

Restructuring the olympic legacy

Qiuhan Zhu & JoonYoung Han*

School of Kinesiology, Yeungnam University, South Korea

Abstract

A notable trend regarding the mega-events is that there are an increased number of events hosted in Oriental countries. At the same time, the aspect of Olympic legacy has become a fundamental force and hot topic for every single host city. The purpose of this study is to challenge the original Olympic legacy concept defined by the International Olympic Committee (IOC), which was premised on the Occident value. The IOC considers Olympic legacy to be insufficient. By comparing the Olympic legacy between Orient and Occident, this study discovered that the Orient Olympic legacy is a result of the Occident's assimilation. In addition, the study found that the hosting city did not usually consider what the Olympic legacy could bring to a Third World. As such, there is a need for further studies to develop the Olympic legacy of acculturation and understand how the Olympic legacy can best be planned, sustained and extended.

Key words: Olympic legacy, Orientalism, Occidentalism, Third World, assimilation, acculturation

Introduction

With the concept of international development, Olympic Games have emerged as favorite global cultures and become symbolic sports mega-events. Meanwhile, Olympic legacy has also become a predominant part of the Olympic Movement (Torres, 2012). Each edition of the event has left several legacies for the Olympic Movement. As well, every host city has created unique and unforgettable sporting moments alongside treasured memories (International Olympic Committee, hereafter IOC, 2012). The Olympic legacy has made sure that the games and the Olympic spirits are lasting.

For Olympic legacy, the perspective of the Occident is usually taken, especially since the Olympics itself was

founded in an Occident society. However, this perspective has not been quite suitable for the host cities in the Orient countries. Still, developing countries have risen on the international scene (Gu, Humphrey, & Messner, 2008). There is a notable trend for sports mega-events to be hosted in the Orient countries such as Korea, Japan, and China (Bob, Swart, & Cornelissen, 2008a). When hosting the Olympic Games, the Orient countries consider how to maintain their unique Oriental advantages, which is not only beneficial in spreading the Eastern culture but also a perfect way to be consistent with the mission of the Olympic globalization.

The Occident include Europe (EU members, European free trade union members, European micro-countries) and the United States, and has become more influential and dominant over the years (Toynbee, 1966). In addition, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and some selected Latin America are also categorised as Occident (Norway, 2015). The Orient is the East, which includes China, Korea,

Submitted : 28 July 2018

Revised : 27 September 2018

Accepted : 6 November 2018

Correspondence : joonyoungghan@yu.ac.kr

* This work was supported by the Yeungnam University research grant program (216A061046).

Japan, Vietnam, and peninsular Southeast Asia (Lewis & Wigen, 1997).

The exchange of the Occident and Orient cultures initiates two distinct outcomes. First, the Orient sports culture is assimilated (Qing, 2005). Since Olympic Games are a product of the Occident, as a western hegemonic culture, it potentially makes the East lose its traditional culture. This is the effect of assimilation, which is similar to cultural integration (Zhang & Zhai, 2017). For Olympic legacy of Beijing 2008, hosting the 29th Olympic Games left many beneficial legacies. However, it is regrettable that the Olympics did not fully embrace an Oriental culture. The IOC Evaluation Commission predicted that 'a unique legacy' would be left after the Beijing Games in 2001 (IOC, 2001). However, the 'unique legacy' was vaguely reminiscent of Wushu, one of the elements of Chinese civilisation. Still, Beijing's application to include Wushu in joining the alliance of the official program of the Games was unsuccessful, even though it fulfilled the Olympic Charter criteria for sports to be included in the Olympic Games' program (Price & Dayan, 2009). This shows that the Olympic Games have often been dominated by the Western-oriented games. Through this, it is evident that the Orient is being assimilated by the Occident.

Second, the sports culture is potential to lead to acculturation by the Orient and Occident. In this case, the Orient sports culture contributes to the development of the Olympic globalization process, which is a process of acculturation and is similar to multiculturalism. It was hard to find a case related to the acculturation of Olympic legacy so people need to pay more attention to it.

Still, it is difficult to host the Olympic Games in Third World countries due to insufficient resources to host the Olympic Games these countries (Bob, Swart, & Cornelissen, 2008b). Generally, it is believed that Third World includes countries that have colonial pasts in Africa, Latin America, Oceania and Asia (Tomlinson, 2003). Regardless of resource constraints, Third World countries have been successful participants in the world Olympic stages. Nonetheless, the Olympic legacy of Third World countries is still deficient.

In recent years, there is a notable trend of refugees sporting events receiving more attention and concern. The Refugee Olympic Team at the Rio 2016 sent a signal of hope to all refugees in the world (Donnelly & Saunders, 2017).

There is usually a collision of the Occident, Orient and Third World cultures during Olympic Games. To maintain a multicultural and harmonious existence, there is a need to emphasise these 'differences' as the advantages of a global culture and to form a basis for future study. As much as the Olympic legacy considers the tangible legacy, the intangible legacy is still also important. The Olympic legacy is not only for the host countries but also for participants. Since most Third World countries are unable to host the Olympic Games, they have not experienced Olympic legacy. To extend this feeling to Third World countries, there is a need for such countries to also identify with the Olympic legacy.

The IOC's definition of an Olympic legacy is insufficient. Perhaps they will need to define a broader concept of the Olympic legacy to include the Orient and Third World host countries. Previous literature on Olympic legacy is scanty. Besides, most of the available literature works have only considered universal or international values, which are a part of the Olympic legacy. On this background, the purpose of this study is to challenge the original Olympic legacy concept defined by the IOC, which was premised on the Occident value. To fulfil the purpose of the study, the following research questions were set.

RQ 1: How much have Oriental nations been involved in the Olympic legacy development compared to Occidental nations?

RQ 2: How have Third World nations been involved in the Olympic legacy development?

RQ 3: How different have assimilation and acculturation impacted Olympic legacy and what are the implications of these phenomena on non-Occidental nations in the context of the construction of Olympic legacy?

Olympic Legacy

The term 'legacy' was first used in the 1956 Melbourne Olympic Games. Here, legacy was used to denote specialised sports' facilities. In 1987, the first international symposium on the subject of "Legacy with Culture" was organised in Seoul by the International Research Academy for Olympics and Intercultural Studies. The Olympic legacy of the modern Olympic was first formally presented in 2002. With the increasing significance of legacy, the IOC convened a general meeting on "The Legacy of the Olympic Games: 1984–2000", with the aim of defining the Olympic legacy (Moragas, Kennett, & Puig, 2003).

Consequently, the IOC added a new statement for host cities of Olympic Games in 2003. Since then, all the bidding cities have been required to include plans in their candidacy files and to point out long-term programs on how the Olympic sites and facilities will be maintained or used even after the Olympics (Hughes, 2013). In 2003, the IOC Olympic Games Study Commission issued a report on legacy's infrastructure, expertise and experience. Until 2015, the Olympic Games Guide on Olympic Legacy referred to 'legacy' as the 'after-effects, often long-term, rather than just actual impacts. This emphasises both tangible and intangible benefits of Olympics Games to a host city or country (IOC, 2017).

The Olympic legacy can be either tangible or intangible. Every host city of Olympic Games has had different forms of Olympic legacies since the Games were revived in 1896 (Cashman, 1998). The IOC defined tangible legacy as easily recognised by images of the Olympic Games Guide. Examples of tangible legacy include new sporting events, infrastructure, urban beautification, and regeneration. The tangible legacies enhance the attraction of the host cities, improve the urban image and improve local residents' quality of life. The intangible legacy is difficult to capture, define or measure. It is closely related to practical benefits to people and society. Examples of intangible legacies are new cultural and material heritage assets, positive changes in people's attitudes or behaviours, advancement of profes-

sional skills, better understanding among people from different countries, and development of new social networks, among others (IOC, 2017).

The tangible legacy is profoundly a concern of the government. Being a mega-event, the Olympics Games is a short-term and high-profile event. As such, the host city must construct specialised buildings and take into account other infrastructural improvements, which usually involve substantial capital costs (Hiller & Harry, 2006). The new infrastructures, such as transportation and sports venues, and tourist attraction sites, among others, improve the city and help in the development of other sectors such as the tourism industry (Kaplanidou, 2012). Solberg and Preuss (2007) agree that infrastructure development provides economic benefits to the host city or country.

Lately, there have been many studies on the intangible legacy of the Olympic Games. The IOC has constantly refined the definition of Olympic legacy. A legacy suggests a long-term effect that is only detected after the completion of the event (Kaplanidou, 2012). The IOC president, Jacques Rogge, points out that the growing awareness of the environment is a kind of non-infrastructural Olympics legacy. Many scholars have focused on non-infrastructural programs such as increased participation in the sporting events (Girginov & Hills, 2008), sustainability (Leopkey & Parent, 2012), employment schemes (Lindsay, 2014), and education as well as volunteering opportunities (Minnaert, 2012).

With the number of host countries of Olympic Games increasing, the Olympic legacy seems to be spreading worldwide. As well, the legacy promoted by various countries has respective characteristics. For instance, in the Occident regions, Olympics legacy bring about urban renewal, venue utilisation, transport, and sports participation, among others. They organise Olympic Games to drive economic development (Preuss, 2004). On the other hand, the Orient countries host Olympic Games as a platform for exposure to the world (Price, 2008). For the Orient countries, such events reinvent their brand for the international community to identify with them (Grix & Lee, 2013). The Oriental countries try to interpret the basic

principles of the Olympics by challenging existing western ontologism and sports norms to promote the coordination of world civilisation (J. A. Mangan & Dong, 2010).

Although the IOC has continually improved the definition of Olympic legacy, it is still only based on the values upon Occidentalism and related cultures. Usually, the host countries prefer taking the legacy plan inclined to the Occident's defined legacy. This involves a focus on sports venues, new sports facilities, Olympic Parks and improvements in urban infrastructure. The purpose of such actions is to improve the international image by displaying tangibles. The IOC has attempted to put forward that Olympic stadiums are recognised as immaterial Olympic legacies. In essence, this is a positive benefit for every host city. However, it seems to be a cultural invasion of the Orient countries, meaning that Olympic globalization has increased the problems of cultural communication.

Orientalism and Occidentalism

London acquired the right to host the 2012 Olympic Games in 2005. It was the first time of the Olympics where a legacy plan was needed before the beginning of the event (Azzali, 2017). Some London Olympic legacy researches have found that the prominent feature of London Olympics' tangible legacy was the controversy over the transformation of the city, including the reconstruction of East London (Watt & Bernstock, 2017), high-quality and sustainable communities (MacRury & Poynter, 2009), and the creation of sustainable sports and transport infrastructure (Bauman, Murphy, & Matsudo, 2013). These tangible legacies were vital to have a sense of the lasting change brought about by the Olympics.

The greatest legacy of the Rio 2016 was the tangible legacy. Three highlights of the legacy of Rio 2016 include urban port areas (Olympic Avenue), Barra da Tijuca, Deodoro Park, and the improvement of the surrounding urban infrastructure. New transit infrastructure, construction of three express bus corridors (BRTs), and a subway extension were some Olympic legacies for Rio (Galatti, 2017; Silva, Maiolino, & Torres, 2018). However, some

studies perceive that the Olympic legacy of Rio 2016 will be a short-time success due to the dismal economic returns and because infrastructure development did not have much regard for the city's residents (Rekow, 2016).

There is a notable trend for sports mega-events to be hosted in the Orient countries such as Korea, Japan, and China (Bob et al., 2008a). The global economic power has shifted from Occident to Orient, with Asia Pacific region becoming a major hub for international sports, although the West still dominates sports culture (Brannagan & Giulianotti, 2015; Rowe & Gilmour, 2008).

Tokyo was the first Asian city to have won the bid for Olympic Games. The success of Tokyo's bid to host the 1964 Olympic has eventually confirmed the fact that western monopoly ended in the 1930s (Collins, 2014). In 1964, Tokyo Olympic was successfully held. Although there was no concept of the Olympic legacy at that time, Tokyo's success helped to develop the Olympic Movement and generalise Olympism in Asia. As a kind of an intangible Olympic legacy, this culture was later adopted by other Asian cities like Seoul in 1988 and Beijing in 2008 to host the Olympic Games.

Hosting the Olympic Games in Seoul in 1988 exposed Korea to the world. In 1987, the first international symposium on the subject of legacy was organised in Korea in which Korea mainly displayed traditional cultural performances. This kind of an Opening Ceremony sparked a trend for subsequent Orient Olympics to highlight the importance of traditional cultural performances in Olympic stadiums and in ceremonies (Collins, 2010). The legacy of Seoul Olympics showed the world Korean culture and sent a message of potentiality to other developing countries (MacAloon & Kang, 1990). This intangible legacy promoted the economic and public services in Korea as well. For instance, two aspects of information technology and tourism achieved great development (Kang, 2010).

The Beijing 2008 was inclined to a "Humanistic Olympics" based on their rich culture spanning over 5000 years (Brownell, 2012). The Beijing 2008 challenged the Occident to dispose of the Occidental interpretation of Olympics and embrace an Oriental perspective. China tried

to interpret the basic principles of the Olympic Games by challenging the established Western ontology and sports norms, promoting world civilisation's harmony (Mangan & Dong, 2013). The Olympic legacy of Beijing 2008 includes infrastructure and transportation, such as Bird's Nest, and Water Cube, as well as the state's investment in Olympic education. Olympic education promised to popularise Olympic-related culture and spread Olympic education to the 230 million primaries and middle school students in Beijing. As well, this was extended to over 400 million youths across China (Beijing Organizing Committee for the Games of the XXIX Olympiad, 2010).

The PyeongChang 2018 Olympic Winter Games left behind a valuable Olympic legacy. The tangible legacy includes new transportations and facilities for the sports' venue. The 35,000-seat PyeongChang Olympic Stadium was partially dismantled and turned into the Olympic Memorial Hall, memorial park, outdoor concert hall and daily sports facilities. Except for these tangible legacies, North Korea successfully participated in the Olympics, which was highly symbolic of unity and peace. The PyeongChang 2018 Olympic Winter Games left behind a legacy of peace. Chang (2018) believes that the PyeongChang 2018 Olympic Winter Games left behind one of the most dramatic and symbolic peace legacies of any modern Olympics.

The Orient and the Occident have different concentrations of the plan of Olympic legacy. As a result the historical difference in their asymmetrical relationships as well as geopolitical environments (Collins, 2010). The original intention of the Orient countries when bidding for the Olympic Games is different from that of the Occident countries. The Occident do not necessarily put to focus the duty of representing their cultural legacy as the Orient do (Collins, 2008). In addition, the Occident countries mostly seek to organise the Olympic Games to make an economic impact or drive economic development (Preuss, 2004). The Orient countries, on the other hand, use the Olympic Games as platforms to get an exposure to the rest of the world (Price, 2008).

Perhaps it would be suitable to understand why the

Olympic legacy has mostly been based on Occidentalism. At the same time, it is crucial to understand why the Orient countries are accustomed to looking at the Olympic legacy with an Occidental's perspective. These issues have not been explicitly studied in existing literature. However, the oriental culture and modern western-dominance of Olympic culture appears to collide in an acculturation process. The Orient countries ought to have the right to present their values in the Olympic legacy. It is important that the Orient countries consider planning the Olympic legacy using Oriental values.

Third World

There is no existing relevant research that touches on Third World countries and Olympic legacy. As long-term Olympic participants, Third World countries have done well in the Olympics. For instance, there are elite sportspersons in most Third World countries; a majority of the African medals have been in individual sports in the Olympics (Manuel Luiz & Fadal, 2011). Winners of won gold medals, from Third World countries, can receive international perceptibility and prestige in competitions. They are likely to set a role model for the next generation of athletes (Chappell & Seifu, 2000). The gold medals they won are the precious tangible legacy that they can identify as their gains from participating in the Olympics.

For the first time in the Olympic Movement, a Refugee Olympic Team competed in the Olympic Games Rio 2016. The Refugee Olympic Team at the 2016 Summer Olympics served as a mark of hope for refugees around the world (Bach, 2016). The Olympic Games Rio 2016 was an attainment of a dream for the entire South American continent. As one of a kind, the Rio 2016 legacy sent a message of hope that the Olympics was committed to building a better world through the sport (Donnelly & Saunders, 2017). As a kind of an intangible legacy, it brought hope to the people in Third World as well.

It is nearly impossible for most of Third World countries to hosting the Olympics. This is because one of the requirements for a city to host Olympics is a consideration

of its economy; the costs of hosting the events are incredibly high. To hold the Olympics, the host city must be established economies in the global environment (Bob et al., 2008a). Also, Shropshire (2012) mentions that the key complication for any city bidding for the Olympics is the finances. There are other factors that are considered, such as security, political temperature, resource capabilities and infrastructure, among others.

The IOC has provided aid to Third World countries since 1996. This is aimed at spreading Olympic ideals directly to these countries. The IOC has provided equipment, facilities and other resources need to compete (Guest, 2009). The IOC has also worked with other humanitarian organisations, such as the UNHCR (United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees), to provide funding for specific needs. The IOC evidently carries out most of the long-term assistance-related projects in Third World countries.

However, every single host country actively participates in the Olympic Games' long-term construction in Third World countries. As much as Third World countries have not obtained the Olympic legacy, the sports mega-events are expected to deliver these legacies with time. Third World countries will soon experience tangible legacies such as infrastructure and intangible legacies as well.

Assimilation and Acculturation

Every nation has realised the importance of cultural exchange in social contexts. Countries that actively participate in mega-events are probably aware that cultural conflicts are inevitable. In some cases, this scenario leads to cultural conformity. In terms of adaptation, different cultures are changed by additions of new cultures (Berry & John, 2005). Culture exchange has created a new opportunity for the world. It has certain advantages, including economic and technological developments, improvements in education and health, as well as clearer understating of social and natural environmental factors. However, there are also negative effects, such as negative imitation of others cultures (Hamdi, 2013). Sociologists refer to this

phenomenon as culture assimilation and acculturation.

Assimilation is 'the cultural absorption of a minority culture to the main cultural subject.' In this process, the minority group loses features of its culture, such as language, traditions, and even its identity. In assimilation, the original culture is replaced with a new one. Assimilation could be spontaneous or occur through force. Others have defined assimilation as 'the immigrants would show greater similarities with the majority native groups' (Alba, Logan, Stults, Marzan, & Zhang, 1999). The dominant culture overwhelms and masks other cultures. Sometimes, it occurs as a unidirectional process and is dependent on acceptance (Spiro, 1955). In the process, the non-dominated group changes its internal values (Teske & Nelson, 1974). Through assimilation, people adapt to new cultures and lose their original identity.

Acculturation occurs when a group of people of different cultures participate in activities or certain events together and retain their respective differences while assuming some habits of the either or both groups. The influence of acculturation is apparent in many levels of primitive (local) and new (host) cultures. Berry et al. (1989) defined acculturation as the process which "occurs when two independent cultural groups come into continuous first-hand contact over an extended period, resulting in changes in either or both cultural groups" (Komisarof & Hua, 2015). As such, acculturation can be said to be a two-way process (Mattei & Aguilar, 2016). In the process of acculturation, people adapt to new cultures while maintaining their original cultural characteristics.

Acculturation is the most suitable way to learn from each other. Coubertin promoted the principle of social equality and advocated for sport for all. He set a new goal of all sports for all people (Chatziefstathiou & Henry, 2012). Acculturation is an exchange on culture based on equality and mutual respect. Meanwhile, acculturation of Olympic legacy or cultural has continually developed. Recognizing the differences between the Orient and the Occident in terms of Olympic cultures can help promote the exchange of world sports culture, thereby increasing the diversity of Olympic culture.

Therefore, when the Oriental and Occidental cultures conflict, the Orient keeps the independence of national cultural and joins in global sports. Besides, Huntington (1993) affirms that only Western culture of democracy provides a suitable basis for the development of a democratic system. Democracy is mostly unsuitable for non-Western societies. From when the Asia-Pacific region became the primary site of global economic activity and wealth in the 20th century, the Western capitalists have incessantly wanted to do business in Asia and exploit its booming markets (Ang & Stratton, 1995).

At present, globalization in sports has become a reality. The Olympics are a near-perfect example of globalization (Marmolejo, 2012). It brings together people from all over the world, thus plays an acculturation role in society (Roche, 2006). In multiculturalism, the assimilation process of the Olympic legacy is not a simple one-way. People have become accustomed to thinking of Olympic legacy from the western perspective. However, the Occident will need to also accommodate the Orient's legacy culture. In addition, both the Orient and the Olympic have to acculturate the Orient legacy culture.

Discussion

Today, there is a notable trend of hosting Olympic Games held in the Orient countries. First, the Olympics Games are characterised by universality and cultural diversity, denoting the fusion of cultures as a way to develop the Olympics. Secondly, Third World countries have emerged on the global scene. The Orient countries are now a basic platform to promote the establishment of the new international political and economic order around the world (Horton, 2011). Compared with the Orient, the development rate of the Occident has declined in the recent past. The Occident has also suffered high costs and huge debts as a result of hosting the Olympic Games, thus reducing the enthusiasm to bid for the Olympic Games (Boykoff, 2011). Meanwhile, the Orient countries have remained active in bidding since it is their chance to have an Olympics' platform to expose their

culture to the whole world. For them, the primary motive is not economic growth.

As at now, the Orient Olympic legacy is seen as a result of the Occident's assimilating. There is no special characteristic of the Orient for the Olympic legacy. Even though the Orient gradually reflects some differences in the Olympic legacy, they do not mainly focus on acculturated Olympic legacy but on the Occident defined legacy. The Orient host countries have attempted to display a variety of national cultures at the opening and closing ceremonies. They look forward to making intangible legacy through such performances. They are also inspired to increase their participation in mass sports by watching competitive sports events. This is an apparent assimilation of legacy, which is based upon the perspective of the Occidental definition.

The acculturation of the Olympic legacy is significant. In particular, the Olympic legacy represents a long-term impact of the Olympic Games. When the Olympic Games are hosted in the Orient countries, they bring about Occident culture. It will be helpful to discard the legacy of Occidentalism to promote cultural communication and an understanding of cultural diversity. In the process of multicultural cooperation, cultural differences are not only the stumbling-blocks in enhancing cultural diversity, but also obstructions to achieving Intercultural Synergy (Jianhong, Li, & Xiaochen, 2006). From the Orient perspective, the Olympic legacy makes full use of acculturation in multiculturalism, which helps to achieve cross-cultural synergies rather than blindly applying the Western outlook.

Today, the Olympic Games have become widely spread across the world. This is attributed to the fact that these sports activities draw nourishment from the advanced culture of the world and constantly enrich the essence of the Olympic Games as a sports mega-event. However, the Olympic Games have mainly stayed rooted in Occidentalism. As much as the modern Olympics tries to develop and become balanced, it still has some aspects of the Western culture (Wang & Xie, 2009). For the Oriental to achieve a greater impact in the Olympics, they will need to go through the western identity (Collins, 2008). The

Orient needs to bridge the gap between the Orient and the Occident (Leo, 2011).

It still remains difficult for Third World to host the Olympics. They need to have rights to benefit from the Olympic legacy. It is necessary that any revision of the Olympic mission becomes more relevant of the universal human values (Milton-Smith, 2002). The universality of the games essentially requires cultural diversity. When universal cultures are respected, universality is truly embodied (Parry, 2006). From the literature, there is no substantial sustainable Olympic legacy for Third World nations. This shows that the major beneficiaries of the Olympic legacy are the host countries. However, the emergence of the Refugee Team in Rio 2016 initiated a good way to include Third World countries in the Olympic stage. Nevertheless, it does not explicitly propose its role in the Olympic legacy. The universal value of the Olympic Games is still not comprehensive.

Assimilation of Olympic legacy is unfavorable for the sustainable development of the Olympic Games. Miller and colleague (2001) argue that sports have been commoditised to match the different needs of spectators. The rising Oriental nations are now at the centre of the new global geopolitical dynamic (Horton & Saunders, 2012). The Olympic Games as a favourite global sports mega-event is concerned with the people. Acculturation of Olympic legacy is critical in enabling development and sustainability. It not only improves the diversity of Olympic culture, but also promotes a climate truly conducive for the pursuit of Olympic declaration. As such, acculturation of Olympic legacy promotes sustainable development of the Olympic Games.

For Occidental nations, accepting the differences between the Orient and the Occident in terms of Olympic legacy can help promote the exchange and development of world sports culture. Acculturation is also an expression of the occident respect for Oriental (Wong, 2008). The Olympic legacy, as a sustainable vehicle for social change, is an important means for the Oriental culture go global (Schulenkorf, 2010). Given that, acculturation of Olympic legacy is significant for the Oriental.

It means that the Olympics are not yet universal. The Occident culture still dominates the Olympics. Besides, there is an imbalance in the development of the economy of the eastern and western cultures, which has led to the penetration and assimilation of the Occidental culture into the Oriental culture (Pan, 2004). However, with the Orient developing international status, the acculturation process of the Occident culture will become more meaningful. As well, the Orient will accept a Western-dominated Olympics, while remaining reluctant to completely assimilate into them. In fact, the Orient seems to attach more importance to their position in the Olympic Games.

Conclusion

When host cities formulate legacy strategies, all stakeholders must be part of the legacy strategy. The Occident, Orient and Third World countries have the right to enjoy the benefits of the Olympic legacy. In particular, both the Occident and the IOC advocate strengthening of universal or international values on Olympics. However, the Orient has overlooked the Olympic legacy of the Oriental nature. In most cases, the organisers do not give much attention to Third World countries. At the same time, the Olympic legacies in Oriental countries are mostly based on the Occident's view and lack Oriental features. For Third World, it is quite difficult to host Olympic Games as at now due to resource restraints. As such, none of the host cities has explicitly proposed Olympic legacy associated with Third World countries. From views of universal human values, every person maintains opportunities to enjoy the Olympic legacy.

It is necessary to refine the meaning of Olympic legacy. At the same time, it is needful that the Orient avoids assimilating the Occident and maintains an Orient's perspective by developing an Oriental outlook. Although there are some differences between the Orient and the Occident in terms of Olympic legacy, it is essential for both of them to pursue peace and justice through the Olympic Games. In particular, it is vital that the host city provides more opportunities to Third World

countries to participate in Olympics by creating new and unique legacies.

To reinvent the Olympic legacy, it is imperative to recognise that the modern Olympic legacy is based on a wrong preference of the Occidental superiority. It is relevant that the Olympic Games become non-westernised. It is desirable that the Orient, Occident, and Third World nations get the same treatment in terms of the Olympic legacy. Without a change in this inclination to one side, the Olympics Games will seem to be a cultural invasion of the Orient while completely being unfair to Third World nations. More importantly, it is indispensable that each host city or country defines Olympic legacy in their best-suited way.

Suggestions for future research

This study has presented findings from an integrated literature review of the Olympic legacy research. Despite the increasing number of studies on the Olympic legacy, only a few studies have mentioned the Orient's and Third World's Olympic legacy. As research on the Orient Olympic legacy is in the early stages of development, there is a need for further empirical studies to develop a more dependable and detailed understanding of the nature of the Orient Olympic legacy. While this study considered that the assimilation of the Olympic legacy happens in the Oriental nations, the concern about changing the solution has not yet been addressed. In addition, it is crucial that such studies discuss how acculturation of Olympic legacy can best be planned, sustained and extended in future research.

References

- Alba, R. D., Logan, J. R., Stults, B. J., Marzan, G., & Zhang, W. (1999). Immigrant groups in the suburbs: A reexamination of suburbanization and spatial assimilation. *American Sociological Review*, 446-460.
- Ang, I., & Stratton, J. (1995). Straddling East and West: Singapore's paradoxical search for a national identity. *Asian and Pacific Inscriptions: Identities, Ethnicities, Nationalities*, 179-192.
- Azzali, S. (2017). Queen Elizabeth Olympic Park: An assessment of the 2012 London Games legacies. *City, Territory and Architecture*, 4(1), 11.
- Bach, T. (2016). The olympic movement, the United Nations and the pursuit of common ideals. *UN Chronicle*, 53(2), 14-16.
- Bauman, A. E., Murphy, N., & Matsudo, V. (2013). Is a population-level physical activity legacy of the London 2012 Olympics likely? *Journal of Physical Activity and Health*, 10(1), 1-4.
- Beijing Organising Committee for the Games of the XXIX Olympiad. (2010). Official Report of the Beijing 2008 Olympic Games Volume III. Retrieved from <http://library.la84.org/6oic/OfficialReports/2008/2008v3.pdf>
- Berry, J. W., & John. A. (2005). Acculturation: Living successfully in two cultures. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 29(6), 697-712.
- Berry, J. W., Kim, U., Power, S., Young, M., & Bujaki, M. (1989). Acculturation attitudes in plural societies. *Applied Psychology*, 38(2), 185-206.
- Bob, U., Swart, K., & Cornelissen, S. (2008). When will it be Africa's turn? Prospects and challenges for South Africa hosting the Olympic Games. *Africa Insight*, 38(3), 49-60.
- Boykoff, J. (2011). The anti-olympics. *New Left Review*, 67.
- Brannagan, P. M., & Giulianotti, R. (2015). Soft power and soft disempowerment: Qatar, global sport and football's 2022 World Cup finals. *Leisure Studies*, 34(6), 703-719.
- Brownell, S. (2012). Human rights and the Beijing Olympics: Imagined global community and the transnational public sphere. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 63(2), 306-327.
- Cashman, R. (1998) Olympic legacy in an Olympic city: Monuments, museums and memory. In R.K. Barney, K. B. Wamsley, S. G. Martyn and G. H. MacDonald (eds) *Global and Cultural Critique: Problematizing the Olympic Games Fourth International Symposium*

- for *Olympic Research*. Centre for Olympic Studies, University of Western Ontario, 107-114.
- Chappell, R., & Seifu, E. (2000). Sport, culture and politics in Ethiopia. *Culture, Sport, Society*, 3(1), 35-47.
- Chatziefstathiou, D., & Henry, I. P. (2012). Coubertin: Patronage and Paternalistic Discourses of Olympism (1887-1937). In *Discourses of Olympism* (pp. 70-144). London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Collins, S. (2008). The fragility of Asian national identity in the Olympic Games. *Owning the Olympics: Narratives of the New China*, 185-209.
- Collins, S. (2010). *Asian soft-power: Globalization and regionalism in the East Asia Olympic Games. Rethinking Matters Olympic: Investigations into the Socio-Cultural Study of the Modern Olympic Movement*. International Centre for Olympic Studies, The University of Western Ontario, 2010, 163-176.
- Collins, S. (2014). *The 1940 Tokyo Games: The Missing Olympics: Japan, the Asian Olympics and the Olympic Movement*. New York: Routledge.
- Donnelly, F., & Saunders, N. E. G. (2017). The Refugee Olympic Team at Rio 2016: rallying around which flag? Open democracy. Retrieved from https://research-repository.st-andrews.ac.uk/bitstream/handle/10023/10449/opendemocracy.net_The_Refugee_Olympic_Team_FINAL_piece_pdf_10.03.17.pdf?sequence=1
- Galatti, L. R. (2017). Rio 2016 legacy (?): Immediate perceptions. *Revista Brasileira de Educação Física e Esporte*, 31(1), 321-329.
- Grix, J., & Lee, D. (2013). Soft power, sports mega-events and emerging states: The lure of the politics of attraction. *Global Society*, 27(4), 521-536.
- Gu, J., Humphrey, J., & Messner, D. (2008). Global governance and developing countries: The Implications of the rise of China. *World Development*, 36(2), 274-292.
- Guest, A. M. (2009). The diffusion of development-through-sport: Analysing the history and practice of the Olympic movement's grassroots outreach to Africa. *Sport in Society*, 12(10), 1336-1352.
- Hamdi, N. (2013). *Small Change: About the Art of Practice and the Limits of Planning in Cities*. London: Taylor and Francis.
- Hiller, H. H. (2006). Post-event outcomes and the post-modern turn: The olympics and urban transformations. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 6(4), 317-332.
- Horton, P. (2011). Sport in Asia: globalization, glocalization, Asianization. In P. Pachura, (ed.) *New Knowledge in a New Era of Globalization* (pp. 119-146). Rjeka: Intech Open-Access.
- Horton, P., & Saunders, J. (2012). The 'East Asian' Olympic Games: What of Sustainable Legacies?. *The International Journal of the History of Sport*, 29(6), 887-911.
- Helen Hughes, K. (2014). *Sport mega-events and a legacy of increased sport participation: An Olympic promise or an Olympic dream*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. Leeds Metropolitan University.
- Huntington, S. P. (1993). The clash of civilizations? *Foreign Affairs*, 22-49.
- International Olympic committee (2017). Legacy strategic approach: Moving forward. Retrieved from https://www.olympic.org/-/media/Document%20Library/OlympicOrg/Documents/olympicLegacy/IOC_Legacy_Strategy_Executive_Summary.pdf?la=en&hash=783C018C6DDC9F56B7A3B428BE0A33334C47E343
- Ma, J., Gao, L., & Hu, X. (2006). Three typical perspectives of intercultural synergy research. *Advances in Psychological Science*, 14(05), 757-761.
- Kaplanidou, K. (2012). The importance of legacy outcomes for Olympic Games four summer host cities residents' quality of life: 1996-2008. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 12(4), 397-433.
- Komisarof, A., & Hua, Z. (2016). Crossing boundaries and weaving intercultural work, life, and scholarship in globalizing universities. *Crossing Boundaries and Weaving Intercultural Work, Life, and Scholarship in Globalizing Universities*(pp. 1-204). London: Taylor and Francis.
- Leo, H. L. H. (2011). Olympism and East Asia: A philosophical reflection on olympic philosophy. *The Olympics in East Asia: Nationalism, Regionalism, and Globalism on the Center Stage of World Sports*, 109.

- Leopkey, B., & Parent, M. M. (2012). Olympic games legacy: From general benefits to sustainable long-term legacy. *The International Journal of the History of Sport*, **29**(6), 924-943.
- Lewis, M. W., & Wigen, K. E. (1997). *The myth of continents: A critique of metageography*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Lindsay, I. (2014). Employment and capital gains. In: Living with London's Olympics. *Palgrave Studies in Urban Anthropology*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- MacAloon, J., & Kang, S-p. (1990). Uri Nara: Korean nationalism, the Seoul Olympics, and contemporary anthropology. In Koh Byong-ik (Ed.), *Toward one world beyond all barriers: The Seoul Olympic anniversary conference* (1, pp. 117-159). Seoul: Poon Nam Publ.
- MacRury, I., & Poynter, G. (2009). *London's Olympic Legacy: A "Thinkpiece" report prepared for the OECD and Department for Communities and Local Government*. London: East Research Institute.
- Mangan, J. A., & Dong, J. (2013). *Beijing 2008: Preparing for glory. Chinese Challenge in the Chinese Century*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Manuel Luiz, J., & Fadal, R. (2011). An economic analysis of sports performance in Africa. *International Journal of Social Economics*, **38**(10), 869-883.
- Marmolejo, M. (2012). *Globalization and the Olympics (Part1). Understand Globalization*. Retrieved from <http://www.understandglobalization.com/2012/07/26/globalization-and-the-olympics/>
- Mattei, P., & Aguilar, A. S. (2016). Cultural and religious conflicts in the history of American schools. In *Secular Institutions, Islam and Education Policy* (pp. 143-164). London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Miller, T., G. Lawrence, J. McKay, and D. Rowe. (2001). *Globalization and sport: playing the world*, London: Sage.
- Milton-Smith, J. (2002). Ethics, the Olympics and the search for global values. *Journal of Business Ethics*, **35**(2), 131-142.
- Minnaert, L. (2012). An Olympic legacy for all? The non-infrastructure outcomes of the Olympic Games for socially excluded groups (Atlanta 1996 – Beijing 2008). *Tourism Management*, **33**(2), 361-370.
- Moragas, M. D., Kennett, C., & Puig, N. (2003). *The legacy of the Olympic Games: 1984-2000*. IOC Lausanne. Retrieved from https://library.olympic.org/Default/doc/SYRACUSE/68159/the-legacy-of-the-olympic-games-1984-2000-international-symposium-lausanne-14th-15th-and-16th-novemb?_lg=en-GB
- Norway, S. (2015). *Innvandrere og norskfødte med innvandrerforeldre*. Retrieved from <http://www.ssb.no/befolkning/statistikker/innvbef>.
- Pan, X. Q. (2004). On decolonization in translation. *Shandong Foreign Languages Journal*, **2**, 105-109.
- Parry, J. (2006). Sport and olympism: Universals and multiculturalism. *Journal of the Philosophy of Sport*, **33**(2), 188-204.
- Preuss, H., & Preuss, H. (2008). The economics of staging the olympics: A comparison of the games 1972-2008. *International Journal of Sport Finance*, **3**(1), 74-76.
- Price, M. E. (2008). On seizing the olympic platform. *Owning the Olympics: Narratives of the new China*, 86, 114.
- Qing, C. (2005). Oriental sports culture under the background of olympic games. *Journal of Sport History and Culture*, **3**, 44-45.
- Rekow, L. (2016). Rio De Janeiro's Olympic legacy: Public security for whom? *Journal of Human Security*, **12**(1), 74.
- Roche, M. (2006). Mega-events and modernity revisited: Globalization and the case of the Olympics. *The Sociological Review*, **54**(2_suppl), 27-40.
- Rowe, D., & Gilmour, C. (2008). Contemporary media sport: De-or re-westernization? *International Journal of Sport Communication*, **1**(2), 177-194.
- Schulenkorf, N. (2010). Sport events and ethnic reconciliation: Attempting to create social change between Sinhalese, Tamil and Muslim sportspeople in war-torn Sri Lanka. *International review for the sociology of sport*, **45**(3), 273-294.
- Shropshire, K. L. (2012). Michael Oriard on NCAA academic

- reform: Academics over dollars. *Journal of Intercollegiate Sport*, **5**(1), 19-21.
- Silva, S. C., Maiolino, C. E., & Torres, J. A. (2018). The Rio Games legacy in mobility: Challenges Beyond Infrastructure. *Focus*, **14**(1), 18.
- Solberg, H. A., & Preuss, H. (2007). Major sport events and long-term tourism impacts. *Journal of Sport Management*, **21**(2), 213-234.
- Spiro, M. E. (1955). The acculturation of American ethnic groups. *American Anthropologist*, **57**(6), 1240-1252.
- Teske, R. H., & Nelson, B. H. (1974). Acculturation and assimilation: A clarification. *American Ethnologist*, **1**(2), 351-367.
- Tomlinson, B. R. (2003). What was the Third World? *Journal of Contemporary History*, **38**(2), 307-321.
- Torres, C. R. (2012). On the merit of the legacy of failed Olympic bids. Retrieved from https://digitalcommons.brockport.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?referer=&httpsredir=1&article=1003&context=pes_confpres
- Toynbee, A. J. (1966). Change and habit; the challenge of our time. *American Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology*, **9**(2), 89.
- Wang, T., & Xie, S. (2009). Assessment of traffic-related air pollution in the urban streets before and during the 2008 Beijing Olympic Games traffic control period. *Atmospheric Environment*, **43**(35), 5682-5690.
- Watt, P., & Bernstock, P. (2017). Legacy for whom? Housing in Post-Olympic East London. In P. Cohen & P. Watt (Eds.), *London 2012 and the Post-Olympics City: A Hollow Legacy?* (pp. 91-138). London: Palgrave Macmillan UK.
- Wong, L. E. (2008). Relocating East and West: UNESCO's major project on the mutual appreciation of Eastern and Western cultural values. *Journal of World History*, 349-374.
- Zhang, W., & Zhai, F. (2017). Study on the inter-sexuality of Chinese and Western sports cultures. *Journal of Capital University of Physical Education & Sports*, **29**(3), 213.