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1. RESEARCH BACKGROUND
Paralympic research needs

- Misener, Darcy, Legg & Gilbert (In press)
  - **Minimal scholarly attention** to Paralympic Legacy
  - ‘Our findings suggest that **minimal attention** has been paid to legacies related to the Paralympic Games, and for the most part have been primarily theoretical or anecdotal in nature.’
  - ‘What is called for is to **move beyond policy statements** and speeches about legacy and **to fully resource legacy programs** that contain a proportion of the resources to evaluate the outcomes of the programs.’

- *E.g.* What **empirical** evidence exists that the Paralympics leaves a legacy? If there is a legacy, what are the facilitators/barriers?

Research problem and project aim

The problem:

What is the volunteer legacy of mega sport events?

Project aim:

– to add to the research on Paralympic events and social legacy creation by exploring the motivations and future volunteering intentions of London 2012 volunteers, i.e. the Games Makers by building on research conducted at Vancouver 2010

The results presented here focus on those who volunteered for the Paralympics.
Other team members

Dr Angela M. Benson
- University of Brighton, Eastbourne, UK
- Conducted interviews of volunteer during the Games
- A.M.Benson@brighton.ac.uk

And
- Mrs F. Anne Terwiel
  - Thompson Rivers University, Kamloops, BC, Canada
- Professor Simon Darcy
  - University of Technology, Sydney, Australia
London 2012 Games makers
http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KPntizvEvio
2. THE RHETORIC OF LEGACY
2.1 The rhetoric: Legacy and the IPC

5.2.1 Planning for Legacies

There are many important legacy fields, primarily in relation to the socio-cultural sphere, that occur in the host city/region because of hosting the Paralympic Games:

1. Accessible infrastructure in sport facilities and urban development.
2. Development of sport structures/organizations for people with a disability, from grass-roots to elite level.
3. Attitudinal changes in the perception of the position and the capabilities of persons with a disability as well as in the self-esteem of the people with a disability.
4. Opportunities for people with a disability to become fully integrated in social living and to reach their full potential in aspects of life beyond sports.
2.2 The rhetoric:
volunteer legacy expectations

• LOCOG (2009)
  – We aim to create a ‘family’ of volunteers after the Games who would like to stay in touch with friends made during the course of their volunteering

• Department for Culture, Media and Sport (2007, 2012)
  – ‘Inspire a new generation of young people to take part in local volunteering, cultural and physical activity’
  – ‘In 1948, London was the first Games ever to use volunteers, and, fittingly, they will again take centre stage in 2012 – this time not only helping to make the Games happen, but shaping a new culture of volunteering across the UK.’
2.3 The rhetoric: Sochi 2014

- Dmitry Chernyshenko, Sochi 2014 President and CEO, said (May, 2011)
  – ‘Our program to train volunteers will not only deliver skilled and enthusiastic volunteers to welcome the world to Sochi in 2014, but also leave the invaluable legacy of a volunteering culture in Russia which will benefit the nation for years into the future’

A volunteer legacy is often used as one justification for the use of large amounts of public monies spent on hosting mega sport events – but where is the proof?
3. THE REALITY OF LONDON 2012
3. Researching the motivations and legacy of volunteering

- Post games online survey distributed to all 70,000 Games Makers by LOCOG Research Department 2 days after the Paralympics exploring:
  - Motivations
  - Previous volunteering
  - Future volunteering expectations

- Responses
  - 11,451 responses (16% response rate)
    - 4,352 volunteered during the Paralympics (38%)
There are many Games-time volunteers not just Games Makers (i.e. OCOG vols)
3.1 Reality:
Post Games Online survey - who responded?

- Paralympic volunteers  
  n=4,352,  
  - Also volunteered  
    - Pre-Games 18%  
    - Olympics 49%

- Gender  
  - **Female** 60% (cf 57%)  
  - **Male** 40% (cf 43%)

- Age  
  - 16-18 yrs 1%  
  - 19-24 yrs 13%  
  - 25-34 yrs 12%  
  - 35-44 yrs 14%  
  - 45-54 yrs 20%  
  - 55-64 yrs 29%  
  - 65 rs+ 12%  

**NB:** Not a representative sample, more females and older volunteers responded.
### 3.2 Top 10 motivations to volunteer
(of 36 items built on SEVM, 5 point scale)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Motivation item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>VANOC 2010 Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>It was the chance of a lifetime</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I wanted to help make the Games a success</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I am interested in the Games</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I wanted to be associated with the Games</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I wanted to do something worthwhile</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I believe in the principles and values of the Games</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I am proud of London and the UK</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I have a passion for the Games</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I have an interest in sport</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I wanted to use my skills</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3.3.1 Intention to volunteer after the Games

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>London 2012 Paralympic Volunteers n=4,057*</th>
<th>Vancouver 2010 Pre-Games intentions: All n=1,697*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less or no volunteering</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same level of volunteering</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More volunteering</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net increase</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Excludes those who indicated that they didn’t know
3.3.2 Future volunteering intentions ~ more vs the same or less volunteering ($X^2$ analysis)

• Significant relationships for
  – age ($X^2$ (6, n=4352), $p<.001$)
    • Those aged **19-44 yrs**: more people indicated they would increase their volunteering rather than staying the same or less
  – employment status ($X^2$ (7, n=4352), $p<.001$)
    • more **fulltime workers, students, carers and the unemployed** indicated they would increase their volunteering
  – previous volunteering experience ($X^2$ (1, n=4352), $p<.001$)
    • those who **did not volunteer in the prior 12 months** were more likely to increase their volunteering post-Games
      – 41% will volunteer more in the future of those who volunteered in the prior 12 months
      – cf 58% more if no volunteering in prior 12 mths

• but no sign. relationships for gender or household income.
3.3.3 Future volunteering plans

✓ Those who plan to volunteer more:
  – Younger people
  – Those who did not volunteer in the previous 12 months
  – Those motivated by:
    • Altruism/giving back
    • Busy people!
    • Where volunteering is a tradition in family or community
    • Not after the rewards

✧ Those more likely to volunteer the same or less:
  • Those motivated by:
    – Wanting skill development
    – The event itself
    – Wanting variety
    – Wanting to use their skills
4. REFLECTIONS AND SOME RECOMMENDATIONS
4.1.1 Reflections

• A social legacy from volunteering requires work and funding before, during and after – well beyond the life of the OCOG

• Knowledge transfer regarding volunteer legacies:
  – needs to occur at the volunteer organisation level (i.e. those that can use the knowledge) not the OCOG;

• It’s easy to be enthusiastic before the Games, it is after the Games that the work begins to create legacy, after the media-caravan moves on.
4.1.2 Reflections

• Sochi 2014: Volunteer Centres
  – May benefit from having Volunteer Centres training people from their local communities, so they connect volunteers with the organisations who may use them
    • But, how enthusiastic will people be in communities without large/mega events?
  – May also benefit from FIFA World Cup
    • but maybe only in sports volunteering,
    • how do community organisations match the recognition and the hype of these events?
  – But, still need funding to transition to a new model after the Games
4.2 Some recommendations

*If* a social legacy of volunteerism is important …

1. Plan for it, e.g.:
   - Make it part of the *bid criteria* and *infrastructure legacy plan*;
   - **Recruit for legacy**: e.g. those motivated by altruism;
   - Make volunteer legacy part of the *knowledge transfer* process between Games, this may also help database design.

2. Evaluate it, and **measure** to see if, what and how it is working, e.g. the OGI
5. LIMITATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS
5.1 Limitations

1. Survey timing:
   - For both London 2012 & Vancouver 2010, timing was controlled by the OCOG and thus occurred at different times
   - We cannot measure the effect of surveying in the ‘after glow’ of the Games …

2. The lack of clarity over ownership of the volunteer database made planning for impact research difficult
5.2 Conclusion

WHAT IS THE IPC’S ROLE IN THIS?

Thus, a robust social science research agenda is required that:

- links to IPC objectives, incl. legacy objectives, e.g.
  - Participation
  - Opportunities
  - Attitudes
- evaluates outcomes,
- informs planning, and
- helps development of a robust volunteer survey tool relevant to Paralympic events.
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