address disadvantage in a way that empowers and enables community members and local leaders to do the work of supporting their communities to prosper.

Furthermore, existing inequalities faced by CIDBs mean that providing additional and adequate resources to level-up CIDBs before the hosting of the events is essential. We call for a clear enumeration of public funds used for supporting CIDBs in this process. We also advocate that such resources should go beyond financial support. Other forms of direct resources, including intangible (e.g., active education for those experiencing homelessness and vulnerable people as to their rights and protection

of civil liberties) and tangible resources (e.g., housing, access to services, training and transportation), should also be provided. Furthermore, recognizing the longitudinal nature of legacy, ongoing community investment, and development is also recommended for building sustainable legacies.

*Proposition Four: Legacy Governance for CIDBs Is Neglected*

The current consideration of event legacy for CIDBs is lacking the governance dimension and its implication is not thought through carefully. As known from past Games, transparent and accountable event legacy commitments for CIDBs were rarely made clear. In terms of the mode of governance, the interactions between the event stakeholders, policymakers, and communities have not yet been systematically mapped out. Incorporating the principles of the systematic governance model as proposed by Henry and Lee (2004) and expanding upon the initial frameworks and structures for event leveraging as outlined by (Chalip et al., 2017), we identify a comparable array of stakeholders pertinent to CIDBs. These stakeholders are collectively referred to as the Strategic Alliance for Event Leverage (refers to a collaborative network




Figure 1. Propositions and the strategic alliance for event leveraging for CIDBs.



of organizations focused on event planning and maximizing the long-term benefits or legacy of the event; Chalip et al., 2017) (Fig. 1).

Furthermore, political steering on event legacy tends to use top-down approaches (which are often made based on the principles of neoliberalism; Lerner, 2000) and are not necessarily aligned with CIDBs' needs. No consideration has been given to how any created event legacies for CIDBs can be sustained.

Learning from other research on event legacy for the general population, it is established that creating legacies requires the design of governance systems—incorporating the enhancement of the host government's capacity to act and the deployment of specific policy instruments—to steer action towards a consensus among the various stakeholders (Girginov, 2012). This is the same for CIDBs, who should be at the heart of this process.

#### *Recommendation Four*

It is important that the host governments establish long-term, sustainable, legacy governance arrangements that specifically prioritize CIDBs. Such CIDBs' governance arrangements can be integrated into the overarching sustained legacy governance and should detail relevant management processes, responsible bodies, and legacy ownership.

In addition, considering financial viability, the inclusion of the private sector (in the form of philanthropy, donors, or any other sources, but different from the typical event sponsorship model) could help to create, launch and manage activities that will benefit CIDBs in the long term.

The basis of leveraging plans of lasting event legacy for CIDBs should be informed by sustainable principles that is event themed (e.g., neighborhood-level initiatives that are more loosely linked to the event) rather than event led (driven by events which typically are top-down) (Smith & Fox, 2007). To do so, collaborative and community-centered approaches should be adopted. Local authorities can set up participatory structures and adopt empowerment strategies during collaborative processes to put CIDBs' views and interests at the heart of the event legacy. Event delivery and legacy leverage through arm's length organizations (for the purposes of enhancing accountability and

transparency) with representation from lived experience experts and people working with them in the sector is also recommended. A vivid example is provided in Bob and Majola's (2011) investigation of the 2010 FIFA World Cup, they reported that when small organizations were educated about event-led tourism opportunities and worked with local governments on developing strategies, positive impacts were generated for small local businesses.

#### *Conclusion*

The impact of major sporting events on communities and individuals from disadvantaged backgrounds calls for detailed and critical scrutiny. In contributing to the scholarly landscape, this collaborative initiative not only infuses a much-needed critical perspective into academic discussions but also offers insights that could inform future policies and research directions. It represents a deliberate move to transition the discourse from generalized narratives to a more nuanced comprehension. This fosters an ecosystem wherein the rewards of hosting major sporting events could be more evenly shared, especially among CIDBs.

Theoretically, the statement articulates a more expansive hermeneutic approach to understanding "disadvantage" in the context of major sporting events. This nuanced framework encourages both scholars and applied researchers to delve deeper into the intricate ways these large-scale events can either mitigate or intensify existing social inequalities. Moreover, it underscores the fluid nature of stakeholder salience, particularly concerning CIDBs in the context of major sporting events. A key observation is the fluctuating salience levels of CIDBs throughout the event life cycle. Initially high in prominence during the bidding phase, their salience often diminishes as operational mandates take over, leaving these communities at the margins of the actual event and its subsequent legacies. Utilizing a stakeholder salience lens offers a nuanced perspective on this dynamic, enabling a more comprehensive understanding of the multifaceted implications for CIDBs. This concept of "shifting salience" serves as an analytical framework that can be applied to various stakeholder groups, urging us to rethink how legacy planning

and stakeholder involvement are inherently inter-linked and subject to change over time.

In practical terms, to prevent the deprioritization of disadvantaged communities, the article presents a series of actionable recommendations aimed at enhancing stakeholder salience at every phase of the event cycle. These range from precise identification and baseline assessments of CIDBs during the bidding process to inclusive legacy planning and governance structures. When salience decreases, as is often the case, strategic actions can be implemented to readjust the focus. For instance, early and iterative consultation with CIDBs, as well as the employment of independent evaluation mechanisms, can serve to sustain and even increase their salience. By actively embedding these practices into the planning, delivery, and evaluation stages, the fluctuating salience levels can be better managed, thereby ensuring that the interests of disadvantaged communities are not sidelined but are integral to the event's lasting legacy.

However, it is imperative to recognize the limitations of major sporting events as a comprehensive solution to the systemic challenges facing CIDBs. While these events may serve as catalysts for community development and social uplift, they are not a silver bullet for the deeply entrenched issues that require multidimensional policy interventions. This consensus statement, therefore, advocates for a balanced approach that neither underestimates the potential benefits nor overlooks the complexities of leveraging major sporting events for social good.

#### Acknowledgment

We are grateful for the support provided by our partner—the Birmingham Race Impact Group—to this project. This project is funded by ESRC, University of Birmingham, Siemens and Russell Partnership Collection.

#### ORCID

Shushu Chen: <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-4010-9177>  
 Mary Quinton: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0636-6957>  
 Helen X. H. Bao: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3966-3867>  
 Kyriaki Kaplanidou: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3763-1861>  
 Maria Karamani: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9730-315X>  
 Jacqueline Kennelly: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8991-3898>

Themis Kokolakis: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2421-8106>  
 Xiao Liang: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7081-1832>  
 Brij Maharaj: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1266-2231>  
 Judith Mair: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2447-3377>  
 Andrew Smith: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5172-3984>  
 Lorraine van Blerk: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1792-2354>  
 Jet Veldhuizen van Zanten: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8422-9512>

#### References

- Bob, U., & Majola, M. (2011). Rural community perceptions of the 2010 FIFA World cup: The makhowe community in Kwazulu-Natal. *Development Southern Africa*, 28(3), 387–399. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0376835X.2011.595999>
- Bonevski, B., Randell, M., Paul, C., Chapman, K., Twyman, L., Bryant, J., Brozek, I., & Hughes, C. (2014). Reaching the hard-to-reach: A systematic review of strategies for improving health and medical research with socially disadvantaged groups. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, 14(1), article 42. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2288-14-42>
- Chalip, L. (2004). Beyond impact: A general model for sport event leverage. In B. W. Ritchie & D. Adair (Eds.), *Sport tourism: Interrelationships, impacts and issues* (pp. 226–252). Channel View Publications
- Chalip, L., Green, B. C., Taks, M., & Misener, L. (2017). Creating sport participation from sport events: Making it happen. *International Journal of Sport Policy and Politics*, 9(2), 257–276. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19406940.2016.1257496>
- Chen, S., & Henry, I. (2020). Assessing Olympic legacy claims: Evaluating explanations of causal mechanisms and policy outcomes. *Evaluation*, 26(3), 275–295. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1356389019836675>
- Chen, S., & Misener, L. (2019). Event leveraging in a nonhost region: Challenges and opportunities. *Journal of Sport Management*, 33(4), 275–288. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jsm.2018-0210>
- Chen, S., Quinton, M., Veldhuijzen van Zanten, J., Liang, X., Duan, Z., Carter, B., Heyes, A., & Lee, M. (2022). *Legacies of major sporting events for disadvantaged communities and individuals: A grey literature review*. [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9zApwCR\\_9rE](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9zApwCR_9rE)
- Chen, S., Veldhuijzen van Zanten, J., Quinton, M., Lee, M., Ali, T., Heyes, A., Liang, X., Alharbi A., Carter, B., Duan, Z., & Karamani, M. (2023). Perceptions of the Birmingham 2022 Commonwealth Games: Legacies for individuals and communities from disadvantaged backgrounds. A report prepared for the funder: ESRC, Siemens, Russell Partnership and University of Birmingham. Birmingham: University of Birmingham. [https://www.majoreventlegacy.com/files/ugd/30c79f\\_b1e2b-8fc6b024144a41fe5b2c4451dca.pdf](https://www.majoreventlegacy.com/files/ugd/30c79f_b1e2b-8fc6b024144a41fe5b2c4451dca.pdf)
- Cumming, J., Whiting, R., Parry, B. J., Clarke, F. J., Holland, M. J. G., Cooley, S. J., & Quinton, M. L. (2022). The My Strengths Training for Life™ program: Rationale, logic model, and description of a strengths-based intervention for young people experiencing homelessness. *Evaluation*

- and Program Planning, 91, 102045. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evalprogplan.2021.102045>
- DCMS. (2013). *London 2012 meta-evaluation*. <https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/london-2012-meta-evaluation>
- Duignan, M., Carlini, J., & Parent, M. (2023). Host community salience loss across major sport event planning. *European Sport Management Quarterly*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1080/16184742.2023.2237063>
- Duncan, M., & Corner, J. (2012). *Severe and multiple disadvantage: A review of key texts*. LankellyChase Foundation. <https://lankellychase.org.uk/publication/severe-and-multiple-disadvantage-literature-review/>
- Girginov, V. (2012). Governance of the London 2012 Olympic Games legacy. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 47(5), 543–558. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1012690211413966>
- Henriksen, K., Schinke, R., Moesch, K., McCann, S., Parham, W. D., Larsen, C. H., & Terry, P. (2020). Consensus statement on improving the mental health of high performance athletes. *International Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 18(5), 553–560. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1612197X.2019.1570473>
- Henry, I. P., & Lee, P. C. (2004). Governance and ethics in sport. In J. Beech & S. Chadwick (Eds.), *The business of sport management* (pp. 3–24). Pearson Education.
- Higgins, D. (2010). *Community development approaches to safety and wellbeing of Indigenous children* (Closing the Gap Clearinghouse Resource Sheet). Australian Institute of Health and Welfare & Australian Institute of Family Studies. [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/264276758\\_Community\\_development\\_approaches\\_to\\_safety\\_and\\_wellbeing\\_of\\_Indigenous\\_children](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/264276758_Community_development_approaches_to_safety_and_wellbeing_of_Indigenous_children)
- Jones, M., & Stokes, T. (2003). The Commonwealth Games and urban regeneration: An investigation into training initiatives and partnerships and their effects on disadvantaged groups in East Manchester. *Managing Leisure*, 8(4), 198–211. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1360671032000148576>
- Kennelly, J., & Watt, P. (2012). Seeing Olympic effects through the eyes of marginally housed youth: Changing places and the gentrification of East London. *Visual Studies*, 27(2), 151–160. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1472586X.2012.677496>
- Kennelly, J. (2016). *Olympic exclusions: Youth, poverty and social legacies*. Routledge.
- Kennelly, J. (2022). Policing the young and the poor in Olympic neighbourhoods: The security legacy in Stratford, London (2012). In D. Silva & L. Kennedy (Eds.), *In power played: A critical criminology of sport* (pp. 291–311). UBC Press.
- Kennelly, J., & Watt, P. (2011). Sanitizing public space in Olympic host cities: The spatial experiences of marginalized youth in 2010 Vancouver and 2012 London. *Sociology*, 45(5), 765–781. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0038038511413425>
- Kokolakakis, T., & Lera-López, F. (2022). Sport legacy impact on ethnic minority groups: The case of London 2012. *Sport in Society*, 25(4), 730–747. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17430437.2021.2011229>
- Larner, W. (2000). Neo-liberalism: Policy, ideology, governmentality. *Studies in Political Economy*, 63(1), 5–25. <http://hdl.handle.net/1983/1011>
- Liang, X., Chen, S., Quinton, M., Veldhuijzen van Zanten, J., Duan, Z., Carter, B., Heyes, A., & Lee, M. (2022). *The legacy of major sporting events for disadvantaged communities/individuals: A systematic review*. National Institute for Health and Care Research. <https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/prospero/display-record.php?ID=CRD42022336493>
- Liang, X., Quinton, M., Veldhuijzen van Zanten, J., Duan, Z., Carter, B., Heyes, A., Lee, M., & Chen, S. (in press). The legacy of major sporting events for disadvantaged communities/individuals: A systematic review. *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal*.
- Lu, L. D., & Misener, L. (2023). Managing and sustaining cross-sector leveraging partnership in the post-event era: A case study of a provincial parasport collective. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 23(5), 1347–1408. <https://doi.org/10.1080/16184742.2022.2025885>
- Maharaj, B. (2015). The turn of the south? Social and economic impacts of mega-events in India, Brazil and South Africa. *Local Economy: The Journal of the Local Economy Policy Unit*, 30(8), 983–999. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0269094215604318>
- Massey, D. S. (2007). *Categorically unequal: The American Stratification System*. Russell Sage Foundation.
- Minnaert, L. (2012). An Olympic legacy for all? The non-infrastructure outcomes of the Olympic Games for socially excluded groups (Atlanta 1996–Beijing 2008). *Tourism Management*, 33(2), 361–370. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2011.04.005>
- Misener, L., McGillivray, D., McPherson, G., & Legg, D. (2015). Leveraging parasport events for sustainable community participation: The Glasgow 2014 Commonwealth Games. *Annals of Leisure Research*, 18(4), 450–469. <https://doi.org/10.1080/11745398.2015.1045913>
- Pappalopore, I., & Duignan, M. B. (2016). The London 2012 cultural programme: A consideration of Olympic impacts and legacies for small creative organisations in east London. *Tourism Management*, 54, 344–355. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2015.11.015>
- Patton, M. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). SAGE.
- Pereira, R. H. M. (2018). Transport legacy of mega-events and the redistribution of accessibility to urban destinations. *Cities*, 81, 45–60. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2018.03.013>
- Preuss, H. (2015). A framework for identifying the legacies of a mega sport event. *Leisure Studies*, 34(6), 643–664. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02614367.2014.994552>
- Rogerson, R., Reid, F., Sly, B., & Nicholson, R. (2018). *Three years on—The impact of being a Host City Volunteer at the Glasgow 2014 Commonwealth Games*. Glasgow Life. <https://strathprints.strath.ac.uk/68717/>
- Sen, A. (1999). *Commodities and capabilities*. Oxford University Press.
- Smith, A., & Fox, T. (2007). From ‘event-led’ to ‘event-themed’ regeneration: The 2002 Commonwealth

- Games Legacy Programme. *Urban Studies*, 44(5–6), 1125–1143. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00420980701256039>
- Spirit of 2012. (2023). *Inquiry into the power of events*. <https://spiritof2012.org.uk/policy/inquiry/>
- Tanton, R., Dare, L., Miranti, R., Vidyattama, Y., Yule, A., & McCabe, M. (2021). *Dropping off the edge 2021: Persistent and multilayered disadvantage in Australia*. Jesuit Social Services.
- Van Blerk, L. (2011). ‘Managing’ Cape Town’s street children/youth: The impact of the 2010 World Cup bid on street life in the city of Cape Town. *South African Geographical Journal*, 93(1), 29–37. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03736245.2011.570515>
- Van Blerk, L., Mendel, J., Rodriguez, A., Fernandes, F. L., & Rizzini, I. (2018). ‘Let’s win this game together’: Children’s rights violations, macro-securitisation and the transformative potential of the 2014 FIFA World Cup in Brazil. *Bulletin of Latin American Research*, 38(3), 284–299. <https://doi.org/10.1111/blr.12840>
- Van Geertsom, J., Lemaire, F., & Hebbelinck, M. (2017). How ‘experts by experience in poverty and social exclusion’ improve access and the quality of public services in Belgium—A case study. Governance International. <https://www.govint.org/good-practice/case-studies/co-production-with-experts-by-experience-in-poverty-and-social-exclusion-in-belgium/>
- Vinson, T. (2007). *Dropping of the edge: The distribution of disadvantage in Australia*. Jesuit Social Services/Catholic Social Services Australia.
- Wang, M., Bao, H. X. H., & Lin, P. (2015). Behavioural insights into housing relocation decisions: The effects of the Beijing Olympics. *Habitat International*, 47, 20–28. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.habitatint.2015.01.001>
- Weed, M., Coren, E., Fiore, J., Wellard, I., Chatziefstathiou, D., Mansfield, L., & Dowse, S. (2015). The Olympic Games and raising sport participation: A systematic review of evidence and an interrogation of policy for a demonstration effect. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 15(2), 195–226. <https://doi.org/10.1080/16184742.2014.998695>