

EDUCATIONAL LEGACIES OF MEGA-SPORT EVENTS FOR AFRICA

Cora BURNETT

*Department of Sport and Movement Studies, University of Johannesburg, Johannesburg,
Republic of South Africa*

ABSTRACT

Current anticolonial discourses in Africa frame a public agenda for positive social transformation underpinned by a human justice framework. Sociologists studying social and educational legacies associated with mega-events have been instrumental in a critical analysis thereof. This paper firstly examines multiple understandings of ‘legacy’, and secondly provides an overview of educational programmes of five consecutive Summer Olympic Games (2000 to 2016). The Agenda 2020 of the International Olympic Committee (IOC) is founded on the commitment to deliver on selected Sustainable Development Goals proposing a neo-colonial framework for educational practices and top-down development. Developing nations need to make informed decisions for optimally leveraging meaningful social transformation and educational practices associated with sport mega-events. Within South Africa, intersecting development and educational agendas from different levels of engagement (international to national and local) by stakeholders, form different configurations to allow space within physical education and school sport practices for sport mega-event educational legacy programmes.

Keywords: Educational legacy; Olympic Games; Olympism; Sport-for-development; Physical education.

INTRODUCTION

Bidding proposals for sport mega-events increasingly feature social and educational legacies associated with neo-colonial ideologies that propose individual empowerment, which manifest at the core of positive social transformation. The spread of Olympism as a universal ‘ideology of life’ found expression in Olympic educational legacy programmes associated with hosting consecutive Summer Olympic Games since 2000 (IOC, 2014a). By describing these different educational legacies, key features emerge for reflective learning – particularly in physical education and school sport that require strategic planning in currently “crowded policy spaces” (Houlihan, 2000).

Social and educational legacies intersect, as the latter encapsulate teachings and learning based on value-education practices and praxis to deliver on planned social outcomes. Channelling educational legacy programmes through schools ensure that youth are the main recipients and drivers of their development and pivotal to social reform (Darnell, 2010). Positive social outcomes, such as social inclusion, community development and nation-building are seldom substantiated by robust evidence, yet continue to feature on nationalist agendas as a persuasive argument for the ‘rhetoric of the rings’ (Kohe, 2010). Failed educational legacies, such as

increased physical activity or broad-based participation levels were caused by policy change (2012 London Games) or the lack of appropriate mechanisms (Toohey *et al.*, 2000).

Olympic education programmes mostly represent a positivist perspective that uncritically promotes the Olympic Movement as an ideal institution without questioning neo-colonial and liberalist ideological underpinnings (Guest, 2013; Burnett, 2016). It is for this reason that Culpan (2016) argues for Olympism education, which relates to value-based education on the premises of local relevancy, contextual understandings and a critical world view. Such a perspective articulates with the concept of Olympism defined by the first Fundamental Principle of the Olympic Charter as “a philosophy of life, exalting and combining a balanced whole - the qualities of body, will and mind...” (IOC, 2014a:13). Olympism education should not allow for an uncritical acceptance of universal values but take cognisance of contextual value systems and authenticity. The lack of conceptual clarity is evidenced in the terminology used by different stakeholders. Olympic education prioritises the values, history and issues of the Olympic Movement compared to Olympism education that focused on human development through holistic education.

In the African context where all countries are non-host Olympic countries, the question is asked, to what extent life skill education (packaged as Olympism education) has a role to play in the enrichment or change of the current physical education and school sport (PESS) curricula and practices. However, value-education alone cannot address the limiting manifestations of poverty which is systemic – entrenched by ideology and resource poor environments.

CONCEPTUALISING LEGACY

The concept of ‘legacy’ is problematic in that in essence, it captures the notion of ‘inheritance’ (Cashman, 2003; Preuss, 2007a). Applying this concept to possible pragmatic consequences of the Olympic Games, it is loosely associated with ideas around possible consequences and also identifiable as impacts (Toohey, 2008). The notion of longitudinal features associated with social legacy, encapsulate the idea of learning and knowledge transfer (Clark, 2005). Within the context of an Olympic Games legacy framework, Preuss (2007b:87) defined the concept as “...all planned and unplanned positive and negative, intangible and tangible structures created by and for a sport event that remains for a longer time than the event itself”.

The potential societal benefits of hosting the Olympic Games have captured the public imagination for centuries, but it was only at the 1996 Atlanta Olympic Games that the concept of ‘legacy’ was coined to capture the positive economic and social outcomes of such an event (Mules & Faulker, 1996; Chappelet, 2008). Sustainability became an issue so as to ensure longer-term cost-effective legacy benefits that were part of the pre-event planning and proactively managed beyond the timeframe of a particular sport mega event (Leopkey & Parent, 2012).

The cost-benefit trade-off at societal and national levels of hosting the Olympic Games did not deliver on the anticipated (often inflated) promises associated with positive economic features, infrastructure development and tourism outcomes (Liu *et al.*, 2014). When the 1984 Los

Angeles Olympic Games turned out to be profitable, the 1988 Calgary bid included planning for legacy projects – a trend that contributed to building a convincing case for the host cities. In 2012, the sport, social, economic and environmental legacies demonstrated a validation for public spending (Leopkey & Parent, 2012). The IOC produced a *Guide on Olympic Legacy* that informs various stakeholders of opportunities and benefits associated with very diverse legacy investments and programmes (IOC, n.d.).

The cost factor, lack of evidence of positive returns and negative publicity contributed to a decline in bidding cities and a shift towards socio-political and cultural (intangible) benefits (Girginov & Parry, 2005). Yet, it did not affect the rhetoric of national governments of host cities promising lasting social and economic benefits in support of their political ideologies and development priorities. Emerging states, such as China (2008), Russia (2014) and Brazil (2016), became contenders for hosting the Olympic Games and Football World Cup, trading on a wide spectrum of anticipated short- (mainly economic) and longer-term benefits (Liu & Gratton, 2010). These benefits correspond with positive legacies in terms of the tangible (sport, housing and transport infrastructure) and intangible outcomes. The latter refer to those that are difficult to quantify and include social, cultural, international and national profiling, nation-building and feel-good factors (Gratton & Preuss, 2008; Schmedes, 2015).

The multidimensionality of the latter type of benefits has been captured by various scholars. They may have relatively lasting effects in terms of network formations, educational enrichments and exchanges that became institutionalised within the host and non-host environments. Liu *et al.* (2014) provide evidence of social legacy effects measured in Shanghai as a non-host city, five years after the Beijing Olympic Games in 2008. By applying an Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA), they traced positive legacy effects in the dimensions related to 'psychic income and social capital', 'networks and cooperation', 'sport and health', and 'identity and culture'. Unintended negative outcomes were not reported in the quest of building a positive case for social legacy programmes associated with sport mega events.

DELIVERING ON SOCIAL AND EDUCATIONAL LEGACY

In 2000, Sydney marginally won the vote to host the Summer Olympics against China and had as central theme the reconciliation of the non-Aboriginal population with the Aboriginal inhabitants (Rowe, 2012). The symbolical capital around human rights and nation-building featured in the cultural programme and ceremonies, but did little to address the systemic oppression and dispossession suffered by the indigenous population during two centuries of colonisation. The well-celebrated athlete, Cathy Freeman who lit the Olympic cauldron during the opening ceremony and displayed the Aboriginal and Australian flags during her victory lap after having won the gold medal in the 400m race, became the very symbol of a new Australian identity. This Olympic branding of the Aboriginal issue mostly concealed the socio-political inequalities and human rights transgressions (Cashman, 2006). The notions of reconciliation and empowerment emerged as a mega-sport event discourse, which represents a rather superficial gaze compared to the sociological discourse of entrenched disenfranchisement. Rowe (2012:286) remarks on the temporality and illusiveness inherent in the public display of such deep-rooted inequality:

... for the purposes of Olympic proponents concerned primarily with symbolically managing rather than materially affecting 'indigenous issues', the task of harnessing aboriginal iconography and managing dissent was successful. The notion of legacy, now routinely mobilized in Olympic and other mega sport event discourse, is inherently – perhaps intentionally – elusive, and so in this respect parallels the global civil society to which it appeals.

In contrast with persuasive images of Aboriginal indigeneity at the 2000 Sydney Olympic Games and muffled resistance, the 2008 Beijing Olympic Games elicited open local and global resistance from civic society. The opening up of Chinese markets and welcoming a 'new China' in the global Olympic fold of the Olympic Family, suppressed blatant human rights transgressions (Brownell, 2012). The international media gained unprecedented access to Chinese society, but the embargo on local media provided a 'mixed legacy' (Rowe, 2012).

Vocal protests against China's human rights infringements sporadically erupted during the Torch Relay around the Tibetan issue and because of China's support for Darfur's repressive regime (Defroad, 2012). At the ceremonies, the Tibetan minority featured in recognition of their cultural heritage and in a display of national unity without setting the scene for ethnic reconciliation between the Tibetans and the Han. Ethnic hegemonic structures and practices prevailed and were protected by IOC regulations of not allowing political demonstrations at the Olympic Games, associated events or venues.

The legacies represented cross-cutting themes in sectors representative of the sport sector, social, educational, environment, infrastructure development and technological domains (Rowe, 2012). The London 2012 Olympic Games set targets for delivering on a health and sport participation framework to increase the physical activity levels of having one million people participating in sport and an additional million to become physically active by 2012. This legacy set out in the Labour government's action plan to increase the sport participation of one million more people, in addition to another million to increase their physical activity levels by 2012, did not materialise as stated by Fox *et al.* (2012:22):

The coalition government has since dropped the physical activity target, and recent data from the Active People Survey suggest there is little chance of the sport goal being met; only 111,800 more adults are participating in sport since 2007/8... So where have things gone wrong? Were the original targets unrealistic? Have strategies been inappropriate?

This finding was supported by an extensive literature study and the authors (Weed *et al.*, 2015) concluded that there was no evidence to substantiate the sport participation engagement and participation policy effects for the United Kingdom government in relation to the 2012 London Olympic Games. This proposed intangible benefit was again framed for the 2016 Rio de Janeiro Olympic Games, yet preliminary findings raised nation-wide scepticism (Sousa-Mast *et al.*, 2013).

As in the case of the 2000 Sydney Olympic Games, evidence emerged that the Games serve to mobilise and inspire the athletic minority with a resultant drainage of the funding from

grassroots physical activity participation opportunities. Watching the Olympic Games does not translate into the necessary psycho-social mechanisms, role modelling and self-efficacy requirements that would enable increased active lifestyle behaviours. For the masses, it seems that the legacy is biased towards classroom-based educational programmes, rather than facilitating active participation or sport practices.

EDUCATIONAL LEGACY PROGRAMMES

All cities bidding for the Olympic Games are required to propose an education strategy. Since the early 1990s, Olympic-themed material and resource kits for school children and teachers became a standard practice. Different approaches were followed in the implementation of Olympic and Olympism education programmes.

The interpretation of the diverse meanings of Olympism as an ideology (Parry, 2003; Smith & Himmelfarb, 2008), a physiological anthropological concept (Parry 1998), an educational philosophy (Binder, 2007; Culpan & McBain, 2012) or a pedagogical institution (Pawlucki, 2009). Defroad (2012) discusses the educational and social application of Olympism as a true articulator of Olympic values and principles – a rationale that found resonance with other Olympic scholars (Gomes, 2002; Chappelet & Kübler-Mabbott, 2008). In this sense, Olympism education and Olympic education demonstrate a high level of overlap with the latter being dominantly utilised by National Olympic Committees implementing the Olympic Values Education Programme (OVEP).

Under the auspices of the International Olympic Committee (IOC), the toolkit for OVEP was developed to reflect what Naul (2008) would identify as a “lifeworld” orientation. Binder (2012), who was involved with the development of several such programmes, acknowledged the Euro-American ideological underpinnings thereof. Contemporary educational theory informed such projects over time, since the first one developed for the Calgary 1988 Olympic Winter Games organising Committee. The project produced for the Athens Foundation of Olympic and Sport Education attempted a rethink of the moral/ethical foundation to ensure multicultural applicability based on the methodology of dialogue (Freire, 1997) and critical thinking (Culpan & Wigmore, 2010).

The concept of ‘transnational spaces’ introduced by Gough (2000) created an awareness of the need to not only perform the ‘universals’ at local levels, but adapt and re-invent the material by merging it with indigenous knowledge and understanding. For instance, in the South African context, the philosophy of *Ubuntu* with an inherent anchoring in a collective conscious and value system of “respect, recognition, concern, compassion, forgiveness, empathy, understanding, cordiality, sincerity and generosity” offers a counter narrative to the individualistic neo-liberal western inspired ideology (Binder, 2012:293). Five values were priorities for school-based Olympic programmes, namely excellence, fair play, justice, peace and health that were considered “the most lasting sporting values, stretching through the whole spectrum of from ancient times, the beginning of the 20th century right up to our present times” (Mountakis, 2016:50). The link of Olympism with culture and education adds to the interrelated presentation across multiple social spheres (Chatziefstathiou, 2012:385):

Thus it is important to understand that Olympism in all these spheres is not only viewed as a static and narrow frame of values, but as a philosophy, that has the flexibility to be adapted to varying contexts which extend beyond the strict sense of “Olympic Education”.

The London 2012 Olympic Games Organising Committee’s ‘Get Set’ educational programme provided comprehensive web-based material. Formalised educational Olympic programmes were channelled through schools and teachers as main recipients, and depending on the pre-event strategy, displayed different life spans. From 2000, different strategies, delivery models and content impacted on the sustainability of educational legacies of host and non-host nations.

At the 2000 Sydney Olympic Games, educational material was produced by SOCOG’s Olympic 2000 National Education Programme and its initiatives. These initiatives include O-News (a student newspaper), ‘aspire’ (interactive learning material), Welcome World Programme, Internet Presence – Kids, ‘Share the spirit’ Art Program, Olympic Welcome Programme, Schools Olympic Flag Purchase Programme, opportunities for involvement of school students in the games and multiple official publications for classroom activities (Toohy *et al.*, 2000).

Prior to the 2004 Olympic Games in Athens, Olympic Education was incorporated in the national educational system with a time allocation of a weekly session for children from ages six to 18 years. The centralised nature of the Greek educational system facilitated rapid expansion to the schools. The programme was implemented by 2000 physical education graduates as a special workforce. A law was passed in parliament to allow for their employment and the Olympic Education Office created under the auspices of the Vice-Minister (in the Ministry of Education) and coordinated by a senior physical education teacher (Mountakis, 2016). Various researchers reported on the effects of such programmes, indicating that two months after the end of the programme, the children demonstrated fair play behaviours, classroom support and autonomy, an orientation toward play and relatively high levels of intrinsic motivation (Hassandra *et al.*, 2007). The Hellenic heritage framed many of the educational programmes between 2005 and 2008, which were then replaced by *kallipateira* with programmes addressing human rights, diversity, multiculturalism and social solidarity (Aroni, 2013).

Strategic planning paved the way for multi-year and widespread implementation of Olympic Education programmes in China prior to the 2008 Beijing Olympic Games. In 2002, the 2001-2010 Olympic Movement Plan was implemented, in 2005 the Beijing Elementary and Secondary School Olympic Education Programme commenced, and in 2006, the 11th 5-year Educational Plan (2006-2010) materialised (Wang & Masumoto, 2009). The Beijing Organizing Committee produced Olympic readers for the school-based programmes and initially educational programmes were implemented in the five venue cities where they were implemented first in 200 model schools in Beijing and 356 schools in other Chinese areas, before the roll-out to 400 million youth nationwide (Wang & Masumoto, 2009). Multiple curricular activities aimed to create enthusiasm for the 2008 Olympic Games, ‘invent’ a heightened sense of nationalism, taught Olympic values, history and content with extracurricular activities focusing on sporting events and environmental education.

Brownell (2009) critically reflected on the promotion of national identity and the patriotic education promoted by the Chinese government during that time. The educational challenge was to find a balance between nationalist values and positioning the newly constructed “open China” in the global world. The Olympic education programme enriched the existing *suchi* (quality) education which contributed to the reconfiguration of Chinese national identity.

The 2010 London Olympic educational legacy was a collaborative initiative driven by the Olympic Legacy Company, the London Organising Committee for the Olympic and Paralympic Games (LOCOG), British Olympic Association, British Paralympic Association and government departments (including School Sport Partnerships), which developed various strategies and initiatives for implementation (Griffiths & Armour, 2013). Sebastian Coe, Chairman of the London 2012 Organising Committee proclaimed the successful implementation of strategy by saying: “Members of the Get Set network are brilliant advocates for London 2012 – demonstrating what a positive difference linking learning to the Games can make to young people” (IOC News, 2011:1). Within the UK, the ‘Get set’ programme was implemented by 85% of the schools and colleges, reaching about seven million young people, and the international sport legacy programme (*International Inspirations*) reached about 12 million youths in 20 countries. Both these programmes aimed at building community cohesion, foster cultural understanding, changing perceptions around disability and respecting the environment (Kiely *et al.*, 2012).

The Olympic educational legacy was mainly channelled through physical education and school sport (PESS) structures. With the Coalition Government coming into power, more ambitious opportunities were created for competitive sport and the implementation of annual Olympic-style school competitions. These were aimed to administer self-governance as opposed to the implementation of a centralised government blueprint. This represented a return to traditional competitive school sport, where schools would determine the scope and time allocation of physical education and school sport despite evidence indicating a decline in curriculum time allocation when schools are free to determine the allocation (Griffiths & Armour, 2013). This set a different agenda of developing sporting talent through competitive sport participation (Woodhouse & Fielden, 2010). This approach does not serve a human rights framework of open access and value-based education for all in school and community environments.

Preliminary research into the effect of the 2016 Rio Olympic Games, reported the perception that there will be an increase in the interest to participate in sport and in turn attract more spectators to open air sport events for entertainment (Sousa-Mast *et al.*, 2013). In 2003, the *Second Half Program* (SHP) was implemented as indicated in the Rio 2016 Olympics bid proposal. The programme aimed at delivering moral education, promote citizenship and address issues of social inclusion (Knijnik & Tavares, 2012). These outcomes were at the core of using sport as a tool “to minimize the effects of risky environments and social vulnerability” and for children and youth to experience “ethical and aesthetic values for socializing” with specific reference to sport for development programmes (Todt *et al.*, 2016:14).

The ‘Transforma Programme’ as an educational initiative of the Rio 2016 Olympic Games stated the following educational aims, namely: ‘experiencing the Olympic and Paralympic values; ‘try new sports’ and ‘to become connected with the Olympic Games’ (Tavares & Kirst, 2016). To achieve these aims, the programme provided for the offering of school festivals and

sport challenges. Just prior to the Games, the programme was implemented by 9 146 schools and set a target of providing access for about four million students across Brazil.

A broad-scaled evaluation carried out by the Brazilian Ministry of Sport on the *Programa Segundo Tempo* (PST) evaluated the educational programme in the area of social vulnerability as per contractual agreement between the Ministry of Sport and the Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul in 2007. The latter stakeholder took the responsibility for training 29 000 physical education teachers (as nuclei and pedagogical coordinators) over a period of two years. The university also assisted with programme design based on principles of participation, tolerance, adversity, fair play, enjoyment, mental well-being, interaction, social inclusion and an active lifestyle. Pedagogical materials included web-based material and 17 books of which 180 000 copies were distributed countrywide.

Academics are relatively more sceptical of the impact of the programme's legacy and focused delivery. In the first instance, there seems to be no clear direction from the IOC to provide a methodology for quantifiable impact assessment of educational legacy programmes, despite the recommendation in the 'Olympic Agenda 2020' to include Olympic values-based education in school curricula globally (IOC, 2014b). Criticism was also directed against the "lack of clear pedagogy... to reach the broader scope that should be approached in an Olympic educational programme" (Knijnik & Tavares, 2012:353). This resonates with current research findings reporting on the knowledge- and experience-focused approaches as identified by Naul (2008) which limited the integrated and more holistic impact of the programme's legacy (Tavares & Kirst, 2016).

These four consecutive Summer Olympic Games' educational legacies demonstrate the crucial role of multi-stakeholder dynamics involvement, political influences, the focus on school-based delivery systems in articulation with mobilising physical educators for programme delivery, the challenge of sustainability in the absence of continuous resource-provision and standardised evaluation methodology.

STAKEHOLDERS AT PLAY

Hosting sport events amounts to huge costs, especially for developing countries falling outside the economic axis where unequal power relations between key stakeholders reflect colonising tendencies in the spread of global humanism on the premise of often powerful agencies in the Global North (Cornelissen, 2004, 2010, 2011; Steinbrink *et al.*, 2011). In the case of the Olympic Games, the International Olympic Committee actively drives a transformation agenda that it can present a persuasive packaging of the Games and legacy programmes to the electorate (Szymanski, 2011). Educational programmes are part and parcel of the bidding process and, as indicted in the Olympic Charter, the proposed universalism associated with Olympism and its positivist underpinnings are essentially Eurocentric (Bale & Christensen, 2004; Teetzel, 2012). For non-hosting African countries, this IOC-driven agenda that places the interests of the Olympic Movement at the core of social transformation, has little relevance compared to national priorities of economic growth and peaceful co-existence (the prevention of conflict, social strife and civil war).

Teaching the content devoid of critical reflection, often promotes idealist stances and exclusion based on political and commercial processes inherent in the Olympic Games (Kohe, 2010; Culpan, 2016). The relevancy of knowledge about the Olympic Movement, rather than practices concerning value-education and grassroots praxis, demonstrates a global perspective devoid of the understanding of contextual realities related to poverty and longitudinal structural disenfranchisement.

The IOC (2015) obtaining observer status in the United States General Assembly in 2009, and the proclaimed “contribution of sport to the sustainable development goals and the post-2015 development agenda”, strengthened a neo-colonial development agenda with increased polarisation between the Global North and Global South (Darnell, 2010; Tiessen, 2011). Inroads made by the Sport for Development and Peace (SDP) movement, as seen in the 2016 Rio educational legacy interventions, questions the effectivity of the focus on individual education and agency, whilst obscuring structural realities and institutional discriminatory practices (Guest, 2013).

Advocacy for a global citizenship provides a blueprint for a neocolonial discourse that shapes a development agenda dictated by the Global North’s powerful agencies (Burnett, 2016). It presents a development framework which places ‘at risk’ youth at the centre of development and views sport as a panacea for solving the ‘social problem industry’ (Hartmann & Depro, 2006). The assumed linear trajectory of development and conditionally empowerment of non-governmental organisations, which embody civic society, represent top-down sport (for) development pathways (Burnett, 2016).

Driven by political and development agendas, national governments act as main funders in picking up the bulk of the cost for hosting a sport mega-event such as the Olympic Games (Giulianotti & Klauser, 2009; Cottle, 2011; Brasil APO, 2015; Deutsche Welle, 2016). Governments bear the responsibility and cost for planning, implementing and the sustainability of social and educational legacies mostly channelled through schools at a national and international (2012) scale. In the case of the 2004 Athens Olympic Games, an additional 2 000 physical education posts had to be created and funded, whilst the life cycle of specially designed curricula seldom outlasts an Olympic year cycle. These realities contributed to leading academics in the field of physical education to adopt a pragmatic, yet critical paradigm for Olympism education as an integral part of physical education, which would ensure meaningful praxis at school level engagement (Culpan, 2016).

IN CONCLUSION - LESSONS FOR AFRICA

From these findings it became clear that the link between Olympic or Olympism (value-based) education and physical education at school level has been firmly established for Olympic Games legacy projects. The synergies are meaningful and reminiscent of the educational vision of Pierre de Coubertin who advocated for the positioning of Olympism within school physical education curricula (Arnold, 1996). Value-based education is part and parcel of current day physical education practices with some scholars like Parry (2003), Culpan and McBain (2012) and Culpan (2016) offering critical frameworks for the inclusion of Olympism Education in modern day educational practices.

As in the case of Brazil, African countries have been the recipients of multiple Sport for Aid projects focusing on neo-colonial and linear understandings of development that inhibit rather than meaningfully contribute to ‘development’ – it being a controversial concept and practice in the first place (Darnell, 2010). Current Olympic Value-based Education Programmes (OVEP) and ‘fair play’ initiatives being rolled out through OlympAfrica centres have such limited reach that it could hardly produce impactful results at societal level (Binder, 2012; Burnett, 2016). The current trend of donor-funded NGOs implementing sport for development projects, equally have limited reach and not necessarily sustainable impact.

Governments in developing economies need to make strategic decisions for optimally leveraging available resources and address social transformation through educational practices associated with sport mega-events. International and national level policy coherence, strategic alignment and contractual undertakings of multiple stakeholders are essential for meaningful and sustainable social transformation. The sport sector (IOC, International and National Sport Federations, Ministries of Sport and Olympic hosts), development agencies (UN-agencies and foreign governments) and civic society (NGOs) may all play a role in forming strategic alliances to deliver indigenous, contextually relevant and critical educational programmes. Without an enabling environment and appropriate institutional arrangements, value-education programmes will promote neo-liberal notions of development, where individual-level interventions seldom deliver sustainable ripple-effect changes over time.

Value-based programmes in schools situated in impoverished African communities should reflect a human justice framework to optimally serve the society in which it is rooted. Social outcomes of sport mega event legacy programmes would continue to be linked to physical education and school sport practices. For sustainable and meaningful social change, it should follow an integrated, holistic and critical approach based on meaningful dialogue within the sport and related sectors in service of the human development, where indigenous ways of knowing and contextual realities shape post-colonial ideologies.

REFERENCES

- ARNOLD, P. (1996). Olympism, sport and education. *Guest*, 48(1): 93-101.
- ARONI, A. (2013). Teaching human rights through Olympic Education in the inter-cultural Lyceum of Athens: A case study. *Intercultural Education*, 24(5): 489-492.
- BALE, J. & CHRISTENSEN, M.K. (2004). *Post-Olympism? Questioning sport in the twenty-first century*. New York, NY: Berg Publishers.
- BINDER, D. (2007). *Teaching values: An Olympic education toolkit*. Lausanne, Switzerland: International Olympic Committee.
- BINDER, D. (2012). Olympic values education: evolution of a pedagogy. *Educational Review*, 64(3): 275-302.
- BRASIL APO (Autoridade Publica Olimpica) (2015). “Matriz de responsabilidades” (trans.: Responsibility matrix). Hyperlink: [http://www.apo.gov.br/downloads/Matriz_2_0_20140728.pdf]. Retrieved on 8 November 2016.
- BROWNELL, S. (2009). Beijing's Olympic Education Programme: Re-thinking *Suzhi* Education, Re-imagining an international China. *The China Quarterly*, 197(March): 44-63.

- BROWNELL, S. (2012). Human rights and the Beijing Olympics: Imagined global community and the transnational public sphere. *British Journal of Sociology*, 63(2): 306-327.
- BURNETT, C. (2016). A critical reflection on sport-for-development discourses: A critical review. *South African Journal for Research in Sport, Physical Education and Recreation*, 36(3): 11-24.
- CASHMAN, R. (2003). What is "Olympic Legacy?" In M. de Moragas, C. Kennett & N. Puig (Eds.), *The legacy of the Olympic Games 1894-2000* (pp. 31-42). Lausanne, Switzerland: International Olympic Committee.
- CASHMAN, R. (2006). *The bitter-sweet awakening: The legacy of the Sydney 2000 Olympic Games*. Sydney, Australia: Walla Walla Press.
- CHAPPELET, J-L. (2008). Olympic environmental concerns as a legacy of the Winter Games. *The International Journal of the History of Sport*, 25(14): 1884-1902.
- CHAPPELET, J-L. & KÜBLER-MABBOTT, B. (2008). *The International Olympic Committee and the Olympic system: The governance of world sport*. London, UK: Routledge.
- CHATZIEFSTATHIOU, D. (2012). Olympic education and beyond: Olympism and value legacies from the Olympic and Paralympic Games. *Educational Review*, 64(3): 385-400.
- CLARK, W. (2005). The Olympic legacy. *Recreation*, 64(7): 32-37.
- CORNELISSEN, S. (2004). Sport mega-events in Africa: Processes, impacts and prospects. *Tourism and Hospitality Planning & Development*, 1(1): 39-55.
- CORNELISSEN, S. (2010). The geopolitics of global aspiration: Sport mega-events and emerging powers. *The International Journal of the History of Sport*, 27(16-18): 3008-3025.
- CORNELISSEN, S. (2011). More than a sporting chance? Appraising the sport for development legacy of the 2010 FIFA World Cup. *Third World Quarterly*, 32(3): 503-529.
- COTTLE, E. (2011). *South Africa's World Cup*. Scottsville, South Africa: University of KwaZulu-Natal Press.
- CULPAN, I. (2016). Olympism education and a pedagogy: A critical repositioning. In C. Burnett, S. Wassong, K. Roux, & J. Krieger (Eds.), *Historical and contemporary issues in Olympic Studies* (pp. 18-35). Johannesburg, South Africa: University of Johannesburg.
- CULPAN, I. & MCBAIN, S. (2012). Constructivist pedagogies for Olympism education. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Health, Sport and Physical Education*, 3(2): 95-108.
- CULPAN, I. & WIGMORE, S. (2010). The delivery of Olympism education within a physical education context drawing on critical pedagogy. *International Journal of Sport and Health Science*, 8(April): 67-76.
- DARNELL, S.C. (2010). Sport, race, and bio-politics: Encounters with difference in 'Sport for Development and Peace' internships. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, 34(4): 396-417.
- DEFROAD, J. (2012). London 2012: Olympic 'legacy', Olympic education and the development of social capital in physical education and school sport: A case study. Unpublished master's thesis. Birmingham, UK: University of Birmingham.
- DEUTSCHE WELLE (2016). "Germany's World Cup Report hails economic, social success". Hyperlink: [<http://www.dw.com/en/Germanys-world-cup-report-hails-economic-social-success/a-2263053>]. Retrieved on 8 November 2016.
- FOX, K., BIDDLE, S. & MURPHY, M. (2012). Creating a legacy for physical activity and health from the London 2012 Games. *The Sport and Exercise Scientist*, 31(Spring): 22-23.
- FREIRE, P. (1997). Pedagogy of the oppressed. In D. Flinders & S. Thornton (Eds.), *The curriculum studies reader* (pp. 150-158). New York, NY: Routledge.
- GIRGINOV, V. & PARRY, J. (2005). *The Olympic Games explained: A student guide to the evolution of the modern Olympic Games*. London: Routledge.

- GIULIANOTTI, R. & KLAUSER, F. (2009). Security governance and sport mega-events: Toward an interdisciplinary research agenda. *Journal of Sport & Social Issues*, 34(1): 49-61.
- GOMES, M. (2002). "Olympic Education: Sameness versus Otherness in multicultural approaches. In L.P. Da Costa, A.M. Miragaya, M. Gomes, N. Abreu & O. Tavares, (Eds.), *Olympic Studies: Current intellectual crossroads* (pp. 255-274). Rio de Janeiro, Brazil: Editora Gama Filho.
- GOUGH, N. (2000). Locating curriculum studies in the global village. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 32(2): 329-342.
- GRATTON, C. & PREUSS, H. (2008). Maximizing Olympic impacts by building up legacies. *The International Journal of the History of Sport*, 25(14), 1922-1938.
- GRIFFITHS, M. & ARMOUR, K. (2013). Physical education and youth sport in England: Conceptual and practical foundations for an Olympic legacy? *International Journal of Sport Policy and Politics*, 5(2): 213-227.
- GUEST, A.M. (2013). Sport psychology for development and peace? Critical reflections and constructive suggestions. *Journal of Sport Psychology in Action*, 4(3): 169-180.
- HARTMANN, D. & DEPRO, B. (2006). Rethinking sports-base community crime prevention: A preliminary analysis of the relationship between midnight basketball and urban crime rates. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, 30(2): 180-196.
- HASSANDRA, M.; GOUDAS, M.; HATZIGEORGIAIDIS, A. & THEODORAKIS, Y. (2007). A fair play intervention program in school Olympic education. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 17(2): 99-114.
- HOULIHAN, B. (2000). Sporting excellence, schools and sports development: The politics of crowded policy spaces. *European Physical Education Review*, 6(2): 171-193.
- IOC (n.d.). *Guide on Olympic legacy 5th update cycle: Post Vancouver Winter Games*. Lausanne, Switzerland: International Olympic Committee.
- IOC (2014a). *Olympic Charter*. Lausanne, Switzerland: International Olympic Committee.
- IOC (2014b). *Olympic Agenda 2020*. Lausanne, Switzerland: International Olympic Committee.
- IOC (2015). *The contribution of sport to the sustainable development goals and post-2015 development agenda*. New York, NY: Office of the Permanent Observer for the International Olympic Committee to the United Nations.
- IOC NEWS (2011). "London 2012". Hyperlink: [<http://www.olympics.org./news.London-2012-education-progress-to-provide-lasting-legacy.pdf>]. Retrieved on 26 January 2017.
- KIELY, A.; MARTIN, A. & MCCOLL, K. (2012). *Learning legacy*. London, UK: London Organising Committee of the Olympic Games and Paralympic Games Ltd. 2007-2012.
- KNIJNIK, J. & TAVARES, O. (2012). Educating Copacabana: A critical analysis of the "Second Half", an Olympic education program of Rio 2016. *Educational Review*, 64(3): 353-368.
- KOHE, G. (2010). Disrupting the rhetoric of the rings: A critique of Olympic idealism in physical education. *Sport Education and Society*, 15(4): 479-494.
- LEOPKEY, B. & PARENT, M.M. (2012). The (Neo) institutionalization of legacy and its sustainable governance within the Olympic Movement. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 12(5): 437-455.
- LIU, D.; BROOM, D. & WILSON, R. (2014). Legacy of the Beijing Olympic Games: A non-host city perspective. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 14(5): 485-502.
- LIU, D. & GRATTON, C. (2010). The impact of mega sporting events on live spectators' images of a host city: A case study of the Shanghai F1 Grand Prix. *Tourism Economics*, 16(3): 629-645.

- MOUNTAKIS, C. (2016). Olympic Education in all Greek schools: Adoption and abandonment. *Acta Universitatis Carolinae: Kinanthropologica*, 52(2): 41-55.
- MULES, T. & FAULKNER, B. (1996). An economic perspective on special events. *Tourism Economics*, 2(2): 107-117.
- NAUL, R. (2008). *Olympic Education*. Aachen, Germany: Meyer & Meyer Verlag.
- PARRY, J. (1998). Physical Education as Olympic Education. *European Physical Education Review*, 4(2): 153-167.
- PARRY, J. (2003). *Olympism for the 21st Century*. Barcelona, Spain: Centre d'Estudis Olímpics.
- PAWLUCKI, A. (2009). Olympic Education as an intergenerational relation of the third degree. *Physical Culture and Sport Studies and Research*, 46(1): 99-108.
- PREUSS, H. (2007a). The conceptualisation and measurement of mega sport event legacies. *Journal of Sport and Tourism*, 12(3-4): 207-227.
- PREUSS, H. (2007b). FIFA World Cup 2006 and its legacy on tourism. In R. Conrady & M. Buck (Eds.), *Trends and issues in global Tourism 2007* (pp. 83-102). Berlin/Heidelberg, Germany: Springer.
- ROWE, D. (2012). The bid, the lead-up, the event and the legacy: Global cultural politics and hosting the Olympics. *British Journal of Sociology*, 63(2): 285-305.
- SCHMEDES, S. (2015). Sustainable design of sport stadiums: Case study analysis of stadiums for the Olympic Games 2000 in Sydney, 2002 in Athens, and 2008 in Beijing. In C. Burnett, S. Wassong, K. Roux and J. Krieger (Eds.), *Historical and contemporary issues in Olympic Studies* (pp. 135-141). Johannesburg, South Africa: University of Johannesburg.
- SMITH, C. J. & HIMMELFARB, K.M.G. (2008). "Actually existing" Olympism: The Beijing 2008 Games and China's Neoliberal Project. *Journal of Current Chinese Affairs*, 37(2): 36-59.
- SOUSA-MAST, F.R.; REIS, A.C.; GURGEL, L.A. & DUARTE, A.F. (2013). Are cariocas getting ready for the Games? Sport participation and the Rio de Janeiro 2016 Olympic Games. *Managing Leisure*, 18(4): 331-335.
- STEINBRINK, M.; HAFERBURG, C. & LEY, A. (2011). Festivalisation and urban renewal in the global South: Socio-spatial consequences of the 2010 FIFA World Cup. *South African Geographical Journal*, 93(1): 15-28.
- SZYMANSKI, S. (2011). About winning: The political economy of awarding the World Cup and the Olympic Games. *SAIS Review of International Affairs*, 31(1): 87-97.
- TAVARES, O. & KIRST, F.V. (2016). Investigating Transforma Programme: The educational initiative of Rio 2016 Olympic Games. Unpublished paper delivered at the Second International Colloquium of Olympic Studies and Research Centres, 2-3 August, PUCR – Porto Alegre, Brazil.
- TEETZEL, S. (2012). Optimizing Olympic education: A comprehensive approach to understanding and teaching the philosophy of Olympism. *Educational Review*, 64(3): 317-332.
- TIESSEN, R. (2011). Global subjects or objects of globalisation? The promotion of global citizenship in organisations offering sport for development and/or peace programmes. *Third World Quarterly*, 32(3): 571-587.
- TODT, N.; SCARTON, A. & TAVARES, O. (2016). Social sports programmes' technology. Unpublished paper delivered at the Second International Colloquium of Olympic Studies and Research Centres, 2-3 August, PUCR – Porto Alegre, Brazil.
- TOOHEY, K. (2008). *The Olympic Games management and legacy*. Lausanne, Switzerland: International Olympic Committee.
- TOOHEY, K.; CRAWFORD, S. & HALBWIRTH, S. (2000). Sydney's Olympic legacy and educational resources. *Orana*, 36(1): 14-19.

- WANG, Y. & MASUMOTO, N. (2009). Olympic education at model schools for the 2008 Beijing Olympic Games. *International Journal of Sport and Health Science*, 7(December): 31-41.
- 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.
- WOODHOUSE, J. & FIELDEN, A. (2010). *Sport: The 2012 Olympic legacy*. London, UK: House of Commons.
-

Corresponding author: Cora Burnett; **E-mail:** corab@uj.ac.za