

**SCRUTINIZING GLOBAL MEGA-EVENTS**  
Chapter 9 in **DOING GLOBAL URBAN RESEARCH** (edited by John Harrison, Michael  
Hoyler)

AUTHORS' COPY

*Christopher Gaffney*  
[cg151@nyu.edu](mailto:cg151@nyu.edu)

*Sven Daniel Wolfe\**  
[daniel.wolfe@geo.uzh.ch](mailto:daniel.wolfe@geo.uzh.ch)

*Martin Müller\*+*  
[martin@martin-muller.net](mailto:martin@martin-muller.net)  
[www.martin-muller.net](http://www.martin-muller.net)

Cite as: Gaffney, Christopher, Sven Daniel Wolfe, and Martin Müller. "Scrutinizing Global Mega-Events." In *Doing Global Urban Research*, edited by John Harrison and Michael Hoyler. SAGE, 2018.

# 9

## SCRUTINIZING GLOBAL MEGA-EVENTS

Christopher Gaffney, Sven Daniel  
Wolfe and Martin Müller

### Why do research on global mega-events?

Over the past 20 years, mega-events – such as the Olympic Games or the football World Cup – have become a global urban force. For many cities, hosting a mega-event propels historically large interventions in urban development, remodelling both urban politics and the built environment in the course of a few years. The Olympic Games and the football World Cup have, in this sense, become urban events more than sporting events.

The capital cost of material interventions into the city – upgrading or building new sports venues, roads, railway lines, airports, communication centres, security systems, and hotels – is now several times the operational cost of putting on the event itself. The Russian city of Sochi spent more than USD 50 billion on infrastructure in preparation for the 2014 Winter Games, compared to less than USD 5 billion of operational expenses (Müller, 2014). Some scholars see the degree of urban transformation as one of the key distinctions between events and mega-events. Hiller (2000: 183), for example, suggests that a mega-event significantly alters the urban fabric and reprioritizes the urban agenda.

It is no exaggeration to claim that, over the past two decades, the urban impacts of mega-events have become global. Whereas cities in North America, Western Europe, and Japan were the traditional hosts of mega-events in the

twentieth century, Russia, China, Brazil, and South Africa have not just joined their ranks but become dominant players: in the years between 2013 and 2022, Japan is the only host of the Olympics or the World Cup that is not an emerging economy. The period between 1992 and 2022 has seen or will see the first Olympic Games or football World Cup ever in Africa (football World Cup 2010) and the Middle East (Football World Cup 2022), and the first Olympic Games in South America (Rio de Janeiro 2016).

That mega-events can serve as showcases of and catalysts for larger dynamics in urban development makes them relevant as a research topic. Mega-events introduce idiosyncratic urban development dynamics and rationales into specific cities, creating stark differences between event-driven and quotidian political economies. The same event may serve very different purposes in urban development in different areas of a given city or for different governmental agendas. While London may have harnessed the Olympics for urban redevelopment, the Olympic Games in Sochi served to lubricate a neopatrimonial political system (Müller, 2014) and Rio opened up spaces for development through public–private partnerships and accumulation by dispossession (Freeman, 2014).

Constituted through global networks and institutional relations, mega-events also epitomize the multiple mobilities at the heart of global urban research. Olympics, World Cups, World's Fairs, and other, smaller events both create and are captured by a vortex of global flows of capital, knowledge, policies, symbols, images, and people (Cook and Ward, 2011; Salazar et al., 2017). As such, they lend themselves to comparative research designs that explore the effects of the same intervention in different locations and trace the flows that bind, at first glance rather different, cities – Sochi and Pyeongchang, Rio and Tokyo – into common global circuits.

## Challenges of researching global mega-events

Mega-events are a global phenomenon in multiple aspects: these large-scale, temporary spectacles travel to new locations around the world and feature international participants, but they are also broadcast to a global audience and each event is produced by a globalized network of actors – sponsors, construction companies, consultants, media companies, public relations firms, architects, banks, and so on. This fluid network is multi-local and temporary, dissolving once the mega-event is concluded and then reconstituting itself in new environments. A global urban researcher focusing on mega-events faces the challenge of making sense of the varying temporalities, spatialities, and articulations of this dynamic network.

Take, for example, the football World Cup: this mega-event is owned by the Fédération Internationale de Football Association (FIFA), a multinational association with 211 member nations, headquartered in Zürich, Switzerland. Nations that are interested in hosting a World Cup will create

bidding committees to prepare and submit proposals for hosting. These committees typically involve members of the nation's governmental, sporting, and business elites, but also hire the expertise of international consultants and marketing firms who specialize in attracting mega-events (Hall, 2006).

Once FIFA grants the right to host a World Cup, the new host nation forms a national organizing committee, often composed of members from the bidding committee but also involving other actors, from both public and private entities (Andranovich et al., 2001). Since World Cup games are played in numerous venues around the host nation, the national organizing committee creates local organizing committees for each host city. Aside from governmental connections at the federal level, each host city is tied into a network of regional, national, and international construction companies, architects and planners, equipment suppliers, energy concerns, technology specialists, security firms, corporate sponsors, and consultants. This network begins the process of preparing the nation to host, launching infrastructure construction and rehabilitation projects and spearheading public relations initiatives.

These developments generate interest both locally and internationally, and are covered by an extensive media network that both reflects and shapes public attitudes. As the opening date approaches, media coverage increases in intensity until the games begin in earnest, at which point billions of people around the world tune in (Solberg and Gratton, 2014). Media is always present in global sport, but during mega-events the media concentration directs the world's attention to make the host city into a stage and the sporting event into global spectacle. Alongside traditional media coverage, social media and the internet represent another point of insertion into a global network, as individuals, organizers, and advertisers make use of new technologies to leverage the global attention paid to the World Cup (Karg and Lock, 2014).

After the closing ceremony, the international spotlight dims as the translocal, multi-scalar assemblage that imagined, produced, sold, and consumed the spectacle enters into a period of deconstructing: fans switch off the television, internet groups go dormant, organizing committees dissolve, companies are disbanded, and sometimes workers join other mega-events as part of the international circuit of travelling consultants and policy experts (Prince, 2012; Wood, 2015). Meanwhile, preparations for the next World Cup are already under way; organizing committee members from future hosts observe the production and operational processes of previous World Cups. Though differing in the organizational details and urban footprint (number of venues and cities, for example, or length of the event), most mega-events follow similar patterns of development, incrementally building complex networks that are both translocal and temporary.

Mega-events do not just result from the emergence of global networks; they also draw the attention of an international network of researchers, each focusing on a particular aspect of the preparations, event dynamics, or impacts. Broadly speaking, these scholars have isolated and analysed a portion of the

mega-event totality, discussing potential economic effects (Abelson, 2011; Baade and Matheson, 2004), environmental consequences (Karamichas, 2013), rationales behind bidding and hosting (Cornelissen, 2010; Wolfe, 2016), or the varying reactions of host populations, from nationalism to popular support to resistance and opposition (Hiller and Wanner, 2015). Other literature focuses more specifically on the built environment, for example on issues of urban regeneration (Coaffee, 2011; Smith, 2014), housing and gentrification (Blunden, 2012), the securitization of space (Bennett and Haggerty, 2011; Fussey et al., 2011), and white elephant infrastructure (Horne and Whannel, 2016: 42–47).

While the literature on mega-events is plentiful, it is dominated by case studies of individual events, and there is a need for more longitudinal and comparative research. This focus on case studies is partly due to the temporal and logistical challenges inherent in mega-events, where events might take place far from researchers' institutional bases, and where reliable information may be scarce, closely guarded, or only available in the host country's language(s). There are, however, some examples of comparative research between different host cities of one mega-event (Essex and Chalkley, 2004), a focus on a single city undergoing change from a series of different mega-events (Castro et al., 2015), and examinations of failed mega-event bidding across different cities (Lauermann, 2014a, Chapter 8). At the same time, the majority of mega-events literature – even the comparative research – tends to focus on the urban nodes of a global network while ignoring the flows and circulations between them.

## Techniques for researching global mega-events

The techniques typically required for conducting mega-events research depend on which aspects of mega-events will be examined, as shown in Table 9.1. These aspects often overlap and multiple techniques can be employed in order to present a more robust picture.

Archival research is the backbone of studies that cover multiple iterations of the same event, such as a long-term analysis of Olympic urban development (Gold and Gold, 2011) or a detailed tracing of Olympic cost overruns (Flyvbjerg and Stewart, 2012; Zimbalist, 2015). Some researchers have used official archives, such as those at the Olympic Studies Centre in Lausanne (Lauermann, 2014b; Mascarenhas, 2013), but it is not necessary to have access to internal documents in order to pursue archival research. Many government documents and records are available online and bid committees sometimes make their urbanization plans and provisional budgets available. Archival research can also be used to trace the development of event coalitions or the history of event models, and it can provide researchers with material for discourse or statistical analysis.

Scholars employ statistical analysis in mega-events research to evaluate large volumes of data. It has been used to examine popular perception of

**Table 9.1** Techniques and possible materials for researching mega-events

<b>Research technique</b>	<b>Aspects of mega-events</b>	<b>Possible materials</b>
Archival research	Urban development, planning methodologies, historical approaches	Planning documents, internal reports, media coverage
Statistical analysis	Population attitudes, image politics, economic impact assessments	Official statistics, opinion polls, surveys and other quantitative data
Grounded fieldwork	Urban development, identity questions, planning methodologies	Host cities, stadiums, airports, hotels, roads, construction sites, maps, blueprints
Interviews	Population attitudes, rationalities for hosting, planning methodologies	Event staff, government officials, planners, volunteers, residents, spectators, consultants
Discourse analysis	Image politics, geopolitics, identity questions, nation-building, rationalities for hosting	Bid documents, image brochures, media reports, press releases, ceremonies, websites
Participant observation	Urban development, planning methodologies, rationalities for hosting	Organizing committees, affiliated companies, host cities, volunteers

events among host populations (Zhou and Ap, 2009), to make sense of media reports collected via automated internet searches (Preuss and Alfs, 2011), and to measure the economic impact of hosting (Baade and Matheson, 2004). Analyses can be performed on primary data collected by the researcher, or they can be based on secondary data from governmental sources or polling firms. Statistical analysis can give weight to an argument that might otherwise be overly reliant on qualitative data and may allow the researcher to generalize trends and findings.

Ethnographic techniques are invaluable when conducting mega-event field research. Through fieldwork, (participant) observation, photography, recordings, field notes, interviews, and activist scholarship, researchers can achieve depth and nuance in their work, grounding the mega-event in local experience. Ethnographic research has been used to document protest against mega-events, from London (Giulianotti et al., 2015) and Poznań (Buchowski and Kowalska, 2015), and to illuminate the plight of homeless youth during the 2010 Vancouver Olympics (Kennelly, 2015). By embedding themselves in the host cities, researchers can provide a perspective grounded in lived experience. Scholars have used this perspective to answer questions of legacy on the local population after the mega-event is concluded (Waardenburg et al., 2015), and to explore the implications of hosting on the city's homeless youth (Kennelly and Watt, 2011).

Interviews provide depth and texture to mega-event research, bringing the human element squarely into focus. Scholars can make use of structured or

semi-structured interviews, as well as informal conversations; transcribed or recorded, they can quote interview participants directly in their work or analyse interviews cumulatively to better communicate the lived experience of mega-events. In his examination of gentrification and the London 2012 Olympics, Watt (2013) includes interviews with residents of council housing, highlighting the human cost of mega-event ambition. Boykoff (2014) makes use of interviews with activists in order to explore dissent at the Olympics, and Alegi (2007) draws on interviews to understand the policy decisions behind Cape Town's controversial Green Point stadium. Other analyses use interviews to grasp the implications of creating securitized spaces through mega-events (Taylor and Toohey, 2011), and to unpack some of the rationales behind hosting the event (Bolsmann and Brewster, 2009).

Finally, mega-events are enmeshed in geopolitics, used by nations as a platform to convey messages and project power at multiple scales to different audiences. Researchers who wish to unpack this aspect of mega-events may find it useful to employ the tools of discourse analysis. Discourse analysis, used broadly here, is a range of techniques that can unpack texts, speech, maps, pictures, and other media (Caldas-Coulthard and Coulthard, 1996). As applied to mega-events, discourse analysis has been used to make sense of the development ideologies behind hosting the Olympics (Darnell, 2012), and to explore the nuances of national image creation through hosting (Alekseyeva, 2014). It can shine light on the symbolism in Olympic opening and closing ceremonies (Puijk, 1999; Qing et al., 2010), and has been used to problematize the Olympic torch relay (McGillivray and Frew, 2013) and to question organizers' discursive frameworks of environmental sustainability and legacy (Gaffney, 2013).

### Case study: Brazil and Rio de Janeiro, 2003–16 (Christopher Gaffney)

In 2003, I was doing my dissertation fieldwork on the geography of football stadiums in Rio de Janeiro when the city was contracted to host the 2007 Pan American Games (Gaffney, 2008). Since that time, Rio has gone through the most extensive cycle of event hosting in the twenty-first century: 2007 Pan American Games, 2011 World Military Games, 2012 Rio+20 UN Conference on the Environment, 2013 Confederations Cup, 2013 World Youth Day, 2014 World Cup, and 2016 Summer Olympics. In addition to these events in Rio, the 2014 World Cup was realized in twelve cities across Brazil, each with localized processes and impacts (Santos Júnior et al., 2015). While these events were taking place in Brazil, the 2010 World Cup in South Africa and 2012 London Olympics were closely watched by Brazilians as models to follow (or not), allowing

for comparative studies that increased the complexity and texture of research in the local context.

The most important first step that I took in preparing my initial research agenda was to contextualize the arrival of the contemporary wave of events in Brazil with previous events (Gaffney, 2010). In successive eras of accelerated globalization, Brazil had always sought to modify its infrastructure and image by hosting events that would push urban development agendas. For the 1922 centennial, for example, Rio de Janeiro demolished *favelas* and the hills on which they stood in the centre of town and built expansive, temporary structures to showcase Brazilian industry, agriculture, and the natural beauty of its then-capital city. In the aftermath of World War II, Brazil hosted the 1950 World Cup, building stadiums on a massive scale that were showcases for its cutting-edge architects, engineers, and designers. In the early twenty-first century, Brazil's economic and political fortunes were rising and they again sought to use the platform of mega-events to transform cities and to transmit political and governmental ideologies. Mega-events – although they may appear singular and exceptional – always need to be situated within larger historical, political, and economic contexts before setting out on an investigative path.

The second element of my research agenda was to reach out to local academics working on similar topics but from different disciplinary perspectives. Colleagues introduced me to sociologists, urban planners, architects, economists, and politicians who had an interest in collaborating on a large project. Through these connections, I worked with a team to develop a collaborative research project on the urban impacts of the 2014 World Cup that had nine research teams around Brazil. As a national co-coordinator of this project, I helped to set the agenda for research, communicated frequently with researchers around Brazil, and was able to make on-site visits to nearly all of the World Cup host cities. While there were inevitably some frustrations with the process of managing such a large, longitudinal, and diverse project, the learning experience was as important for me personally as the academic output. I had a ringside seat to the processes, problems, and possibilities of conducting mega-event research on a national scale. In this sense, I built a network of scholars to grapple with the network of the event, as outlined above.

My research was facilitated by the fact that I lived in the city I was researching and spoke fluent Portuguese; thus, every time I stepped out the door, I was engaging in fieldwork. I was teaching about the process of mega-event hosting and the historical context of the city and was able

(Continued)

to gather more information than I could possibly process on a daily basis. In addition to my role as an academic, I was a member of the foreign media and contributed my research to the burgeoning social movements that were resisting the implementation of mega-event governance paradigms and urbanization projects. This triple role as academic, journalist, and activist would make many researchers uncomfortable, but I found that it gave me a unique perspective on the various levels at which the event operates. For instance, my strong media presence forced the event organizers to pay attention to me in ways that they would not have had I only been writing academic articles. As a result, I was invited to 'exclusive' sports management conferences where I could talk face to face with event rights holders and their so-called stakeholders. On the other hand, I was on the streets holding protest banners and running from the tear gas and rubber bullets of Rio's notoriously violent military police. I maintained a blog for many years and became a conduit for translating what was happening on the ground, in the halls of power, and in the Brazilian media for foreign and Brazilian audiences.

This seemingly complex mix of research, media exposure, popular writing, and activism was inevitably influenced by my evolving knowledge of the urban transformations taking place in Rio. While I had started with a narrow range of focus, as I learned more about the city and event dynamics I began expanding my geographic and conceptual ranges. Of course, my disciplinary training as a geographer had encouraged a holistic view of my object of study, but as I learned more about the specificities of Rio's and Brazil's urban political economy, urban planning regimes, political machinations, and social struggles, I began to connect those in ever more complex and specific ways to my research. Eventually, I wrote academic articles on public security, gentrification, transportation, stadiums and sports venues, the political economy of Brazilian football, urban social movements, smart city technology, and corrupt practices in event organizing. I used a melange of all of the techniques we have enumerated above, choosing investigative implements from this toolbox as they suited the object of study. I had not set out to write about more than one or two of these elements, but as the events emerged on the urban landscape and I connected with an increasingly diverse and geographically diffuse public, my research interests shifted accordingly.

It is impossible for one person to have a totalizing conception of a mega-event, and this is perhaps what makes it such an attractive, elusive, and difficult research area. Gaining the kind of access that I had to documents, public meetings, rights holders, and the media, while being a part of social movements contesting the mega-events was uncommon, infusing my academic work with a texture, nuance, and intensity that may only be possible while living within the context of the event.

Much of the English-language literature that emerged out of the London 2012 Olympics was similarly situated, though perhaps less engaged with public pronouncements against the conjuncture of the events themselves. The close engagement with the local conditions is not, of course, a necessity for understanding and researching urban dynamics but we should always keep in mind the geographic and social positions from which we conduct, read, and communicate scholarship.

The academic consensus is that global mega-events are causing more harm than good, yet there seems to be very little public interest in halting the march of the white elephants across globalized and globalizing urban landscapes. Part of the problem lies in translating academic research to the broader public that consumes these events and in communicating directly with mega-event rights holders and local event coalitions that determine the urban futures of their host cities and countries. The role of researchers in the mega-event complex is under-theorized yet it is clear that many academics make their living on and off the mega-event industry as much as consultants, sports professionals, and stadium construction firms. Researchers have a role in shaping debates, public perception, and public policy – it is essential that we recognize this role and use it to minimize the damage that the current model of planning and execution of mega-events invariably brings.

The Brazilian experience of hosting mega-events was defined by massive public protest, endemic corruption, waste, incomplete, unnecessary, or ill-considered infrastructure, and some of the most exhilarating mega-parties on the planet. This 13-year cycle of hosting also brought unprecedented academic attention to the global phenomenon of mega-events – the Brazilian World Cup and Olympics produced record amounts of research, media reports, and documentation. As the dust settles after the 2016 Olympics and the global spotlight moves on, it will be important to maintain a focus on the long-term impacts of the events on Brazil and Rio de Janeiro. The forms that this research takes will be conditioned by the shifting dynamics on the ground but also by the interest of mega-event researchers in working outside the imminent epistemology of the event cycle.

## Reflections on conducting global mega-events research

Mega-events are an attractive access point to doing global urban research: they manifest the global in one location, leaving traces of that interaction on the urban landscape and in the collective consciousness of hundreds of millions of people. In mega-events, the global is not just something that is abstract, floating

around somewhere. It comes together in a city and it causes very visual, material changes: the swanky stadium by Calatrava; the new high rises, financed with pension funds, that replace old tenements; global migrants and local hipsters that drive gentrification (see also Shin, Chapter 10). In emerging economies, the mega-event is a mechanism for an accelerated insertion into the global, with the often-overplayed desire to join the club of rich countries and enjoy the recognition that comes with this.

But it would be misguided to conceive mega-events solely as global neoliberal steamrollers that flatten whichever city dares to host them. To really understand mega-events, one needs to see and research them as global phenomena, emerging from a web of relations, with very specific local articulations. As a consequence, one also needs to question any division between the global and the local. For while the Olympic Games may come with a standardized format that imposes similar requirements on hosts around the world, the social, political, and material outcomes of Beijing 2008, London 2012, and Rio 2016 are strikingly different. These differences result from the constant intermingling of the local and the global – a division erased as global processes become localized and local processes go global.

Recognizing that mega-events are global urban phenomena also means recognizing that they come with many of the same contradictions as globalization. They create winners and losers; they mobilize some things and people and immobilize others; they are vanguards in the global shift towards consumerism; they foster the most unreflexive nationalism while purporting to adhere to universalist ideals. While we can hone our analytical tools for doing global urban research with mega-events, we would do well not to forget that there is also a political side to these events that too often gets lost in the allure of the global spectacle.

---

## References

- Abelson, P. (2011) 'Evaluating major events and avoiding the mercantilist fallacy', *Economic Papers: A Journal of Applied Economics and Policy*, 30(1): 48–59.
- Alegi, P. (2007) 'The political economy of mega-stadiums and the underdevelopment of grassroots football in South Africa', *Politikon*, 34(3): 315–31.
- Alekseyeva, A. (2014) 'Sochi 2014 and the rhetoric of a new Russia: Image construction through mega-events', *East European Politics*, 30(2): 158–74.
- Andranovich, G., Burbank, M.J. and Heying, C.H. (2001) 'Olympic cities: Lessons learned from mega-event politics', *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 23(2): 113–31.
- Baade, R.A. and Matheson, V.A. (2004) 'The quest for the cup: Assessing the economic impact of the World Cup', *Regional Studies*, 38(4): 343–54.
- Bennett, C.J. and Haggerty, K.D. (eds) (2011) *Security Games: Surveillance and Control at Mega-Events*. London: Routledge.

- Blunden, H. (2012) 'The Olympic Games and housing', in H.J. Lenskyj and S. Wagg (eds), *The Palgrave Handbook of Olympic Studies*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 520-32.
- Bolsmann, C. and Brewster, K. (2009) 'Mexico 1968 and South Africa 2010: Development, leadership and legacies', *Sport in Society*, 12(10): 1284-98.
- Boykoff, J. (2014) *Activism and the Olympics: Dissent at the Games in Vancouver and London*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Buchowski, M. and Kowalska, M.Z. (2015) 'Doing ethnography and writing anthropology: A single-site-multiple-ethnography of a protest event against the 2012 UEFA European Championship in Poznań', in B. Alpan, A. Schwell and A. Sonntag (eds), *The European Football Championship: Mega-Event and Vanity Fair*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 150-72.
- Caldas-Coulthard, C.R. and Coulthard, M. (1996) *Texts and Practices: Readings in Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Routledge.
- Castro, D.G., Gaffney, C., Novaes, P.R., Rodrigues, J.M., Santos, C. and Santos Júnior, O. (eds) (2015) *Rio de Janeiro: Os Impactos Da Copa Do Mundo 2014 E Das Olimpíadas 2016*. Rio de Janeiro: Letra Capital.
- Coaffee, J. (2011) 'Urban regeneration and renewal', in J.R. Gold and M.M. Gold (eds), *Olympic Cities: City Agendas, Planning and the World's Games* (2nd edition). London: Routledge, pp. 180-93.
- Cook, I.R. and Ward, K. (2011) 'Trans-national networks of learning, mega-events and policy tourism: The case of Manchester's Commonwealth and Olympic Games projects', *Urban Studies*, 48(12): 2519-35.
- Cornelissen, S. (2010) 'The geopolitics of global aspiration: sport mega-events and emerging powers', *The International Journal of the History of Sport*, 27(16-18): 3008-25.
- Darnell, S.C. (2012) 'Olympism in Action, Olympic hosting and the politics of "Sport for Development and Peace": Investigating the development discourses of Rio 2016', *Sport in Society*, 15(6): 869-87.
- Essex, S. and Chalkley, B. (2004) 'Mega-sporting events in urban and regional policy: A history of the Winter Olympics', *Planning Perspectives*, 19(2): 201-4.
- Flyvbjerg, B. and Stewart, A. (2012) 'Olympic proportions: Cost and cost overrun at the Olympics 1960-2012', *Saïd Business School Working Paper*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2238053>
- Freeman, J. (2014) 'Raising the flag over Rio de Janeiro's favelas: Citizenship and social control in the Olympic city', *Journal of Latin American Geography*, 13(1): 7-38.
- Fussey, P., Coaffee, J., Armstrong, G. and Hobbs, D. (2011) *Securing and Sustaining the Olympic City: Reconfiguring London for 2012 and Beyond*. Farnham: Ashgate.
- Gaffney, C. (2008) *Temples of the Earthbound Gods: Stadiums in the Cultural Landscapes of Rio de Janeiro and Buenos Aires*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

(Continued)

- Gaffney, C. (2010) 'Mega-events and socio-spatial dynamics in Rio de Janeiro, 1919-2016', *Journal of Latin American Geography*, 9(1): 7-29.
- Gaffney, C. (2013) 'Between discourse and reality: The un-sustainability of mega-event planning', *Sustainability*, 5(9): 3926-40.
- Giulianotti, R., Armstrong, G., Hales, G. and Hobbs, D. (2015) 'Sport mega-events and public opposition: A sociological study of the London 2012 Olympics', *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, 39(2): 99-119.
- Gold, J.R. and Gold, M.M. (eds) (2011) *Olympic Cities: City Agendas, Planning and the World's Games* (2nd edition). London: Routledge.
- Hall, C.M. (2006) 'Urban entrepreneurship, corporate interests and sports mega-events: The thin policies of competitiveness within the hard outcomes of neoliberalism', *The Sociological Review*, 54 (Supplement s2): 59-70.
- Hiller, H.H. (2000) 'Toward an urban sociology of mega-events', *Research in Urban Sociology*, 5: 181-205.
- Hiller, H.H. and Wanner, R.A. (2015) 'The psycho-social impact of the Olympics as urban festival: A leisure perspective', *Leisure Studies*, 34(6): 672-88.
- Horne, J. and Whannel, G. (2016) *Understanding the Olympics* (2nd edition). London: Routledge.
- Karamichas, J. (2013) *The Olympic Games and the Environment*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Karg, A. and Lock, D. (2014) 'Using new media to engage consumers at the Football World Cup', in S. Frawley and D. Adair (eds), *Managing the Football World Cup*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan. pp. 25-46.
- Kennelly, J. (2015) "'You're making our city look bad": Olympic security, neoliberal urbanization, and homeless youth', *Ethnography*, 16(1): 3-24.
- Kennelly, J. and Watt, P. (2011) 'Sanitizing public space in Olympic host cities: The spatial experiences of marginalized youth in 2010 Vancouver and 2012 London', *Sociology*, 45(5): 765-81.
- Lauermann, J. (2014a) 'Legacy after the bid? The impact of bidding to host Olympic Games on urban development planning', The Olympic Studies Centre. [https://library.olympic.org/Default/doc/SYRACUSE/32532/legacy-after-the-bid-the-impact-of-bidding-to-host-olympic-games-on-urban-development-planning-john-?\\_lg=en-GB](https://library.olympic.org/Default/doc/SYRACUSE/32532/legacy-after-the-bid-the-impact-of-bidding-to-host-olympic-games-on-urban-development-planning-john-?_lg=en-GB) (accessed 19 September 2017).
- Lauermann, J. (2014b) 'Competition through interurban policy making: Bidding to host megaevents as entrepreneurial networking', *Environment and Planning A*, 46(11): 2638-53.
- Lauermann, J. (2018) 'Evaluating global urban sustainability', in J. Harrison and M. Hoyler (eds), *Doing Global Urban Research*. London: Sage, pp. 110-24.
- Mascarenhas, G. (2013) 'Londres 2012 e Rio de Janeiro 2016: Conceito e realidade na produção da cidade Olímpica', *Revista Continentes*, 2(3): 52-72.
- McGillivray, D. and Frew, M. (2013) 'The Olympic torch relay: Activating citizen-consumer discourses', *Lusophone Journal of Cultural Studies*, 1(2): 214-33.
- Müller, M. (2014) 'After Sochi 2014: Costs and impacts of Russia's Olympic Games', *Eurasian Geography and Economics*, 55(6): 628-55.

- Preuss, H. and Alfs, C. (2011) 'Signaling through the 2008 Beijing Olympics - using mega sport events to change the perception and image of the host', *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 11(1): 55-71.
- Prince, R. (2012) 'Policy transfer, consultants and the geographies of governance', *Progress in Human Geography*, 36(2): 188-203.
- Puijk, R. (1999) 'Producing Norwegian culture for domestic and foreign gazes: The Lillehammer Olympic opening ceremony', in A.M. Klausen (ed.), *Olympic Games as Performance and Public Event: The Case of the XVII Winter Olympic Games in Norway*. New York: Berghahn Books, pp. 97-136.
- Qing, L., Boccia, L.V., Chunmiao, H., Xing, L., Fu, Y. and Kennett, C. (2010) 'Representing the opening ceremony: Comparative content analysis from USA, Brazil, UK and China', *The International Journal of the History of Sport*, 27(9-10): 1591-1633.
- Salazar, N.B., Timmerman, C., Wets, J., Gato, L.G. and Van den Broucke, S. (eds) (2017) *Mega-Event Mobilities: A Critical Analysis*. London: Routledge.
- Santos Júnior, O., Gaffney, C. and Ribeiro, L.C. (eds) (2015) *Brasil: Os Impactos Da Copa Do Mundo 2014 E Das Olimpíadas 2016*. Rio de Janeiro: Letra Capital.
- Shin, H.B. (2018) 'Studying global gentrifications', in J. Harrison and M. Hoyler (eds), *Doing Global Urban Research*. London: Sage, pp. 138-52.
- Smith, A. (2014) "'De-risking" East London: Olympic regeneration planning 2000-2012', *European Planning Studies*, 22(9): 1919-39.
- Solberg, H.A. and Gratton, C. (2014) 'Broadcasting the World Cup', in S. Frawley and D. Adair (eds), *Managing the Football World Cup*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 47-62.
- Taylor, T. and Toohey, K. (2011) 'Ensuring safety at Australian sport event precincts creating securitised, sanitised and stifling spaces?', *Urban Studies*, 48(15): 3259-75.
- Waardenburg, M., van den Bergh, M. and van Eekeren, F. (2015) 'Local meanings of a sport mega-event's legacies: Stories from a South African urban neighbourhood', *South African Review of Sociology*, 46(1): 87-105.
- Watt, P. (2013) "'It's not for us": Regeneration, the 2012 Olympics and the gentrification of East London', *City*, 17(1): 99-118.
- Wolfe, S.D. (2016) 'A silver medal project: The partial success of Russia's soft power in Sochi 2014', *Annals of Leisure Research*, 19(4): 481-96.
- Wood, A. (2015) 'The politics of policy circulation: Unpacking the relationship between South African and South American cities in the adoption of bus rapid transit', *Antipode*, 47(4): 1062-79.
- Zhou, Y. and Ap, J. (2009) 'Residents' perceptions towards the impacts of the Beijing 2008 Olympic Games', *Journal of Travel Research*, 48(1): 78-91.
- Zimbalist, A. (2015) *Circus Maximus: The Economic Gamble behind Hosting the Olympics and the World Cup*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.
-