

**PARALYMPIC IMPACTS AND LEGACIES –
INVITATIONAL FORUM 2014
TECHNICAL REPORT**

PARALYMPIC IMPACTS AND LEGACIES – INVITATIONAL FORUM TECHNICAL REPORT

Bonn, Germany, May 5-6, 2014

Editors: Andrea Bundon, Apostolos Rigas & Robert Sparks

Prepared by: Andrea Bundon

Final report of the proceedings of the Paralympic Impacts and Legacies Invitational Forum organized and hosted by the International Paralympic Committee (IPC) and the University of British Columbia Centre for Sport and Sustainability (UBC CSS) in Bonn, Germany on May 5-6, 2014.

Preferred Citation:

Andrea Bundon, Apostolos Rigas & Robert Sparks (Eds.) (September 2015). *Paralympic Impacts and Legacies - Invitational Forum 2014, Technical Report*. Published by the University of British Columbia's Centre for Sport and Sustainability in cIRcle digital repository. <http://circle.ubc.ca>

CONTENTS:

Hosts	3
Background and Purpose	4
Programme	5
Summary of Proceedings	7
Collection of Summaries	9
Participants	37
Abbreviations	42
Supplemental Information	43
Reading List	44

HOSTS:

International Paralympic Committee: The IPC was founded on 22 September 1989 as a non-profit organisation, with the goal of developing sports opportunities for all people with an impairment from the beginner to the elite level. The IPC is the global governing body of the Paralympic Movement. Its purpose is to organise the Summer and Winter Paralympic Games and to act as the International Federation for nine sports, supervising and coordinating World Championships and other competitions. The vision of the IPC, run by 200 members, is 'To enable Paralympic athletes to achieve sporting excellence and inspire and excite the world.'

www.paralympic.org



International
Paralympic
Committee

UBC Centre for Sport and Sustainability: The UBC CSS was founded on 4 November 2009 as an extension of UBC's role in conducting the Vancouver 2010 Olympic and Paralympic Winter Games Impact study (OGI/PGI). The UBC CSS's mission is to act as a community resource to capture and transfer knowledge on how sport can create sustainable benefits locally, regionally and internationally. The UBC CSS hosted two think tanks in 2010 and 2011 that focused on assessing impacts and legacies of sports mega-events.

www.css.ubc.ca



a place of mind
THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

Centre for Sport and Sustainability

BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE:

The purpose of the Forum was to engage groups doing research on Paralympic Games impact and legacy in a discussion focused on:

- I. Lessons learned about evaluating Paralympic impacts and legacies
- II. Theoretical and methodological issues in impact and legacy assessment, including an evaluation of strategies to leverage the benefits of hosting the Paralympic Games

In addition to IPC and UBC CSS representatives, researchers and practitioners were invited from academic, government, non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and industry contexts, together with International Olympic Committee (IOC) staff, groups responsible for assessing the impacts of the Paralympic Games and/or representatives of the Organising Committees for the Olympic and Paralympic Games (OCOGs) for Beijing 2008, Vancouver 2010, London 2012, Sochi 2014, Rio de Janeiro 2016, PyeongChang 2018 and Tokyo 2020.

Sessions were organised around the following themes:

1. The IPC's strategy for sustainable legacies
2. The Olympic and Paralympic Games Impact study
 - a. Past – OGI/PGI completed
 - b. Current – OGI/PGI underway
 - c. Future – OGI/PGI forthcoming
3. Theoretical and methodological issues in studying impact and legacy
 - a. Conceptualising possible Paralympic legacies
 - b. Conceptualising a research agenda

PROGRAMME:

Monday, May 5, 2014	
09:00-09:30	Apostolos Rigas , IPC Bob Sparks , UBC & CSS <i>Welcome, introductions, setting the stage</i>
Session 1: IPC's strategy for sustainable legacies and introduction to OGI/PGI	
09:30-10:30	Apostolos Rigas , IPC <i>IPC's strategy for sustainable legacies of Paralympic Games</i>
	Apostolos Rigas , IPC <i>Problem definition: Defining potential Paralympic legacies and fostering legacies from hosting the Paralympic Games</i>
	Jocelin Sébastiani , IOC OGI Project Officer <i>Introduction to OGI: Background, approach used, evolution and current status</i>
Session 2: PGI/OGI — Impact and legacy studies completed	
11:00-12:30	Apostolos Rigas , IPC <i>Beijing 2008</i>
	Caitlin Pentifallo , UBC CSS <i>Vancouver 2010</i>
Session 3: PGI/OGI — Impact and legacy studies underway	
14:00-15:00	Paul Foster , former Paralympic Lead in Government Olympic Executive <i>London 2012</i>
	Mariya Goryachko , Lomonosov Moscow State University <i>Sochi 2014</i>
Session 4: PGI/OGI — Impact and legacy studies forthcoming	
15:30-17:00	Sandrine Cuvillier , Federal University of Rio de Janeiro <i>Rio 2016 Paralympic legacy bid commitments, current status of people with an impairment</i>
	Byungnam Lee , Director General of Games Planning and Coordination <i>PyeongChang 2018 Paralympic legacy bid commitments, current status of people with a disability</i>
	Shinji Nakamae , Director Paralympic Games Planning <i>Tokyo 2020 Paralympic legacy bid commitments, current status of people</i>

	<i>with an impairment</i>
--	---------------------------

Tuesday, May 6, 2014

Session 5: Theoretical and methodological issues in impact and legacy assessment
Panel 1: Conceptualizing the range of possible Paralympic legacies

09:00	Bob Sparks , UBC CSS <i>Introduction: Beginning the conversation</i>
	Tracey Dickson , University of Canberra <i>Evaluating legacy frameworks</i>
10:00	Andrea Bundon , Loughborough University <i>Paralympic impacts and legacies from a critical disabilities perspective</i>
	Natalia Dannenberg-Spreier , IPC <i>The evolution of media coverage of the Paralympic Games</i>
10:00– 10:30	Group discussion <i>Facilitator: Bob Sparks, UBC CSS</i>

Session 6: Theoretical and methodological issues in impact and legacy assessment
Panel 2: Conceptualizing a research agenda

11:00– 12:00	Andrea Bundon , Loughborough University <i>Para-sport – Mobilising youth using digital methods</i>
	David Howe , Loughborough University (joined via Skype) <i>Ethnographic research as a lens to understand Paralympic impacts and legacies</i>
	Caitlin Pentifallo , UBC CSS <i>Importance of national and local contexts to studying impacts and legacies</i>
12:00– 12:30	Group discussion <i>Facilitator: Bob Sparks, UBC CSS</i>

Session 7: Engaging with the IPC’s strategy for legacy: How best to identify, facilitate and measure legacies and foster strategies for leveraging legacies?

13:30– 14:30	Keith Gilbert , University of East London David Legg , Mount Royal University Calgary (joined via Skype) <i>Paralympic legacies</i>
	Laura Misener , Western University Ontario, Canada <i>Leveraging para-sport events for positive social impacts: Comparing integrated versus non-integrated events</i>

	<p>Evgeny Bukharov, Director of Paralympic Integration & Coordination for Sochi 2014 Organising Committee</p> <p><i>Implementing a targeted Paralympic legacy strategy: The Barrier-Free Environment programme of Sochi 2014</i></p>
14:30– 15:00	<p>Group discussion</p> <p><i>Facilitator: Apostolos Rigas, IPC</i></p>
<p>Session 8: Identifying concrete next steps</p>	
15:30– 17:00	<p>Facilitators: Apostolos Rigas, IPC and Bob Sparks, UBC CSS</p>

SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS:

The following is a summary of the proceedings from the meeting and provides a broad overview of topics discussed and questions raised during the two days of the Forum. For a more detailed description of the contents of each session please see the summaries of the presentations made by individual Forum participants (pp. 9-36).

Definition of Paralympic Legacy: Ongoing debates about the definition and suitability of the term 'legacy' create difficulties in conceptualising the subject globally. Such debates include challenges associated with working across languages or using approaches based on a western viewpoint that do not necessarily apply in other contexts. However, the Forum agreed that a debate on definitions is a secondary problem and the critical point is that we consider legacy's meaning in each local context.

It was recognized that the Paralympic Legacy framework, initiated by the IPC in 2006 and thereafter used to guide work and measurement studies (in particular OGI/PGI studies), has been successful. Given that, it was felt that it is worth exploring whether there are new dimensions to be considered due to the emerging recognition and reach of the Paralympics, primarily among people with a disability but also to audiences who follow the Paralympics but do not themselves have an impairment. Connected to this discussion is the notion of 'inspiration.' While the IPC has long stated that the purpose of the Games is to 'inspire,' there is a need to define *who is inspired, who inspires, how people are inspired, and what they are inspired to do.*

Measuring Paralympic Games Impacts and Legacies: It was broadly recognised that since its establishment by the IOC, the OGI/PGI project has increased the level of transparency and accountability of Games' organisers. Especially with its current, more flexible format, the OGI/PGI study can potentially be used by the IOC, the IPC and OCOGs to better define and defend their choices, directions and amounts of investments. However, the delayed manner in which data are gathered, prepared and transmitted tends to compromise the usefulness of the study; there needs to be a more forward looking approach that can prepare estimates and projections and help to inform choices and amend plans in a more timely fashion.

Further to the above, it was stressed that attribution is the most difficult part of impact assessment and there will always be a challenge to determine whether any impact was triggered by the Games or not. An indicator-based impact assessment is a transparent and

objective way of measuring impacts, but the approach also tends to limit perspectives. In this regard, the Forum appreciated practices where collected data were bundled together in meaningful themes. Moreover, there was consensus on the need to develop case studies and promote further empirical research on Paralympic impacts and legacies using both the OGI/PGI framework and other methods.

Most importantly, the Forum agreed *that impact assessment should focus on developing methods to measure what is important to the event and its legacies, and not be distracted by ancillary factors simply because they are measurable and data are available.*

Fostering Paralympic Legacies in Host Communities: The Forum acknowledged the important work being done by current OCOGs to ensure tangible and large scale legacies from hosting the Paralympic Games, such as Sochi 2014's Barrier-Free Environment programme, Rio 2016's four-pronged legacy plan, PyeongChang 2018's Actualizing the Dream Programme and Tokyo 2020's research into current attitudes towards and perceptions of disability as a baseline for future initiatives.

The Forum identified two major challenges in ensuring Paralympic legacies truly happen and remain over the long-term in host communities: (1) early intervention in policy making and, (2) continuing legacy work post-Games. It was recognized that intervention is needed immediately after awarding the Games to the host city to position legacy targets during policy setting activities and to ensure that the set-up of the OGI/PGI framework accounts for measurement of the set targets. It is important that legacy potential is made relevant to the local context for each Games edition, with clear objectives defined and endorsed by the stakeholders as early in the process as possible. Also, it was evident that legacy initiatives are typically driven by the OCOGs who become the main promoters but, of course, cease to exist soon after the Games. It is a challenge to continue legacy-related work when the host city is not in the spotlight anymore and there is no longer an OCOG to help organize and steer initiatives.

It was deemed extremely important to have in place systems already built pre-Games in order to capitalize on Games-time interest and to sustain existing or future initiatives. An idea in this regard is that local Paralympic sponsors should be encouraged to continue leveraging their association with the Paralympic Games by funding or undertaking critical initiatives related to the key legacy aspects of the Paralympic Games; London 2012's

Paralympic-specific sponsor Sainsbury's Active Kids project is a good example of a model that should be promoted and replicated.

The IPC's Role in Promoting Lasting Legacies from the Paralympic Games: The Forum recognized the IPC's central role in promoting lasting legacies within the host communities of the Paralympic Games. Suggestions in this regard were:

- Legacy aspiration as a result of hosting the Paralympic Games should be further emphasised as a criterion for bid assessment.
- The IPC needs to work with the host city authorities as soon as the Games are awarded, and later with the OCOG, in order to ensure that both a sound plan and a related system of measurement are established sufficiently early to enable optimal use in planning and activation phases.
- Dedicated legacy project management is needed throughout the lifecycle of planning and hosting the Games; this should remain active post-Games.
- As social change via sport is the ultimate aspiration of the IPC, the Forum participants encouraged the IPC to acquire appropriate resources or consultation structures in the field of social sciences.
- Linkages should be explored between the Forum and existing IPC structures (e.g., the IPC Sports Science Committee) with the goal of facilitating access for researchers exploring the social impacts of the Games.
- Creating a permanent – even virtual – research centre on Paralympic impacts and legacy should be considered along with launching a targeted initiative that would promote further research in the field.

COLLECTION OF SUMMARIES:

The following are summaries of the presentations made by Forum participants.

SESSION 1: THE IPC'S STRATEGY FOR SUSTAINABLE LEGACIES AND THE OGI/PGI

Apostolos Rigas, IPC

IPC's strategy for a sustainable legacy of Paralympic Games

Summary: Stimulating social development is among the IPC's guiding principles for organisation of the Paralympic Games. The IPC endeavours to use its resources, expertise and global network to provide advice on good practices that maximise the potential for legacy. The IPC has a three-step strategy for supporting legacy.

Step 1: Determine the targeted fields for possible Paralympic legacies

- Sources used: Observed impact from past Games, outcomes of earlier Think Tanks hosted by the UBC CSS in Vancouver, provisions of UN Convention for Rights of People with Disabilities, existing OGI/PGI indicators.
- Fundamental legacy fields already identified include: (1) Accessible infrastructures in overall urban development, (2) development of sport structures for people with a disability, (3) attitudinal changes in the perceptions of people with a disability and the self-esteem of people with a disability and (4) opportunities for reaching full inclusion in social life for people with a disability.

Step 2: Develop a solid methodology to measure legacy and impact

- Strategy: Integrate PGI indicators into the IOC's existing OGI study
- Current state: The introduction of PGI indicators into the OGI Technical Manual (completed in 2007) helped to put a context, set targets and objectives to achieve with regards to measuring Paralympic impacts and legacies. The indicators included at that time covered fields such as public perceptions of, knowledge about, and employability of persons with a disability and also indicators on accessible construction, sustainable utilisation of accessible Olympic and Paralympic venues and the suitability and knowledge of coaches and other Games related staff.

Step 3: Working towards achieving legacy objectives

- Priorities moving forward: Tokyo 2020 must align its planning and objectives for hosting of the Paralympics with the city's and the country's long-term development goals. This requires the host city authorities and Tokyo 2020 to set targeted objectives and work towards achieving these objectives through the planning and

preparation phase and into Games time.

Key points:

- IPC aims to work with host cities and organising committees to ensure that the legacy potential of hosting the Paralympic Games is maximised.

- This entails determining the potential legacies and impacts of the Paralympic Games, identifying fundamental legacies fields to target, setting in place methodologies to measure impacts and legacies and then taking strategic steps to ensure that legacy planning is carried through from bid to delivery phase.

Apostolos Rigas, IPC

Problem definition: Defining potential Paralympic legacies and fostering legacies from hosting the Paralympic Games

Summary: The IPC's aim is to work with OCOGs and host city authorities to make legacy happen. To accomplish this, the IPC uses various means including the advancement of Paralympic organization obligations and guidelines, undertaking direct action and using the power of the event itself. Moving forward, we need to systematically challenge past and current assumptions with a view to promoting the growth and development of the Paralympic Games.

The existing definition of Paralympic Legacy was well-researched and explored when it was first introduced and has since been practically accepted and implemented by the reputed entities entrusted to conduct the OGI/PGI Study. Today, we need to explore how this definition is scientifically validated, and possibly updated, by independent bodies with expertise in the field. The OGI/PGI studies continue to record data related to the set indicators in the Technical Manual. A question that exists is how the IOC and the IPC can ensure the quality of the outcomes and what kind of mechanisms could be put in place to monitor quality. Furthermore, each OGI/PGI study is conducted in relative isolation. It needs to be explored to what extent it is possible or desirable to have comparable results.

The original definition of the impact and legacy potential of the Paralympics was done in an era when the Paralympic Games were still growing. We need to explore whether today there are additional dimensions to be considered due to the new size and reach of the Games specifically in regards to the growing number of people who follow the Paralympics but who do not themselves have an impairment.

Finally, it is critical that, in addition to asking host cities for legacy commitments (a legacy plan), that the IPC investigate how they can help host cities to define, target, measure and ultimately leverage legacies.

Key points:

- The existing definition of 'Paralympic Legacy' was well researched when it was developed and has been implemented in the OGI/PGI study.
- We need to revisit the concepts of legacies and impacts in view of the new size and

reach of the Paralympics.

- IPC aims to work with OCOGs and host cities to define, measure and leverage the potential legacies of the Paralympic Games.

Jocelin Sébastiani, IOC OGI Project Officer

Introduction to OGI: Background, approach used, evolution and current status

Summary: The Olympic Games Impact (OGI) study was launched in 2003-2004 by the IOC to better determine and understand the impacts of the Olympic Games and Paralympic Games, on host cities, regions and countries. The study was also designed to help bidding cities and future organisers to identify potential legacies and thus maximise the benefits of hosting the Games. The third objective was to enable the IOC to create a relevant and useful knowledge base on the impacts, legacies and case studies of the Games. Since its inception, the idea has been that the OGI study should be conducted by academics to ensure its neutrality and relevance. Despite the changes that were made in 2007 and 2011 to reflect the advice of the Organising Committees of the Olympic Games (OCOGs) and their Research Partners, these two principles remain at the heart of the study.

Another principle that has guided the IOC for the management of the study is that the OGI should be a flexible tool. As it has to reflect the context and the evolution of the host city throughout the duration of the study (from nine years before to three years after the event), the themes and focus areas must be carefully chosen by the OCOG research partners. Only a local organisation (or a group of various local entities) knowing the specific characteristics of the host city can perform this critical task and provide the IOC and OCOG with recommendations on adaptations to be made to the study for the efficient collection of relevant primary data and a better assessment and analysis of the effects of the Games.

In terms of deliverables, two major reports are expected from the OGI. The first of these is due 4 years before the Games. It presents the initial situation during the bidding phase and the early planning period. The final report then has to be released 3 years after the Games. It is the final evaluation of the impacts that shows how the city has evolved during the period. Two interim project status reports must be delivered to the IOC to discuss the difficulties faced, to present the trends identified and to provide an update on the contextual environment.

OGI is not a stand-alone impact study to be treated in isolation. It is one element of a bigger package requested, which includes case studies, annual reports, sustainability reports and commitment updates. When viewed as one of the integral elements of the OGI approach, the study by itself provides a valuable overview for the national and city authorities to gauge their performance and commitments. The OGI approach aims at

increasing the levels of transparency and accountability for the Games Organisers and their delivery partners.

Key points:

- OGI was developed in 2003-2004 by the IOC to determine and understand the impacts of the Olympic and Paralympic Games on host cities, regions and countries.
- The purpose of OGI is to help hosts identify potential legacies in order to maximise the benefits of hosting and to enable the IOC to develop a knowledge base of impacts, legacies and case studies of the Games.
- Principles guiding the OGI are: that the OGI be conducted by academics to ensure neutrality and relevance and that the OGI remain a flexible tool adaptable to the specific characteristics of the host city.

SESSION 2: PGI/OGI – IMPACT AND LEGACY STUDIES COMPLETED

Apostolos Rigas, IPC

Beijing 2008

*The following was presented by Apostolos Rigas based on a report to the IPC in 2009 by Renmin University and the China Disabled Persons Federation (CDPF). Unfortunately, representatives from Renmin University and CDPF were unable to attend the Forum in person.

Summary: The PGI assessment from Beijing 2008 Paralympic Games was based on a survey conducted by Renmin University and the China Disabled Persons Federation (CDPF). In 2006, a baseline survey was conducted that included two groups: people with a disability and non-disabled. A second study was conducted in 2008 and included the same two groups plus focus groups and interviews. The surveys allowed for a comparison of pre-Games and post-Games periods as well as comparisons between groups. The survey was based on the 7 impact indicators introduced to the OGI study by the IPC in 2007.

- Watching the Paralympic Games altered the opinion of 45% of the public that still believed people with a disability are a financial burden to the society.

- In 2006, an overwhelming majority of people held a positive view on the influence of hosting of the Paralympics in changing public perceptions, and in 2008, the actual general public evaluation in this regard was even higher than expected.
- The 72% of people with a disability agreed that the Paralympics was helpful for them in finding a job; 82.4% of able-bodied individuals also believed so. This was supported by the adoption of policies and proactive measures by central and local governments.
- During the 7 years of preparations, Beijing had invested over RMB1 billion in over 14,000 accessible facilities, the sum of all the past 20 years.
- Most of the citizens have learned from the Paralympics some knowledge about people with a disability and practical skills to help.
- Both people without a disability and people with a disability generally agree that the Games will bring positive changes to the people with a disability through: elevation of social status, more public attention, public respect, improvement of social security, easier access to employment, and better education opportunities.
- The Paralympic Games have brought more legislation on the building of accessible facilities for disabled people, which have triggered massive accessibility construction campaigns in an increasing number of cities across the country, with accessible facilities covering roads, transport, key public places and famous scenic spots.

Key points:

- The staging of the Paralympic Games prompted policies and proactive measures by government that an overwhelming majority of the people surveyed believe have provided easy access to job opportunities for people with a disability.
- The staging of the Paralympic Games brought more legislation on the building of accessible features for disabled people.
- The Paralympic Games have helped in fostering an ambience of everybody helping people with disabilities and in advancing respect and care for people with disabilities.

Caitlin Pentifallo, UBC CSS

Vancouver 2010

Summary: This presentation will provide an overview of our experience (UBC CSS) conducting the 2010 OGI/PGI project and in particular our experience with the methodology. It will not address the specifics of the data but rather how we got the data.

For Vancouver, we were working off the 2007 Technical Manual which required four reports – a baseline report on 2001 data, a pre-games report (2002-2006), a games-time report (2007-2010) and a post-games report (2011-2013).

UBC CSS methodology

- **Stages of legacy creation:** Identified three stages of legacy creation including the authorship phase (pre-bid, bid), the ideational phase (planning, hosting) and the implementation phase (post-games).
- **Bundling:** Though the current technical manual has 30 indicators (with sub-indicators), in 2007 we were working with 126 indicators. We thus developed a method of 'bundling' the indicators. Bundling creates a basket of indicators that can help illuminate changes across areas and speak to larger contextual changes. It provides a lot more information about changes and trends and situates everything a lot more contextually than if those indicators were just taken alone. A lot of these indicators are now packaged together in recent versions of the manual as part of the feedback provided to the IOC.
- **Before-and-after-control-impact method (BACI)** – This has to do with how impact is attributed. BACI is a method of analysis to distinguish between the contribution of a specific intervention (the Games) and the observed outcomes and the contribution of other external factors or chance that might have impacted the city. For example, Vancouver's planning phase hit the middle of a recession – so BACI was a means of comparing how the recession impacted other locations that have similar climates, similar populations and comparing them to Vancouver.

With regards to the Paralympic Games indicators and those indicators addressing the impact of the games on people with disabilities, I think it is important to note that this was the only place we were using primary data. Most of the OGI/PGI is dependent on secondary data from a variety of sources. However, the PG indicators are unique in that a global market

research company was hired to conduct these phone interviews across Canada (and then further stratified by region).

Key points:

- Bundling is a useful means of combining indicators within a particular sphere of influence. Bundling combines a basket of indicators for like comparison. Though the technical manual now packages these indicators together already it is useful for research teams to remember that there may be things in the data that make more sense when taken together than when apart.
- We can never know what Vancouver would have looked like had it not hosted the Games. However, the methodologies developed by the UBC CSS team (in particular BACI) do provide some means of assessing to what extent the changes in the city can be attributed to the changes brought about because of the Games.

SESSION 3: PGI/OGI – IMPACT AND LEGACY STUDIES UNDERWAY

Paul Foster, former Paralympic Lead in Government Olympic Executive (GOE)

London 2012

Summary: The UK Government said that the London 2012 Games would help to drive forward the cause of disability equality. In 2009, ministers supported a cross department legacy plan.

Theme 1: Changing the perception of disabled people's economic contribution to society.

- *Challenge:* A 2010 British Social Attitudes Survey found that 79% of people felt there was some level of prejudice towards disabled people and 35% felt disabled people get more from the economy than they put in.
- *Priority:* Promote economic inclusion by changing the perception of disabled people's economic contribution to society.
- *Strategies:* Work with media to positively raise the profile of disabled people's talents. Promote the principles of the 'social model.' Encourage London businesses to think about how they can make their goods and services accessible.
- *Results:* Survey following the Games showed that 81% of people thought that the Games had a positive effect on how disabled people are viewed.

Theme 2: Support opportunities to participate in sport and physical activity.

- *Challenge.* In 2005 disabled people in the UK were half as likely to participate regularly in sport and physical activity compared to non-disabled people. Limited number of disabled coaches, officials and volunteers. Coaches were not confident in coaching disabled athletes due to lack of training and awareness.
- *Priority.* To increase participation level amongst disabled people. To secure buy in from key delivery partners including National Sport Governing Bodies.
- *Strategies.* Sport England established an Inclusive Sport Fund of £10.2 million with a further £8 million investment announced in 2014 and targets were set for 44 sports.
- *Results.* Participation rates for disabled people playing sport show an upward trend since 2005 and 1.67 million disabled people now play sport each week.

Theme 3: Promote community engagement through the Games.

- *Challenge.* To deliver the 'most accessible games ever.'
- *Priority.* To include inclusive design across all venues and implement the London 2012 Inclusive Design Standards. To make services accessible and to engage businesses.
- *Strategies.* Included development of inclusivelondon.com website that provides accessibility information regarding Games venues, hotels, restaurants, shops, transportation, etc. Publication of the London 2012 Inclusive Design Principles.
- *Results.* 22,000 London black cabs and 8,500 buses have hearing loops and are wheelchair accessible. Inclusive design is a core feature of the training for built environment professionals (architects, town planners, civil and structural engineers).

Key points:

- Make the Paralympic Games and the legacy of the Paralympics Games a collective responsibility and get relevant agencies and departments on board early.
- Use the media positively to inform, educate and engage.
- Encourage private stakeholders to 'reap the benefits' of hosting the Paralympic Games by making their services more accessible.

Sochi 2014

Summary: The Sochi 2014 Olympic and Paralympic Games were the first national project of this scale and were implemented in accordance with a platform for sustainable development. They were a unique example of the revolutionary transformations of the sociocultural environment on the local (city) level in Russia. The main focus of the plan was the transformation of the city of Sochi through social and environmental innovation.

Sochi: For the area of Sochi, a sustainable development of its demographic potential was targeted that combined population growth with a reduction in unemployment. With a local economy based on the tertiary sector (over 60% of employees), the economy specialization shifted to trade, tourism and construction. The results show:

- A decline in the proportion of people with incomes below the minimum cost of living (from 26.1% in 2005 to 13.1% in 2011).
- A growth of real wages in Sochi ahead of wage growth for the Krasnodar region and Russia as a whole and an expected tax growth of revenue because of this.

The economy in the area is driven by tourism. Sochi has been the main resort in the country with a recorded growth in the number of tourists from 3 to 5 million people during the period 2005-2009. However, a stagnation was recorded in 2010 and a decline in 2011 to the level of 2006 (3.9 million people), while in 2012 and 2013 about 4 million people visited the region. Also, a winter mini-peak in tourist flow was identified. Despite the growing interest of Russian and foreign tourists in the territory, there have been more active dynamics of tourist arrivals by the region of the Black Sea coast compared to Sochi. This trend is expected to reverse with improvements to the Sochi urban environment and seasonality is also expected to decrease. Infrastructure enhancements included: improved reliability of power supply, new wastewater treatment plant, expanded waste sorting capacity, construction of new roads and junctions and improvement of transport accessibility overall and for persons with a disability specifically.

In the area of sport and health lifestyle, the number of people attending sport schools for children and young people in Sochi has seen a significant growth since 2010 (after a vast decline in the period between 2006 and 2010). The number of children involved in sports is now at more than 20% of the total youth population (35% of the population aged 5-24 years).

Key points:

- The strategic plan for leveraging the legacy of the 2014 Olympic and Paralympic Games was founded on a platform for sustainable development. The main focus of the project was the transformation of the city of Sochi into a dynamic urban environment.
- The sustainable development of the demographic potential of Sochi was targeted combining population growth with a reduction in unemployment. The results of the initiative were a decline in the proportion of people with incomes below minimum cost of living and the growth of real wages in Sochi area. This growth was mainly fuelled by tourism and construction projects.
- In the area of sport and healthy lifestyle, the number of young people in Sochi attending sport schools has risen significantly since 2010 after a period of a decline from 2006 to 2010. Thirty-five percent of the population aged 5-24 years is involved in sports.

SESSION 4: PGI/OGI – IMPACT AND LEGACY STUDIES FORTHCOMING

Sandrine Cullivier, Federal University of Rio de Janeiro

Rio 2016 bid commitments for PG legacy, current status of people with a disability

Summary: Rio 2016 has identified 4 legacies objectives that include: transformation of the city, social inclusion, youth and education, and sport development. The following is a description of some of the initiatives that are particularly relevant to the IPC's 'fundamental legacy fields.'

Urban infrastructure:

- Accessible new transport (metro line 4, BRT) network and improved accessibility of renewed transport infrastructure (metro, metropolitan trains).
- Revitalization of "last mile" of existing venues (Maracanã, João Havelange, Rio Centro).
- Rehabilitation and accessibility improvement of sidewalks and walkways.
- Increase the number of hotels with accessible rooms to achieve the target of 1%.

Sport venues:

- Accessible sport venues in Rio (Paralympic Games competition venues).
- Accessible sport venues outside the city of Rio, as a result of accessibility improvements at pre-games training venues.

Social destination of assets:

- Donation of mobility equipment (scooters, motorized wheelchairs) and sport equipment to non-profit mobility programmes in the city of Rio.

Knowledge transfer:

- Rio 2016 Knowledge Legacy website with a dedicated accessibility theme.
- OGI/PGI knowledge legacy.
- Accessibility technical guidelines, positive business practices (barrier-free workplaces and recruitment of persons with a disability).

Values and behaviour change:

- Growth of Paralympic Movement in Brazil.
- Foster positive attitudes and perceptions about persons with a disability.
- Increase self-esteem of persons with a disability.
- Increased participation in sporting activities by persons with a disability.
- Encourage a volunteer culture among persons with a disability.
- Vocation training and professional development of persons with a disability, and build awareness in workforce about disability in a positive way.
- Transforma – Rio 2016 education programme building positive awareness about Paralympic Games and sports in public schools.

Key points:

- Rio 2016 has identified four key areas for legacy. Each of these areas aligns with one or more of the IPC's fundamental legacy fields.
- The 7 indicators in the OGI/IPC that pertain to Paralympic legacies will be used to capture the impacts of Rio2016 in these fundamental fields and will contribute to our overall understanding of the potential impacts and legacies of hosting a Paralympic Games.

Byungnam Lee, Director General of Games Planning and Contribution

PyeongChang 2018 bid commitments for PG legacy, current status of people with a disability

Summary: The PyeongChang Organizing Committee for the 2018 Olympic and Paralympic Winter Games is entering the 2nd phase of the planning process. The focus of the Games Preparation phase (2014-2016) involves finalising ceremonies and cultural programmes, recruiting and training volunteers, training the sports workforce, and completing venues and infrastructure projects. Specifically as it pertains to the Paralympics, this phase entails addressing issues of accessibility and 'smart' design to ensure a barrier free environment for the Paralympic Games and prioritising accessibility and convenience from the design phase. Preparations for the Paralympics also include encouraging participation in 'Dream Programme' that will include 160 youth with impairments from 40 countries annually.

OGI/PGI study on impairment (current status):

- Total number of registered people with impairment in Korea = 2,511,159 (Increase from 2.0% in 2000 to 4.9% in 2012 while proportion of severely impaired has decreased from 42.4% to 32.7%).
- Economic participation of persons with an impairment is significantly lower than that of the population at large (Men without impairment 73.9% / Men with impairment 49.9%; Women without impairment 51.2% / Women with impairment 22.1%).
- A full survey of convenience facilities every 5 years to promote accessibility for the disabled, the aged, and the pregnant and to confirm if legally required facilities are in place – first survey has been conducted and included 4,467 buildings and 157,822 amenities.
- Status of para-sports in Korea – currently registered athletes in para-sport federations is at 0.52% nationwide and 0.62% in Gangwon region (increase in Gangwon thanks to raised awareness after winning the bid).
- Status of recreational sports for the impaired: Participation in para-sport is steadily increasing, however, indifference to sport activities is also on the rise and more measures needed.
- Next step is to secure stable opportunities for para-athletes by establishing professional Paralympic winter sports teams (Korean government, starting in 2012, has subsidized 0.7M USD annually to support para sports professional teams).

Key points:

- At this phase of preparation for the 2018 Olympic and Paralympic Games, the focus is on ensuring that venues are being designed and built to be accessible and 'smart' and conducting surveys of existing venues and transportation networks to assess their conformance to accessibility standards.
- Participation in para-sport in Korea is still relatively low but is increasing and the Korean government has been supporting the further development of professional Paralympic winter sports teams via direct funding.

Shinji Nakamae, Director Paralympic Games Planning

Tokyo 2020 bid commitments for PG legacy, current status of people with a disability

Summary: The recent survey shows the high perception of Japanese people regarding the Paralympic Games and their commitment to improve the environment for persons with an impairment. Tokyo 2020 will foster the actions of these strongly committed, and give momentum to the creation of a community where all people, regardless of whether they have an impairment or not, will respect each other and can live in harmony.

The Tokyo 2020 Paralympic Games will be held in the centre of Tokyo, which is one of the largest and most advanced cities in the world. Tokyo is already one of the most accessible cities in the world. The concept of accessibility is enshrined in law, so that every person can be independent and take part in society. The Tokyo Metropolitan Government is committed to putting accessibility at the heart of all urban planning, with the principles of universal design incorporated into facilities throughout the city.

Hosting the Tokyo 2020 Games will be a great chance to show the world how a city can use technology and design innovation to bring even greater social inclusion. The Games in Tokyo will bring very significant legacies not only to Tokyo but also to Japan as a whole and to the Paralympic Movement. The Games will send the message that it is possible to create a society where everyone can live in harmony and where people with impairments are able to live independently.

In order to hold such a festival, the Tokyo Organising Committee of the Olympic and Paralympic Games (TOCOG) was established on January 24, 2014 and, in close cooperation with all concerned parties, we will deliver the Games with high quality and stability thereby contribution to the Olympic and Paralympic Movement and leaving behind tangible and intangible legacies.

Key points:

- Survey data shows that Japanese people have a high awareness off the Paralympic Games and a willingness to improve the built and social environment for persons with an impairment. Tokyo is already one of the most accessible cities in the world and the principles of universal design are part of all urban planning.
- Hosting the Tokyo 2020 Games is an opportunity to show the world how technology

and design innovation can promote even greater social inclusion.

- The Tokyo Organising Committee of the Olympic and Paralympic Games will work in collaboration with stakeholders to ensure both tangible and intangible legacies of hosting the Games.

SESSION 5: THEORETICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES IN IMPACT AND LEGACY ASSESSMENT

Panel 1: Conceptualizing the range of possible Paralympic legacies.

Bob Sparks, UBC CSS

Introduction: Beginning the conversation

Summary: The concept of legacy begs several questions: What is a legacy? What role does it serve? What timeframe does it cover? To set the scene, I offer the following statements made on the occasion of the Opening Ceremonies at the Sochi 2014 Paralympic Games.

"Sport is more than sport with the Paralympic Games... because of all the things that come after..." (Chantal Petitclair, Paralympian and commentator for Canadian Broadcasting Corporation).

"This is the beginning of a lasting legacy for Sochi and the world. In the same way that Sochi has built barrier-free facilities, I invite you to have barrier-free minds, not just to change you now, but forever... [The Paralympics] create a magnificent platform on which change can occur." (Sir Philip Craven, President, IPC).

The tension that we are addressing at this forum is 'how do you use an event that is limited in space and time to create lasting social change?' Begin by thinking about the event assets in longer range terms. We need to think about the games-related deliverables that we have already been discussing but then extend the timeframe well beyond the event itself. The assets include: infrastructure, educational programmes, volunteerism, sport development, athlete engagement, media relations, etc. (Misener et al., 2013; Dickson et al., 2011). These legacies can be further divided into hard legacies and soft legacies.

Next we need to think about the evidence base (Misener et al., 2012). Right now there exist several gaps in our knowledge.

Gap 1:

- High level of case experience
- Low level of case study
- Low level of empirical research

Gap 2:

- The OGI/PGI and most mega-event research looks at a relatively narrow window (from bid to 3 years post-event)

Gap 3:

- Poor knowledge capture
- Poor exchange and translation with a few exceptions

These gaps are also opportunities. Today's agenda includes first discussing **what we do know from empirical research** and secondly discussing what is **the right research agenda moving forward?**

Tracey Dickson, University of Canberra

Evaluating legacy frameworks and insights on social legacies

Summary: Both the IOC and the IPC have legacies as part of their charters and missions statements (IOC: 2.14 – “to promote a positive legacy from the Olympic Games to the host cities and host countries; IPC 5.2.1 Planning for Legacies – “The IPC, the Host NPC & the OCOG share a responsibility to promote lasting legacies in all aspects... The IPC shall use its resources, expertise and global network to provide advice and transfer good practices in order to assist in maximizing potential for legacy”). Additionally, host societies frequently draw on a ‘volunteer legacy rhetoric’ as part of their justification for bidding for/hosting the event. For example, in Vancouver 2010, the VANOC Mission stated one of the legacies of the event would include “volunteers trained in event planning and execution” (VANOC Business Plan, 2007, p. 35) and, furthermore, that helping with the Games would be “[an] unique experience [that] will create an enhanced talent pool of volunteers... and provide increased awareness about, passion for, and benefits of, volunteerism across the country” (p. 36). Similar rhetoric was used by London 2012 and Sochi 2014 with both OCOGs claiming that the Games would create a culture of volunteering that would benefit respective nations following the Games. A volunteer legacy is often used as one justification for the use of large amounts of public and private monies spent on hosting mega sport events – *is there proof?*

Framework for Legacy: Preuss et al. 2007 and Dickson et al 2011 have both proposed frameworks for discussing legacies that include planned/unplanned legacies, tangible/intangible legacies, and positive/negative legacies. The focus of many pre-event studies and bid documents is on those legacies that are planned, positive, and tangible with less attention paid to unplanned, negative or intangible outcomes. Dickson (2011) states that legacies can equally be considered using a ‘web’ or ‘radar’ framework with different legacies having different dimensions (cost, planning required, tangibility, timeframe, spatial impact, etc.) and requiring different investments.

Current Research (Redefining Legacy: Enhancing the management of volunteers to maximise the social and economic impact of volunteer participation in mega sporting events): This project, approved by the IPC includes research partners from the UK, Canada, and Australia. Research questions address who is volunteering, motivations for volunteering, volunteering post event and *‘how can we increase the potential volunteer legacy?’* Methods include online survey sent out by OCOGs (Vancouver, London, Sochi) – this is the first and largest

study of Olympic and Paralympic volunteers across multiple events. Findings to date indicate that: i) each OCOG has created their own volunteer training materials when much of the information could be transferable, ii) it is difficult to demonstrate what skills/knowledge a volunteer has acquired, and iii) training on disability awareness (which is transferable knowledge) is delivered inconsistently.

Key points:

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

- Volunteer legacy should be part of the knowledge transfer between Games with a focus on developing strategies for recruiting volunteers for legacy (e.g. those motivated by altruism) and developing open access training materials that focus on transferable skills/knowledge.

Andrea Bundon, Loughborough University

Paralympic impacts and legacies from a critical disabilities perspective

Summary: Though many disciplines study 'disability' as a topic, 'disability studies' refers to a field of scholarship that developed in the United Kingdom and North America in the 1970s and was informed by the Disability Rights Movement. The field is broad and encompasses different strands with scholars drawing on theories from Marxism, political economy, materialism, and feminism — among others. In her recent book, Carol Thomas makes the point that it is possible to differentiate between 'disability studies' and work that 'studies disability' by asking the question 'Whose side are you on?' Working from a critical disability studies perspective means taking sides and producing work that fundamentally challenges ableist culture. What I propose is that we consider how critical disability theories might inform the questions we ask when setting out to report on the impacts of the Paralympic Games. These questions include: Who do we believe are the stakeholders of the Paralympic Movement? Who do we think should benefit (or benefit most) from hosting the Paralympic Games? And who might be (in)directly harmed by hosting the event? Working from a critical disability studies perspective demands that we acknowledge that impacts are not value neutral — some impacts might contribute to more just societies but other impacts could perpetuate inequalities. It is my contention that a disability studies lens is one way for the IPC to ensure that they are not "impartial observers" but rather active agents in influencing the impacts of the Games. To discussion about how disability scholarship could inform our thinking on impacts and subsequently ensure that we are "stimulat[ing] social change," I offer these examples.

Accessibility: We have seen presentations discussing steps taken to make host cities and Games venues accessible. Disability theorists would point out accessibility is not the same as inclusiveness. Though accessible built environments are pre-requisites for social inclusion, it should not be assumed that removing barriers automatically results in the full and equal inclusion of disabled people.

Changing attitudes about disability: It has been left to those conducting OGI reports to interpret who are the individuals with attitudes that need changing. For example, Vancouver reported that employers said they would be more willing to hire a person with a disability after watching the Paralympics yet a report before London found that over 40 percent of disabled people in the UK believed the Paralympics were patronizing or made them feel like 2nd class citizens. Is it more important that the Paralympic Movement change able-bodied

individuals' perceptions of disability? Or that individuals with disabilities experience less discrimination and marginalization because of the Games?

Individual empowerment versus challenging ableism: The 'vision' of the Paralympic Movement includes "creat[ing] conditions for athlete empowerment" and "touch[ing] the hearts of all people for a more equitable society." A critical disability perspective differentiates between *individual empowerment* and *collective emancipation*. Though some athletes will derive positive benefits from their sport involvement, it does not follow that simply getting more disabled individuals involved in sport will result in a "more equitable society."

Key points:

- Working from a disability studies perspective enables us to critically interrogate the impact of hosting the Paralympic Games – both positive and negative.
- Understanding that the Games have the potential to both empower and marginalise people with disabilities is the first step in ensuring that the IPC and their partners are active agents in promoting affirmative ways of thinking about disability.

Natalia Dannenberg-Spreier, IPC

The evolution of media coverage of the Paralympic Games

Summary: There has been a considerable evolution of media coverage of the Paralympic Games over the past 15 years or so. This presentation covered four areas (1) the growth of TV audiences, (2) Games media attendance, (3) online growth and social media, and (4) future trends.

Growth of TV audiences: The IPC now sells the rights to the Games and has secured deals for Sochi and Rio in a number of major territories. This includes NBC in USA, NHK in Japan, ABC in Australia, CCTV in China, Channel 4 in the UK, EBU covering Europe and CBC in Canada. We now have more broadcast partners than ever before who are paying more and showing more. Furthermore, London clearly demonstrated that more people are now watching the Games outside of the host country.

Games media attendance: The number of media is increasing at the Games although there are some disparities in the data. The Beijing figures are higher because there were 1,000

domestic media compared to 400 in London. The number of foreign media in attendance at the Games is increasing. We have started to see an increase in the number of USA media attending and the aim is to maximise this market in lead up to Rio 2016.

Online growth and social media: In London we had more visitors to the IPC site each day than we did during the whole of Beijing. We also had more visitors to the site during London than the last three years combined. More people are taking their content online and in Sochi we streamed all five sports live and in London we had five online channels and showed a mixture of sports and live results. With regards to social media, the Paralympics were the number one trending sport event of 2012 on Twitter. During London there were 1.5 million Paralympic tweets, 82.1 million Facebook views from 24 million users and 9.9 million YouTube views. We have attempted to leverage strategies such as the Samsung Bloggers to get the public closer to the athletes.

Future trends: Media coverage of the Games is rapidly evolving. We have more media and more broadcast attention than ever before (and are faced with increasing demands given 24 hr media cycle). This leading to greater scrutiny and some of the headlines we are getting now are about classification and other issues that might be more critical. There is more recognition of individual athletes in both domestic and international markets. There is also a change in tone in media, there is a lot more focus on the sport and telling the story about the athletes rather than a sob story about the disability.

Key points:

- There is an increased appetite and demand for coverage of the Paralympic Games as demonstrated by the IPC securing deals with major media networks for upcoming Games. These networks are paying more and showing more than before.
- There has been astronomical growth in the area of online media and social media. The IPC and partners are broadcasting events live online and the public is engaging with IPC social media channels (YouTube, Facebook, Twitter) at unprecedented rates.
- Future areas to monitor or develop include working towards greater coverage in USA markets and raising the profiles of individual athletes.

Group discussion

Facilitator: Bob Sparks, UBC CSS

Overview: Bob Sparks: The idea of this session was to open up the conversation and think broadly about how we are conceptualising the possible legacies of the Paralympics. One of the discourses that we have heard repeatedly is about the legacy of volunteers and building the volunteer capacity in host communities – but Tracey Dickson’s presentation has troubled our general understandings of how this works because most of us, including me, did think that we were training volunteers and this was having a positive effect. Yet after her presentation we see there can be mismanagement, poor follow up, and questionable training – these issues raise questions about the legacy of volunteers. Then we have Andrea Bundon’s presentation that explored how young disabled people experienced the London Paralympics and the impacts of these games on their sport involvement. Finally – Natalia Dannenberg-Spreier spoke of media relations and the changing dynamics there. What thoughts do these raise for the group?

Discussion 1: Laura Misener initiated a conversation about how the OCOGs are being forced into a position of making increasingly grandiose claims about the volunteer legacy/capacity building capabilities of their event. Participants referenced Caitlin Pentifallo’s earlier presentation regarding how bidding cities tend to replicate the promises made in previously successful bids when they should be encouraged to look at their particular context and focus on more realistic goals. Tracey made the point that there have been significant changes to how events are hosted over the past decade including the increasing professionalization of event hosting/management leading to changing roles for both volunteers and staff. Apostolos Rigas questioned whether OCOGs, if they are really interested in capacity building, should be encouraged to think beyond the immediate needs of the games and also look to train volunteers in skills that are in demand for their region on a longer term basis.

Discussion 2: Bob opened a second discussion by saying that both Andrea’s and Natalia’s presentations raised issues about who are the stakeholders of the Games and that when telling stories about the Paralympics or engaging with the media we need to think about who are the producers of these stories and who are the audiences. Apostolos commented that the question Andrea raised about ‘who is inspired?’ and ‘what are they inspired to do?’ really resonated with him. Certainly his experience is that people watching the games are ‘inspired’ to think differently about disability but are they inspired to *do* something? Natalia stated that this was a topic the IPC media team was increasingly attentive to – they

recognise that the Paralympics are a 'feel good' event but are wondering if there is more to it than making audiences feel good – can they be inspired to create change or take action?

SESSION 6: THEORETICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES IN IMPACT AND LEGACY ASSESSMENT

Panel 2: Conceptualizing a research agenda

Andrea Bundon, Loughborough University

Para-sport – Mobilising youth using digital methods

Summary: My interest in this area started with the motto of the 2012 London Olympic and Paralympic Games — ‘Inspire a Generation.’ Though many host communities have discussed legacies in terms of the ability to ‘inspire’ people, London in particular focused on the potential of the games to mobilize youth and increase rates of sport participation. However, some impacts are harder to measure than others and ‘inspiring youth’ is one that is particularly difficult to assess — particularly when there is no definition of what is meant by *inspire*. When looking into the research that has been done with regards to Paralympics impacts and young people I found very little except for a few studies on the perceptions towards disability of able-bodied children who participated in Paralympic School Days programmes. I also observed that though planning documents discuss the potential of the Games to impact the physical activity rates of young disabled people, in follow up reports it was more common to see rates of participation among young people and disabled people — not young AND disabled people.

Digital Storytelling and Paralympic Impacts and Legacies: Though many platforms that could technically be called digital storytelling, I am interested in a particular form of digital storytelling pioneered at the Centre for Digital Storytelling (California) in the 1990s:

- The stories are created in group settings (referred to as story circles or workshops)
- The stories are short – typically 1 to 4 minutes.
- The stories are most frequently (though not always) told in the first person
- The stories commonly include photos, videos, illustrations, voice over and captions.
- EMPHASIS ON ‘STORY’ AND ‘TELLING’ NOT ON ‘TECHNOLOGY’

The ‘Are We Inspired Yet?’ Project: My interest is in exploring how digital storytelling might be used to capture the impacts and legacies of hosting a Paralympic Games. I am currently working with schools, sport clubs, community centers and local and national organizations to hold digital storytelling workshops for young disabled people. During the workshops, young people are asked “to tell their story about sport or physical activity. The reason I am really excited by this work is that it is a good reminder to me that when we talk

about impacts and legacies, we are not talking about Summary concepts — we are talking about policies and initiatives that have real implications for young people's sport involvement. Though, as Paul Foster stated earlier, it is difficult to track the direct impact of the £1 billion that was spent on sport development in the UK around the 2012 Games, it is possible to document if and how individuals have been impacted by the hosting of the Games. Instead of looking for 'big data' and 'big impacts' I am asking what could 'small stories' about 'small impacts' tell us about the potential for the Paralympic Games to inspire a generation?

Key points:

- Though young disabled people are frequently touted as the beneficiaries of the Paralympic Games and the generation to be 'inspired,' little empirical work has explored their views on the Games and how the Games inform their sport participation.
- Listening to stories by young disabled people about sport is a way of capturing the small data – the impacts and legacies of the Games at an individual level.

David Howe, Loughborough University

Ethnographic research as a lens to understanding Paralympic legacies and impacts

Summary: This talk highlighted the importance of thinking about the cultural specificity of legacy and impact. In other words it is important to remember that legacies and impacts vary cross-culturally and it is paramount that we bear this in mind when engaging in empirical research on the topic. When asking informants about the impact and legacy of the Paralympic games it is important also to remember that what people do not know that they know - is key to gaining a detailed cultural understanding (Last, 1981). Related to this is the importance of word games within specific cultural contexts (Bourdieu et al, 1991; Wittgenstein, 1969). The terms legacy and impact in other words need to be unpacked in each distinct cultural environment. While the IOC has highlighted the importance of legacy of the Olympic and Paralympic Games bidding process and engrained it in the Olympic Charter, we need to be mindful that these values, definitions and ethos are based upon western cultural hegemony and as a result may not be universally accepted outside the realm of international sport governance. Ultimately this presentation asked whether or not prioritising legacy, a nebulous concept at best, is a benefit to the International Paralympic Committee. Highlighting the case of London 2012 Paralympics – where there is a clearly

demarcated history (or legacy) within the UK prior to games – it is unclear whether this last instalment of the summer games actually had a positive impact upon the lives of impaired populations within the United Kingdom - where early research findings suggest that those individuals who did not take part in the games are often seen as a negative drain upon society. As a result we need to be aware of the negative as well as the positive consequences of legacy and impact.

References :

Bourdieu, P., Chamboredon, J-C. & Passeron, J-C. (1991) *The Craft of Sociology. Epistemological Preliminaries*. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Last, M. (1981) The Importance of Knowing About Not Knowing. In Social Science and Medicine. Vol. 158:387-392.

Wittgenstein, L. (1969) *The Blue and Brown Books*. Second edition. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Key points:

- The concept of legacies and impacts differs in specific cultural contexts. While the IOC and the IPC have highlighted the importance of legacy in the bidding process, we need to be mindful that these values are based upon western cultural hegemony and may not be universally accepted outside the realm of international sport governance.

- We need to be aware of the negative as well as the positive consequences of legacy and impact and be alert to the possibility that the Games may also serve to further marginalise groups – and that this is also a 'legacy.'

Caitlin Pentifallo, UBC CSS

Importance of national and local contexts

Summary: The goal of this presentation is to discuss how we can encourage a shift in how we think about indicators and impact assessment and subsequently their relationship to legacy creation and evaluation. We have already stated that benchmarking and comparing two very different cities is a waste of time. But the OGI/PGI is changing and that change is for the better – the IOC is pushing for flexibility over rigidity and case study rather than prescription. The statement was made by IOC President Thomas Back that bidding should be thought of “more as an invitation” for candidate cities to study how hosting the Olympic Games would fit “into their long-term city and regional and country development.” Also, we have seen that linking policies and bundling indicators can provide a more comprehensive account of changes.

My objectives today are (1) to demonstrate how indicator-based impact assessment can be used to conduct an analysis sensitive to local, regional and national policy context and (2) to provide evidence of how a qualitatively-oriented approach sensitive to the history, political and social climate and policy landscapes can supplement the largely quantitative information generated by the OGI/PGI study. To explore these questions I draw on the methodological approaches of critical policy studies, policy genealogy and case study. Case study methodology is used here because of the highly contextual nature of hosting an Olympic and Paralympic Games; It is interesting to note that case study methods were introduced in the most recent versions of the OGI Technical manual.

Case Study: A total of 84 policies were created in Vancouver (at city, regional, provincial and national level) that explicitly linked government objectives pertaining to disability to hosting the Games. One of these was ‘2010 Vision for British Columbians with Disabilities’, and can serve to illustrate my points. The policy’s first goal was to foster greater opportunities within the city of Vancouver and across BC for people with disabilities; the second goal was to harness the 2010 Games as a catalyst for such opportunities. It was passed by 40 local municipalities and was remarkable in that it engaged with the province and yet was developed within the host city. This policy had two agendas, an accessibility agenda (focused on the physical, attitudinal and institutional barriers encountered by people with disabilities) and a citizenship agenda (emphasis on belonging, rights, responsibility and contributions over disability and handicap). This document was picked up by various partners and a ‘Measuring Up’ document was produced that included indicators that were

locally generated and extremely meaningful in the context of the legacy that this particular policy sought to project.

Key points:

- As a means of combining performance indicators and policy analysis, my recommendation is to integrate indicators at the onset of the ideational phases of policy making and getting on board with different stakeholders including NGOs, interest groups, city councillors and people who have a vested interest in pushing these policies forward and then aligning their vision with the OGI/PGI.
- In aligning indicators with the vision of the host city, impacts can be better accounted for. Rather than serving as campaign material, these promises can be traced through their evolution from bid to organising stages and later be held accountable.
- Legacy planning and assessment needs to proceed in tandem with pre-existing local development objectives and in this way, the Games can be integrated into long term urban and regional development policies rather than remaining extraneous.

Group discussion

Facilitator: Bob Sparks, UBC CSS

Overview: Bob Sparks: In her presentation, Andrea Bundon spoke about the value of storytelling and digital methods for exploring 'small legacies', David Howe emphasized the need to explore the impacts of the Games on disabled communities, and Caitlin Pentifallo discussed the need to link the conversation about impacts to local context and local policy. What is the group's reaction to these points?

Discussion: Andrea questioned whether instead of capturing 'big legacies', we should explore 'small legacies'; stories are potentially as important as statistics. Tracey Dickson suggested quantitative measures were important when seeking to change policy. Andrea concurred but felt statistics accompanied by stories could have even greater impact - that the numbers can provide the rationale for policy change but the stories tend to be remembered by policy makers and can provide context. This discussion also connects to Natalia Dannenberg-Spreier's presentation about using social media to get closer to athletes as well – people want to talk to athletes and see behind the scenes and digital tools are one way of doing that. The IPC's approach to social media has been quite 'personable' and really involved the athletes but there are concerns that as it grows and becomes more professionalised this 'closeness' could be lost. Bob made the connection between Andrea's presentation that spoke about how the IPC and the Paralympic Movement could learn to 'listen' to the stories of young disabled people and David Howe's presentation on ethnographic approaches which are also based on 'living among' groups and learning from the ground up. Jocelin Sébastiani made the point that the notion of learning from the local and trying to make the OGI studies context specific was an ongoing agenda item. This led to a discussion about increased focus on Case Studies within the OGI/PGI study and how this could provide more flexibility for research teams to study OGI indicators that are relevant to local context rather than attempting to collect predetermined data sets that are either not available or not relevant. Laura Misener made the important point that we should be wary of using 'Case Study' as a generic term to refer to any qualitative or narrative approach that looks at a single case or instance. Case Study is a rigorous and well-established methodology and that is what we need to push for in future OGI work.

SESSION 7: ENGAGING WITH THE IPC STRATEGY OF ACTIVE PROMOTION OF LEGACIES

How best to identify, facilitate and measure legacies and strategies for leveraging legacies?

Keith Gilbert, University of East London

David Legg, Mount Royal University

Paralympic Legacies

Summary: In this presentation Keith and David reviewed the process that led to and the results emanating from the publication of their edited book *Paralympic Legacies* including: the challenges and opportunities related to the definition of legacy, why legacy is important from a Paralympic perspective, and suggestions for future directions. The book itself is in four main parts. Part one covers the Paralympic Games Debate. The second portion addresses Paralympic host cities legacies including 9 chapters dedicated to summer host cities and 4 to winter (with 3 of them reviewing multiple cities). Many of these reviews were addressed from unique perspectives including those of athletes, volunteers, officials, host organizing committee members and academics. The third portion of the book addresses emerging issues in Paralympic legacies focusing on social currency, links to physical activity and health, links to physical education and urban regeneration. The fourth portion of the book addresses re-conceptualizing Paralympic Legacies. David and Keith ended the presentation posing two questions; who is responsible for understanding Paralympic Legacy and is Paralympic Legacy sustainable?

Key points:

- The book *Paralympic Legacies* edited by David Legg and Keith Gilbert makes an important contribution to the discussion of Paralympic Legacies by addressing the issue of legacies from the perspective of multiple Paralympic stakeholders.

Laura Misener, Western University

Leveraging para-sport events for positive social impacts: Comparing integrated versus non-integrated events

Summary: The aim of this research project is to examine how the hosting of different forms of sport events for persons with a disability are being leveraged to create opportunities for community participation, and influence community attitudes towards disability. Article 30 of the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with a Disability states that persons with a disability should have the right to participate on an equal basis in community life including recreational, leisure and sporting activities (UN, 2009). The Government of Canada's Annual Report on Disability Issues reported that 50.6% of people with disabilities would like to participate in more cultural and leisure activities, but are prevented from doing so by barriers such as inaccessible facilities and transportation, the need for specialized equipment, and misperceptions about disability (HRSDC, 2010; WHO, 2011). Hosting sporting events can offer an opportunity to access scarce resources to create more accessible infrastructure, increase supportive services, gain access to specialized equipment, and potentially change attitudes about disability (Sherry et al., 2011). While events are uniquely positioned to tap into resources to create enduring infrastructural and social legacies for the local disabled population, little empirical evidence exists supporting these claims (Darcy & Appleby, 2011). Similarly, it is believed that the hosting of sporting events for persons with a disability can influence community members' perceptions of disability resulting in greater integration of persons with a disability into community life. The reality is that no research has addressed this issue (Misener et al., 2012; Legg & Gilbert, 2010).

This project on two different types of sporting events: integrated events where able bodied athletes and athletes with a disability compete alongside one another (2014 Commonwealth Games – Glasgow), and non-integrated events that have a distinct event for athletes with a disability separated by time, but occurring in the same or similar location following the Olympic/Paralympic model (2015 Pan/Parapan American Games – Toronto). The objectives of this project are to: a) compare and contrast social legacy tactics, strategies, and programmes of integrated versus non-integrated events; b) analyze spectator, volunteer, and community members' attitudes and awareness of disability; and c) develop a framework for understanding how various stakeholder groups can better leverage para-sport events to benefit community participation opportunities, and influence attitudes and awareness about disability. To examine these issues, we use document analyses and interviews. To determine the levels of perceptions and awareness of disability, we will employ the *Scale of Attitudes Towards Disabled Persons (SADP)*, Antonek, 1981) survey with three groups (volunteers,

spectators, community members). Combined, these techniques will offer a broad spectrum of empirical evidence of how sport events for persons with a disability are being utilized to increase opportunities for community participation and greater levels of social inclusion. Our preliminary results suggest that despite the move towards a focus on strategically leveraging events for social impact, the rhetoric of legacy amongst the organizing committee and associated groups perpetuates the notion that the event in and of itself will have the desired social effects.

Key points:

- While it is often stated that hosting para-sport events can contribute to enduring legacies for the local disabled population and influence perceptions of disability, there exists little to no empirical evidence to support these claims.
- This project will help to understand how para-sport events might be leveraged to increase opportunities for greater social inclusion for people with disabilities.

Evgeny Bukharov, Director of Paralympic Integration & Coordination for Sochi 2014

Implementing a targeted Paralympic legacy strategy: The barrier-free environment programme for Sochi 2014

Summary: From the beginning of the planning stage, Sochi 2014 Organizing Committee decided a barrier-free environment was the key factor to a successful Paralympic Games and to providing long-term legacy for the city, the region and the country. The initial approach to the Barrier-Free Environment concept was based on the consideration that there could be people with various impairments in all the client groups within the Olympics and Paralympics. The Barrier-Free Environment Plan was approved by the Russian government and became obligatory for more than twenty different organizations involved.

Accessible sports venues: The Sochi 2014 Organizing Committee engaged international and Russian experts on barrier-free environment to ensure the highest quality and maximum efficiency. All sports venues that hosted Winter Paralympic Games events comply with accessibility standards. They were fully adapted not only to host Paralympic athletes, but also to welcome spectators with a disability and other client groups. The Opening and Closing Ceremonies of the Sochi 2014 Games were accessible for visually impaired spectators owing to verbal descriptions that were provided through headphones.

Accessible transport: Accessible pathways between city and Games venues, as well as inside the competition venues and the Olympic Park ensured comfortable movement of all the guests. 327 of the 800 buses added to the city transport system during the Games Time were accessible for wheelchairs. During the Pre-Games time the main and auxiliary Games transport hubs, including railway stations and international airports in Sochi, Moscow, St. Petersburg, Krasnodar and Anapa, were brought into compliance with barrier-free environmental standards.

Accessible Sochi: Accessible rooms were provided in all hotels, resorts and accommodation locations in the city as part of the preparations for the Games. In the Central, Khosta and Adler Regions over 40 km of pathways were equipped for anyone with limited ability. Accessible public transportation (buses, taxi-cabs, electric trains, cable car routes) ensured an easy movement for the Games participants and guests between the Sochi city venues. A Barrier-Free Map of Sochi (www.sochibezbarierov.ru) was created. The OCOG assisted by the International Olympic University and Sochi administration hosted education events. More than 100 workshops on Accessibility Assessment and Barrier-Free Environment Strategy were provided for OCOG and partners (4,000 people) and 97 workshops and trainings on

Disability Awareness and Ethics in Communication with People with Impairments were organized for 12,000 Games staff (volunteers, drivers, security, commentators).

Key points:

- The Barrier-Free Environment programme created for Sochi 2014 was premised on the concept that there could be people with various impairments in all of the Games client groups (athletes, spectators, volunteers, staff, city residents).
- The programme created in Sochi allows people with disabilities to move more freely and independently around the city, use transport, visit attractions, places of work and study, leisure and recreation, and practice sports. Approximately 200 Russian cities have adopted Sochi's model for best practice.
- Paralympic sports in Russia received a significant boost, with a threefold increase in the number of sportsmen with disabilities during the Pre-Games time of 2006 to 2011.

Group discussion

Facilitator: Apostolos Rigas, IPC

Overview: In lieu of a synthesis discussion at the end of the session, short discussions were held after each of the three presentations.

Discussion 1 (following David Legg & Keith Gilbert presentation): Keith observed that the previous day he had questioned whether it was possible for the Paralympics to have 'their own' OGI rather than be tied to Olympics. Apostolos Rigas stated that right now there is a legal agreement that requires the organising committee to carry out the OGI. Should a separate PGI be created then it would have to be negotiated with both IOC and host to have it included in the hosting agreement. Sandrine Cuvillier noted there would be concerns about duplicating work or adding to workload without providing additional resources. Apostolos responded that although the current OGI does require some compromise (for example, originally some 17 Paralympic indicators were proposed but only 7 made it into OGI) there is an advantage to conducting one study rather than two and the IPC is in this way able to capitalise on some of the data that is already being collected as part of OGI. For him, the concern is not in the set up or the legalities of the agreement but rather in making sure that the indicators work with the local context and continuing to refine what data are collected. Tracey Dickson added that part of that refinement has to be not just asking if

there was a legacy (yes or no) but also collecting data on how the legacies (both positive and negative legacies) were arrived at so that we can then reproduce the desirable legacies and avoid the negative legacies.

Discussion 2 (following Laura Misener presentation): Paul Foster asked if the research team investigated if cities bid on certain events because they perceive different legacies potential associated with hosting particular games? Laura noted that Glasgow had objectives linked to the 'hosting agenda' (wanting to demonstrate their hosting capabilities), and the Commonwealth Games were a big enough event but not too big. There was no suggestion they were specifically drawn to the Commonwealth Games because they are an integrated event. Toronto was a strategic decision because they wanted to bid on the Olympics and wanted to show they can deliver on this model (two events running one after the other). Paul asked if there was research that explored whether one model is more valued by athletes? Laura indicated opinion is divided in the athletic community. For example, Chantal Petitclerc (former Paralympian and Chef de Mission for Team Canada) is a strong advocate for integrated. Others feel strongly about separate events because of fear that attention to para-sport will be lost if integrated. David Legg noted that Chantal competed in wheelchair racing, an event that would likely be included in integrated games while other events might not. David personally supports the separate model because it provides more competitive opportunities for athletes with disabilities but acknowledged this does not address more philosophical aspects of the debate. Tracey asked if there would be any media monitoring during events to see if para-sport was covered in integrated Games; Laura indicated there would be.

Discussion 3 (following Evgeny Bukharov presentation): Bob Sparks asked to clarify the statement that Sochi organisers learned from best practices of former OCOGs. Evgeny and Apostolos explained the 'Observer programme' whereby key staff and volunteers were sent to previous Games and other international events (World Cups, for example) to observe what was done and report back. Andrea Bundon stated that as a guide on the Canadian team she had seen the Russian observers at many events in the lead up to Sochi and was pleased to see how they had taken elements used at other venues and applied them at the Sochi Nordic venue. Paul concluded that Evgeny's presentation was an excellent reminder that while percentage of spectators with disabilities might be higher at Paralympics, the net number is higher at Olympics so issues of accessibility cannot be limited to hosting of Paralympics.

SESSION 8: IDENTIFYING CONCRETE NEXT STEPS

Facilitators: Apostolos Rigas, IPC and **Bob Sparks**, UBC CSS

The final session was planned to consider implications, opportunities and next steps for key ideas, questions and concerns that were generated during the Forum.

Apostolos Rigas: The main idea of this Forum was to bring together key people working in the area of Paralympic impacts and legacies. This group (who participated in the Forum) will be ever expanding as we move forward, as there will be more people coming in with future OGI studies, more people involved with measuring legacies for the Paralympic Games, and hopefully more academics doing this work. From the IPC point of view, since 2006, we had hoped that the academic connection would begin as soon as we joined with the OGI. The IPC is not a research or academic institution and we feel that our role is to encourage research to happen in this area; we want to make data available, make the research available, try to trigger interest, but in the end it is the global research community that will need take it from there and move the research forward.

Bob Sparks: Building on this, it will be important to identify concrete steps we can take to build on the ideas and interests that have been identified here. One question is whether we can make the presentations and materials from the Forum available electronically. This could be through the IPC, UBC cIRcle Library (an open access library), or through our respective institutional/organizational websites.

1. Sharing Presentations from the Forum

A discussion followed about potential copyright and trademark issues for hosting the presentations on one website. It was generally felt the best approach would be for each group to publish their materials electronically in accordance with their own institutional policies, and to make the urls available to the other participants, as appropriate.

2. High Level Summary Report

There was strong support for preparing a high level summary report of the Forum that would contain abstracts of the presentations and summaries of the discussions, along with information about the rationale for the Forum and its main findings. **Action Item:** It was agreed that Bob Sparks and Apostolos Rigas would oversee this process.

3. Online Repository/Virtual Research Centre

A second discussion followed about creating an online repository or virtual research centre that could collect a variety of kinds of research on Paralympic impacts and legacies. It was not felt that the IPC could take on this role at this time, although this warranted consideration for the future. **Action Item:** Apostolos Rigas agreed to follow up with the IPC with regards to possibilities.

a. Sharing Datasets

In addition to OGI/PGI reports and academic publications, questions were asked about whether such a repository or centre could contain databases from the OCOGs and potentially from other sources that could be used by researchers. It was felt that such a step would be highly beneficial for stimulating meta-analyses and secondary use of the data (such as for graduate student education). Concerns were raised about whether such databases are proprietary and restricted by agreements between the OCOGs, national committees and the IOC and IPC. Nevertheless, the option of creating and releasing open datasets remains a possibility. **Action Item:** This item needs someone to help carry it forward.

b. ResearchGate

A further consideration was whether a virtual research centre might play an active role in facilitating research such as by identifying a network of people who can assist with social science research and projects investigating Paralympic impacts and legacies. Such a centre might include a social network function like ResearchGate (similar to LinkedIn) that puts people into a digital network. There was a brief discussion about whether ResearchGate itself could be used to identify a group of people interested in Paralympic impacts and legacies. **Action Item:** Andrea Bundon agreed to look into the possibility of creating a group on ResearchGate.

c. First Steps

There was strong support for a repository or virtual research centre, and it was decided that this could be an **Action Item** going forward. An easy first step would be to identify the urls for existing reports and publications, such as the OGI reports, and post these on our respective websites. For example, the UBC CSS website already links to the UBC cIRcle Library that contains the full Vancouver 2010 OGI Reports and English-translated copies of

the survey instruments that were used for the 2008 Beijing Paralympic Games, along with reports from two CSS Think Tanks (TT1 and TT2) that focused on impacts and legacies of sports mega-events. The UBC CSS urls are public and can be shared with any group. UBC CSS also would be pleased to host through cIRcle or post urls for other reports and information and to link with other organizations. Please contact Bob Sparks about this.

d. Information Accessibility

An important consideration was raised about making the online resources as accessible as possible and the potential technical issues involved in doing this. For example, 'portable document format' (pdf) is a preferred file format for archiving documents and power point presentations because of its security features, but challenge is that some pdf formats are not fully accessible for text readers for people with visual impairments. This is a good reminder that we will need strong technical support to develop a fully accessible online resource.

4. Supporting Social Science Research on the Paralympics

Questions were raised about how best to support Paralympic social science research and Paralympic impacts and legacies research.

a. Role of the IPC

There was a strong desire for a clear statement of the IPC's strategy for supporting the social sciences and impact and legacies research, and an explanation of how social scientists can optimally obtain approval for their research projects. The group was aware that some social science researchers had experienced difficulties getting their studies endorsed by the IPC Sports Science Committee (SSC). The SCC reviews all scientific research applications and the sense was that social science research was not as well supported as natural science research. Researchers appreciate the need for proposals to be reviewed and for studies and personnel to be accredited in order to have access to the Games. Several participants commented on the value that accreditation provides in terms of legitimacy and accessibility. Nevertheless, the collective opinion was that this process could be better than it is at present. **Action Item:** Apostolos Rigas agreed to approach the SSC to discuss these issues.

Questions were also raised about whether linkages should be sought with the IPC Education Committee and the Communications Committee, as their work fits with some of the mandates of the OCOGs and the academic researchers around education and

communication. **Action Item:** Apostolos Rigas agreed to raise this issue with the IPC for further consideration.

b. Role of OGI/PGI

The Olympic Games Impact (OGI) Study, which includes indicators for the Paralympic Games (PGI), was seen as a useful tool for collecting data on the impacts of the Paralympics across time and across host cities and countries. There was strong support for maintaining the robustness of the Paralympic indicators in OGI and for making the OGI Technical Manual more available to Paralympic impacts and legacies researchers. Currently, the Manual is proprietary with the IOC and IPC, and access is restricted to those researchers contracted by the OCOG to conduct the study for the Games. It would be an asset for research on Paralympic (and Olympic) impacts and legacies if the Manual could be accessible to other researchers who in turn could configure their research around complementary areas where data is not being collected for OGI and who could also contribute to updating and improving the OGI Paralympic indicators. **Action Item:** Jocelin Sébastiani agreed to check whether the IOC might be willing to provide access to the Manual for researchers.

c. Beyond the IPC and OGI

Beyond this, there was also strong support for examining ways to encourage social science research outside of OGI and the IPC. Games Time research was seen to have its own requirements, but there is a great deal of research to be done on sport and disability outside of the Paralympic Games and the Paralympic Movement that can still have potential bearing on Paralympic impacts and legacies. *(Editor's Note: Although not discussed in detail at the Forum, such research potentially covers a broad range of topics including research on the politics of disability, social justice, the interactions of disability stakeholder groups, cultural contexts, roles of social and mass media, corporate social responsibility programmes, and factors in social and organizational change, to name a few areas. Please see 'Further Readings' on p. 45).* It was seen as important to keep this broader perspective in focus and to encourage research across disciplinary boundaries and fields.

5. Supporting OCOG Knowledge Transfer

From the OCOG standpoint, there was strong support for better knowledge transfer from OCOGs, OGI researchers and academic researchers doing complementary work on Paralympic impacts and legacies.

a. Information Sharing

The OCOG representatives found that the OCOG, OGI and academic research presentations at the Forum were useful, and felt there was room for improving knowledge translation and sharing going forward so they could have up-to-date information about latest findings and best practices. This was particularly true for the OCOGs that were in the early stages of planning, but everyone supported the idea. **Action Item:** Apostolos Rigas agreed to pursue with IPC.

b. OGI Technical Manual

Similarly, it was noted that the OGI Technical Manual empowers the local group to configure OGI to best suit the local context, which is highly beneficial, but that the Manual is not instructive about how to prioritize the study and does not convey best practices, even though changes in the Manual are ongoing based on prior case learnings. It was felt that the OGI process could be improved by sharing best practices on how to prioritize the indicators and organize the study. It was also felt that efficiencies could be achieved by linking OGI data collection to required OCOG reporting to the IOC and IPC. OGI researchers presently struggle to collect data, some of which is already (or could be) collected by the OCOG. Both of these processes (improving the technical manual and linking OGI and OCOG data collection) could be enhanced by cross-team information sharing and dedicated academic research. **Action Item:** This was seen as an item for the upcoming review of the Technical Manual. Caitlin Pentifallo voiced interest in participating in the review process. Interested parties should follow up with Jocelin Sébastiani

c. Knowledge Translation & Transfer from Academic Research

The academic researchers saw an opportunity to better identify the practical implications of their research as a way to aid knowledge translation and transfer for all groups. Some examples for how this could be operationalized included:

- I. The Disability & Society journal requires three take-away points for knowledge translation as part of article abstracts. This could be taken on by researchers doing work on Paralympic impacts and legacies.
- II. The Tri-Council Granting Agencies in Canada require all funded researchers to do KT (knowledge translation) presentations to key target audiences. This could be incorporated into OGI as a requirement for the OGI research team.
- III. Inviting all impacts and legacies researchers to build social implications and KT into their technical reports, manuals and published papers, monographs and articles.

This was identified as an important **action item** that requires a champion. In the meantime, the group was encouraged to think about ways these strategies could be operationalized.

d. Networking

All groups felt there was significant value to be derived from more systematic networking with peers and colleagues across areas (OCOG, OGI, academic research). One goal of the Forum was to lay the foundation for further networking. For the academics, this was seen as a crucial step for conducting their research. It was one thing to get accredited, but quite another to identify the actual people you needed to work with. The OCOG representatives indicated they were very willing to help support the academic researchers. **Action Item:** Apostolos Rigas agreed to pursue this further with the IPC. In his words, "the IPC has the responsibility, we know the people and we can assist."

6. IPC Social Change Agenda

Apostolos Rigas noted that the core business of the IPC, as of its Strategic Plan, is to offer the Paralympic Games. They do this through enhancing athletes' development, and working with partners, through association with the IOC, and through technical support for the Games. Why they do this is about more than just the Games themselves, however - namely to "use sport, the Paralympics and the athletes to create a more equitable society with equal opportunities for all people."

This led to a discussion about research on social change. Stories about inspiration and empowerment from participating in or watching the Paralympic Games are common, however, the research evidence is not all positive. Part of this has to do with the complex mosaic of groups that engage with the Paralympics, including athletes with disabilities; spectators, fans and family members who are familiar with disabilities; as well as people not related to the Paralympics who do not have disabilities or direct experience with disabilities.

While participants agreed that the agenda for social change is important, it was recognized that this is a unique field of endeavor in its own right and an area that warrants its own research and critical approach. **Action Item:** Going forward, it would be helpful to have a better understanding of the IPC's agenda and commitments in this area.

7. Follow-up meeting at Vista - October 7, 2015, Girona, Spain

The Forum participants agreed that, in addition to preparing a summary report, it would be good to convene a follow-up meeting. Since some participants were planning to attend Vista, it was suggested this was an opportunity to organize a meeting and invite other interested individuals who had not been able to participate in the Forum itself. **Action Item:** Apostolos Rigas agreed to approach the Vista organizing committee about arranging a meeting room prior to the Vista conference for a three-hour follow-up meeting.

PARTICIPANTS:

Participants in the Forum included researchers and practitioners working in academic, government, NGO and industry contexts; and representatives from the groups responsible for assessing the impacts of the Paralympic Games for Beijing 2008, Vancouver 2010, London 2012, Sochi 2014, Rio de Janeiro 2016, PyeongChang 2018 and Tokyo 2020.

Participants were asked to attend all sessions and contribute actively to discussions, as well as to present information on their research or other activities relating to Paralympic impacts and legacies and/or their involvement with planning or conducting OGI/PGL studies.

EVGENY BUKHAROV, PhD

Paralympic Games Integration & Coordination Director, Sochi 2014 (RUS)

ebukharov@gmail.com

Evgeny Bukharov has six years experience in preparation and staging of Sochi 2014 Paralympic Winter Games. Starting from March 2008 in Sochi 2014 OCOG, he passed through all stages of Paralympic Games planning and implementation as a leader of Paralympic Games Integration and Coordination Department. During this period he was also responsible for programs and projects which developed the key success factors of Sochi Paralympics and created long-term legacy in the host-city, such as Barrier-free Environment Programme, International Education Forum “Strategy of building Barrier-free environment for cities and business decisions for accessibility”, Paralympic Induction and trainings, and the Paralympic library of Sochi 2014 OCOG.

ANDREA BUNDON, PhD

Peter Harrison Centre for Disability Sport, Loughborough University (UK)

a.bundon@lboro.ac.uk

Andrea Bundon is a postdoctoral fellow at the Peter Harrison Centre for Disability Sport in the School of Sport, Exercise and Health Sciences at Loughborough University. Her research, funded by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, uses digital storytelling to explore how youth with disabilities understand and relate to the Paralympic Movement. Bundon’s research interests include issues of inclusion/exclusion in disability sport, community based research, and qualitative digital and online methods. She has published in numerous international journals including *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health*, *the Journal of Sport and Social Issues* and *Disability and Society*.

SANDRINE CUVILLIER,

Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro (BRA)

sancuvilliers@gmail.com

Sandrine is currently a PhD candidate at the Federal University of Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, studying sustainability evaluation methodologies and degrowth themathic. She is the executive coordinator of the OGI study project her lab team is leading for the local organising committee and for the IOC and IPC. She participated in projects of environmental and socioeconomical impacts evaluation for local companies and the local state government (Rio + 20 summit). Sandrine is Certified trainer since 2009 by the *Global Reporting Initiative* (GRI) program on sustainability reporting.

NATALIA DANNENBERG-SPREIER, Digital Media Manager

International Paralympic Committee (GER)

natalia.dannenberg@paralympic.org

Natalia Dannenberg-Spreier is the Digital Media Manager at the IPC and managed the IPC's London 2012 and Sochi 2014 social media teams. During those Games, the IPC quadrupled their Facebook 'likes,' doubled their Twitter following and significantly enhanced the online presence of the Paralympic Movement.

TRACEY DICKSON, PhD

University of Canberra (AUS)

tracey.dickson@canberra.edu.au

Tracy holds several degrees in Tourism, Sport and Event Management. She is the National Secretary (Australia) for the International Society for Skiing Safety (ISSS), a Life Member of Outdoor Recreation Industry Council of NSW and an Australian Government Higher Education Registered Provider.

PAUL FOSTER, Paralympic Lead

London 2012 Government Olympic Executive (UK)

paul@thesportconsultancy.com

Paul has been a Team Manager of GB men's Wheelchair Basketball squad in Beijing 2008 and then he acted as a Senior Paralympic, Sport and Venues Advisor for the Government Olympic Executive of UK Government. In this capacity, he oversaw £110m government investment into the Paralympic Games and co-wrote *London 2012: A legacy for disabled people*.

He has been the Equality & Diversity Board Member of Royal Parks and at Games-time in London he worked for the Olympic Park, overseeing external operations of the Olympic Park

KEITH GILBERT, PhD

Centre for Sport, Disability & Health, University of East London (UK)

k.gilbert@uel.ac.uk

Keith Gilbert is a Professor in Sport Management in the School of Health & Bioscience at the University of East London and Director of the Centre for Disability, Sport & Health. He researches in the area of sport management, sport sociology [which includes opening up many areas of innovation] and disability of sport and has a strong interest in qualitative, interpretive

and narrative research methodologies. He has numerous publications and has edited several books in the broad areas of sport, sociology, cultural studies, sustainability, environment and Paralympics. He was the Assistant Chef de Mission [Administration] of the Australian Paralympic Team in Sydney 2000 and maintains a healthy relationship with Australian and British sport. Dr Gilbert was an IOC research scholarship winner. He was awarded an Australian Prime Ministers medal for his work at the Sydney 2000 Games and he has worked closely with the USOC in London 2012 and also in Vancouver for the 2010 Winter Olympics.

MARIYA GORYACHKO, PhD

Moscow State University (RUS)

mgoryachko@yandex.ru

Mariya Goryachohko is an Associate Professor of Geography at Moscow State University. She was the project manager of the OGI study for Sochi 2014. Her research interests include: investment processes, regional policy, major investment projects, and the impact of investment on regional development. She has recently worked on and directed projects exploring the sustainable development of the Olympic Sochi and the legacy of the World Cup in Russia.

SVETLANA GURIEVA, Head of Monitoring of Sochi Games Preparations Department

Russian Olympic Committee (RUS)

rg2014.okr@mail.ru

Svetlana Gurieva has worked in sport for more than 55 years and has made an enormous contribution to creation of a stable and comfortable environment for those athletes who seek highest results and achievements in Winter Olympic Games. Gurieva wrote the "Concept of Krasnaya Polyana mountain resort development". As the Sochi 2014 Bid Committee Sports Venues Director, Gurieva took part in the formation of the bid book focusing on the disposal of the Olympic Venues. During Sochi 2014 Olympic Games, she worked in the Main Operational Center and contributed to the staging of the Games. Currently, Gurieva heads the Department aimed at further monitoring and study of the Olympic Games Impact and the sustainability of the achievements in place.

DAVID HOWE, PhD

Centre for Olympic Studies and Research, Loughborough University (UK)

p.d.howe@lboro.ac.uk

David Howe is a Senior Lecturer in the Anthropology of Sport in the School of Sport, Exercise and Health Sciences at Loughborough University. Howe was a former Paralympian and is an advocate for social justice through sport. He is currently also the vice president of the International Federation of Adapted Physical Activity (IFAPA) and is a leading figure in

socio-cultural analysis of Paralympic sport. Howe holds a visiting professorship at Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, Belgium and an adjunct Professorship at Queen's University, Canada. Trained as a medical anthropologist, he is author of *Sport, Professionalism and Pain: Ethnographies of Injury and Risk* (Routledge, 2004) and *The Cultural Politics of the Paralympic Movement: Through the Anthropological Lens* (Routledge, 2008).

BYUNGNAM LEE, Director of General Games Planning and Coordination
2018 PyeongChang Olympic and Paralympic Games Organizing Committee (KOR)
leebn@pyeongchang2018.com

Byungnam Lee is Director General of Planning and Coordination Office in the PyeongChang Organizing Committee for the 2018 Olympic and Paralympic Winter Games and oversees legacy, sustainability, education, legal, planning and coordination, operational readiness, test event management, and accessibility. He is currently a government official seconded from the Ministry of Security and Public Administration. During the bid stage, he worked as Director General of Evaluation Preparation at the PyeongChang Bid Committee for the 2018 Olympic and Paralympic Winter Games.

DAVID LEGG, PhD
Mont Royal University (CAN)
DLegg@mtroyal.ca

David Legg is a professor at Mount Royal University where he has taught since 1998. He has also been a visiting scholar at Dalhousie University (Canada), Deakin University (Australia), Leuven University (Belgium), Adjunct Faculty at Memorial (Canada) and a Research Fellow at Northeastern University (USA). As a volunteer, Legg served for 12 years as a board member for the Canadian Paralympic Committee including the role of President from 2010-2013. David has also served as a board member of the Toronto 2015 Pan Parapan American Games and is currently a Leadership team member for Canadian Sport for Life. Among his many sports and academic honours, Legg was named to Calgary's Top 40 Under 40 in 2003. In 2011, he received both the Gary McPherson award from the Province of Alberta and the King Clancy Award from the Canadian Foundation for Physically Disabled Persons and, in 2012, the Queen Elizabeth Diamond Jubilee Medal.

LAURA MISENER, PhD
Mont Royal University (CAN)
laura.misener@uwo.ca

Laura Misener is an Assistant Professor in the School of Kinesiology at Western University in Canada. Her research focuses on how sport and events can be used as instruments of social change. Her work critically examines numerous ways that sport events have been purported to positively influence community development, social infrastructure, social inclusion and healthy lifestyles of community members. Misener's current research programme is focusing on the role of sport events for persons with disabilities in enhancing community accessibility, influencing attitudes and perceptions of disability and increasing opportunities and access for participation in sport and physical activity.

SHINJI NAKAMAE, Director Paralympic Games Planning
Tokyo 2020 (JPN)
shinji.nakamae@tokyo2020.jp

Shinji Nakamae has been Manager of Performance Development Support Section, Japanese Paralympic Committee (May 2007–March 2014). He was also the Deputy Director, Tokyo 2009 Asian Youth Para Games Organizing Committee (2008-2009) and the Manager of International Liaison of FESPIC Federation Secretariat (1999-2006).

CAITLIN PENTIFALLO, PhD Candidate
The University of British Columbia (CAN)
caitlin@halcyonsportevent.com

Caitlin is currently a PhD Candidate at the University of British Columbia studying the sociology of sport mega-events. Her dissertation investigates urban development projects in sport mega-event host cities, primarily focused on the evaluation of the 2010 Winter Olympic Games. Pentifallo's research is largely based around negotiations surrounding the Vancouver Olympic Athletes' Village and the delivery of social housing units, as well as efforts to organize a socially inclusive event. As a member of the OGI-UBC Research Team assembled to conduct the Olympic Games Impact study of Vancouver 2010, Pentifallo has also holds research interests in the efficacy of indicator-based impact assessment, legacy design and implementation, and the assessment of government leveraging initiatives. She is the principal and founder of Halcyon International Sport Event Consulting, a boutique consulting firm specializing in the research needs of bid and organizing committees, host cities, and international governing bodies (halcyonsportevent.com).

APOSTOLOS RIGAS, Head of Knowledge Management
International Paralympic Committee (GER)
apostolos.rigas@paralympic.org

Apostolos Rigas is acknowledged as one of world's foremost experts on Paralympic Games management. After a successful career as a coach for athletes with a disability at the national level, he worked as the Athlete Classification Manager at Sydney 2000 Paralympic Games and

as the Manager for Paralympic Games Planning at Athens 2004 Paralympic Games. Since 2005 he has worked with the international Paralympic Committee (IPC). Today, he is the Head of knowledge Management for the IPC, responsible among others to supervise all elements of Paralympic Games organization guidelines and requirements, Paralympic Games organization transfer of knowledge, Paralympic Games impact, IPC's work in the critical area of accessibility, several functional areas and Games-time operations etc. Rigas has led the development of IPC's strategy on Paralympic Games Legacy and is also coordinating the IPC Accessibility Working Group, which has developed, among others, the IPC Accessibility Guide. He has studied Adapted Physical Activity at the University of Athens and holds a Masters' Degree in Sports Management from the UTS University of Sydney. He has been awarded as "Sports Manager of the Year 2006" by the Hellenic Society of Sports Management.

JOCELIN SEBASTIANI, OGI Project Officer

International Olympic Committee (CHE)

jocelin.sebastiani@olympic.org

Jocelin Sébastiani works at the IOC where he has been an OGI project officer responsible for developing and updating the OGI study Technical Manual. He currently serves as the Manager of Research and Reference Services at the Olympic Studies Centre in Lausanne.

NINA SHOLOKHOVA, Senior Project Manager of Monitoring of Sochi Games

Sochi Games Preparation Department (RUS)

rg2014.okr@mail.ru

Nina Sholokhova started her career in the field of the Olympic movement in 1999 and was actively involved in the concept of Krasnaya Polyana development as an all-year-round modern mountain resort, being herself an active explorer and pathfinder of the territory. Sholokhova was part of the preparation and arrangement of Sochi 2014 bid team starting from year 2005 and worked on developing the bid book. As part of the working group "Sochi 2014" of the Russian Olympic Committee, she worked on preparations of the Sochi Olympic Games, interacting and cooperating with national Winter Sports Federations directly, as well as OCOG Sochi 2014 and State Corporation "Olympstroy."

ROBERT SPARKS, PhD

Centre for Sport and Sustainability, The University of British Columbia (CAN)

robert.sparks@ubc.ca

Robert Sparks is Professor and Director of the School of Kinesiology at the University of British Columbia. He received his Ph.D. and M.S. in Sport Studies from the University of Massachusetts in Amherst, and a B.A. in French from Wesleyan University in Connecticut. His research over the last 18 years has been focused on sport marketing, mass communication, policy analysis and public health. He is the Director of the UBC Centre for Sport and Sustainability, and has taught courses on sport sponsorship and communication, consumer culture, body politics, and ethics. Sparks helped negotiate the terms of the UBC-VANOC Olympic Games Impact (OGI) research agreement on behalf of UBC. He was the UBC

administrator responsible for the OGI project, and also served as a member of the advisory team that provided project oversight.

KENSUKE YOKOTA, Manager of Games Planning Team

Tokyo 2020 (JPN)

kensuke.yokota@tokyo2020.jp

Kensuke Yokota has been the Manager of Measures and Policy Promotion for persons with an impairment for the Bureau of Social Welfare and Public Health, Tokyo Metropolitan Government (2010-March 2014).

ERI YOSHIDA, Manager of Games Services Planning

Tokyo 2020 (JPN)

eri.yoshida@tokyo2020.jp

Eri Yoshida has been the Manager of Games Planning and Coordination Section, Bureau of Tokyo 2020 Olympic and Paralympic Games Preparation, Tokyo Metropolitan Government (2011-March 2014).

ABBREVIATIONS:

UBC CSS The University of British Columbia Centre for Sport and Sustainability

OGI/PGI Olympic and Paralympic Games Impact study

IOC International Olympic Committee

IPC International Paralympic Committee

NGO Non-Governmental Organisation

OCOG Organising Committees for the Olympic Games

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION:

The following are links provided to reports (OGI/PGI and other) and datasets pertaining to Paralympic Legacies and Impacts arranged by Paralympiad.

I. Beijing 2008:

2008 Paralympic Survey Instruments

<http://css.ubc.ca/projects/2008-paralympic-survey-instruments/>

II. Vancouver 2010:

Olympic Games Impact (OGI) Study for the 2010 Olympic and Paralympic Winter Game: including Baseline Report, Pre-Games Technical Report, Pre-Games Results Report, Games-Time Report, and Post-Games Report

<http://css.ubc.ca/projects/olympic-games-impact-study/ogi-reports/>

III. London 2012:

London 2012: A legacy plan for disabled people

<http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20130812104657/http://odi.dwp.gov.uk/docs/wor/leg/legacy-full.pdf>

Inspired by 2012: The legacy from the London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games

https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/224148/2901179_OlympicLegacy_acc.pdf

FURTHER READINGS:

The following is a partial list of readings pertaining to some of the issues discussed at the Forum. Though not exhaustive, it is intended to highlight the academic research that has been conducted around the theme and as a starting point for future conversations on the topic of Paralympic impacts and legacies.

IV. Paralympic Studies (General):

Bailey, S. (2008). *Athlete first: A history of the Paralympic Movement*. John Wiley & Sons.

Brittain, I. (2009). *The Paralympic Games explained*. Routledge.

Howe, D. (2008). *The cultural politics of the Paralympic Movement*. London: Routledge.

Legg, D. & Gilbert, K. (Eds.). (2011). *Paralympic Legacies*. Common Ground, Champaign, IL.

V. Paralympic Impacts and Legacies:

a. Frameworks for evaluating Paralympic legacies

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

Misener, L. (2013). A Media Frames Analysis of the Legacy Discourse for the 2010 Winter Paralympic Games. *Communication & Sport, 1*(4), 342-364.

Misener, L., Darcy, S., Legg, D., & Gilbert, K. (2013). Beyond Olympic legacy: Understanding Paralympic legacy through a thematic analysis. *Journal of Sport Management, 27*(4), 329-341.

b. Social legacies

Ahmed, N. (2013). Paralympics 2012 legacy: accessible housing and disability equality or inequality?. *Disability & Society, 28*(1), 129-133.

Darcy, I., Dickson, T. J., & Benson, A. M. (2014). London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games: Including Volunteers with Disabilities—A Podium Performance?. *Event Management, 18*(4), 431-446.

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

Misener, L. (2015). Leveraging parasport events for community participation: development of a theoretical framework. *European Sport Management Quarterly, 15*(5), 132-153.

Weed, M., & Dowse, S. (2009). A missed opportunity waiting to happen? The social legacy potential of the London 2012 Paralympic Games. *Journal of Policy Research in Tourism, Leisure and Events, 1*(2), 170-174.

VI. Media discourses and Paralympic Sport

Bush, A., Silk, M., Porter, J., & Howe, P. D. (2013). Disability [sport] and discourse: stories within the Paralympic legacy. *Reflective Practice, 14*(5), 632-647.

DePauw, K. P. (1997). The (1n) Visibility of DisAbility: Cultural Contexts and "Sporting Bodies". *Quest, 49*(4), 416-430.

Howe, P. D. (2008). From Inside the Newsroom Paralympic Media and the Production'of Elite Disability. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport, 43*(2), 135-150.

Howe, P. D. (2011). Cyborg and supercrip: The Paralympics technology and the (dis) empowerment of disabled athletes. *Sociology, 45*(5), 868-882.

Pappous, A., Marcellini, A., & de Léséleuc, E. (2011). From Sydney to Beijing: the evolution of the photographic coverage of Paralympic Games in five European countries. *Sport in Society, 14*(03), 345-354.

Purdue, D. E. J., & Howe, P. D. (2012). See the sport, not the disability: exploring the Paralympic paradox. *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health, 4*(2), 189-205.

Schell, B. L. A., & Rodriguez, S. (2001). Subverting bodies/ambivalent representations: media analysis of Paralympian, Hope Lewellen. *Sociology of Sport Journal, 18*(1), 127-135.

Silva, C. F., & Howe, P. D. (2012). The (in) validity of supercrip representation of Paralympian athletes. *Journal of Sport & Social Issues, 36*(2), 174-194.

Thomas, N., & Smith, A. (2003). Preoccupied with able-bodiedness? An analysis of the British media coverage of the 2000 Paralympic Games. *Adapted Physical Activity Quarterly, 20*(2), 166-181.

VII. Empowerment and the Paralympic Games

Gilbert, K., & Schantz, O. J. (Eds.). (2009). *The Paralympic Games: Empowerment or sideshow?* (Vol. 1). Meyer & Meyer Verlag.

Howe, P. D., & Jones, C. (2006). Classification of disabled athletes:(dis) empowering the paralympic practice community. *Sociology of Sport Journal*,23(1), 29.

Howe, P. D. (2011). Cyborg and supercrip: The Paralympics technology and the (dis) empowerment of disabled athletes. *Sociology*, 45(5), 868-882.

Peers, D. (2009). (Dis) empowering Paralympic histories: absent athletes and disabling discourses. *Disability & society*, 24(5), 653-665.

Purdue, D. E., & Howe, P. D. (2012). Empower, inspire, achieve:(dis) empowerment and the Paralympic Games. *Disability & Society*, 27(7), 903-916.

VIII. Disability rights, disability advocacy and the Paralympic Movement

Bundon, A., & Clarke, L. H. (2014). Honey or Vinegar? Athletes With Disabilities Discuss Strategies for Advocacy Within the Paralympic Movement. *Journal of Sport & Social Issues*, 0193723514557823.

Blauwet, C., & Willick, S. E. (2012). The Paralympic Movement: using sports to promote health, disability rights, and social integration for athletes with disabilities. *PM&R*, 4(11), 851-856

Braye, S., Dixon, K., & Gibbons, T. (2013). 'A mockery of equality': an exploratory investigation into disabled activists' views of the Paralympic Games. *Disability & Society*, 28(7), 984-996.

Braye, S., Gibbons, T., & Dixon, K. (2013). Disability'Rights' or'Wrongs'? The Claims of the International Paralympic Committee, the London 2012 Paralympics and Disability Rights in the UK. *Sociological Research Online*, 18(3), 16.

Burkett, B., McNamee, M., & Potthast, W. (2011). Shifting boundaries in sports technology and disability: equal rights or unfair advantage in the case of Oscar Pistorius?. *Disability & Society*, 26(5), 643-654.

Darcy, S. (2003). The politics of disability and access: the Sydney 2000 Games experience. *Disability & Society*, 18(6), 737-757.

IX. Inclusion, exclusion, integration and segregation of athletes with disabilities

Howe, P. D. (2007). Integration of Paralympic athletes into athletics Canada. *International Journal of Canadian Studies/Revue internationale d'études canadiennes*, (35), 133-150.

Hums, M. A., Moorman, A. M., & Wolff, E. A. (2003). The Inclusion of the Paralympics in the Olympic and Amateur Sports Act Legal and Policy Implications for Integration of Athletes with Disabilities into the United States Olympic Committee and National Governing Bodies. *Journal of Sport & Social Issues*, 27(3), 261-275.

Legg, D., Fay, T., Hums, M. A., & Wolff, E. (2009). Examining the inclusion of wheelchair exhibition events within the Olympic Games 1984–2004. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 9(3), 243-258.

Misener, L., & Darcy, S. (2014). Managing disability sport: From athletes with disabilities to inclusive organisational perspectives. *Sport Management Review*, 17(1), 1-7.

Spencer-Cavaliere, N., & Peers, D. (2011). "What's the Difference?" Women's Wheelchair Basketball, Reverse Integration, and the Question (ing) of Disability. *Adapted Physical Activity Quarterly*, 28(4), 291-309.

Wolbring, G., Legg, D., & Stahnisch, F. W. (2010). Meaning of Inclusion throughout the History of the Paralympic Games and Movement. *The International Journal of Sport & Society*, 1(3), 81-93.