



RUSSIAN
INTERNATIONAL
OLYMPIC
UNIVERSITY

OLYMPIC LEGACY and OLYMPIANS



Presented for:
INTERNATIONAL RESEARCH-TO-PRACTICE
CONFERENCE
OLYMPIC LEGACY: GROWTH AREAS RECOGNITION
SOL'16

September 20, 2016 – Sochi, Russia

Lecturer and RIOU MSA 2016 graduate student:

Christina Nathalie Smith

Dissertation Supervisor:

Professor Dimitra Papadimitriou, PhD






Agenda of the Presentation

- Introduction & Erasmus program
- Definition of the Problem / Social Capital
- Aim, Sample & Methodology
- Objectives, Results & Discussions
- Conclusions





RUSSIAN
INTERNATIONAL
OLYMPIC
UNIVERSITY



ERASMUS PROGRAM – PATRAS, GREECE



Definition of the Problem



- According to the WOA (2016)
 - **100,000 living Olympians throughout the world**
 - special capacity to use **the power and neutrality of sport** for the good of society,
 - use sports' unique potential to foster social cohesion.
- Bach, Olympian & President of the IOC (2015),
“Olympians are at the heart of the Olympic Movement. They are the main representatives of our ideals. They make our values and our message tangible for millions of people worldwide.”



Definition of the Problem



- “The International Olympic Committee (IOC) is the supreme authority of the Olympic Movement.” (Olympic.org, 2016) ...who strongly advocates the promotion of the Olympic values and Olympism (IOC, 2015).
- IOC Olympic Agenda 2020
 - strategic roadmap for the future of the Olympic Movement
 - 40 recommendations - pieces of a jigsaw puzzle with the aim of safeguarding the uniqueness of the Olympic Games and strengthening sport in society.



Social Capital – clichés



- Ostrom (2000; 179) “social capital does not wear out with use but disuse” – use it or lose it!
- Yang (2007), says SC is the single form of capital that cannot be owned or sold as others have an investment.
- Staveren and Knorringa (2006; 3), “the missing link” known as social capital is “relationships matter”.
- “the people who do better are somehow better connected” (Burt, 2000; 3)
- “it’s not what you know, it’s who you know” (Woolcock & Narayan, 2000: 225).
- Ferrin et al (2008), “it take two to tango”, as the advancement of reciprocated trust and collaboration comprises of a sophisticated dance that twists and turns gradually and is vitally shaped by collaborators’ preliminary moves.





Therefore....

- in this study we are merging different theoretical conceptualizations which links social capital to networks, which focuses on individual engagement, as well as bridging dissimilar people (as does the power of sport).



Research Aim



- **to provide insight into** Olympians in post-athletic career,
- their employment,
- scholastic and athletic achievements,
- the impact on Olympians by the Olympic Movement,
- their trust and loyalty towards Olympic organizations,
- and their active engagement in the sport and non-sport community.



Methodology

- Research Design – Quantitative study
- Data Collection Techniques
 - Qualtrics survey software – on-line (64 close ended questions)
 - Approx 15min
 - Distribution via RIOU to NOCs
 - Social Media
- Sample of the Study:
 - anonymous sample of 92 Olympians
 - both genders,
 - targeted at the international participation of both Summer and Winter Olympians
 - exclusively in post-athletic career (retired)





Table 1: Highlights of the Demographic Profile of the Sample of Olympians (N=92)



Olympians Sample dating from 1941-1993	Male	Female	Total	Summer	Winter
One respondent didn't record gender – missing in total (N=91)	f (%)	f (%)	f (%)	f (%)	f (%)
Gender	50 (55%)	41 (45%)	91 (100%)	52 (57%)	39 (43%)
Age					
37-46	16 (61%)	10 (38.46%)	26 (100%)	14 (54%)	12 (46%)
47-56	15 (56%)	12 (44%)	*27 (100%)	14 (52%)	13 (48%)
The Continent Olympians competed for in the Olympics					
	Male f (%)	Female f (%)	f (%)	f (%)	f (%)
	Summer /Winter	Summer/Winter	Total	Summer	Winter
Americas & Caribbean	19 (30.16%) / 14 (22.22%)	19 (30.16%) / 11 (17.46%)	63 (100%)	38 (60.32%)	25 (39.68%)
Europe	6 (25.00%) / 9 (37.50%)	5 (20.83%) / 4 (16.67%)	24 (100%)	11 (45.83%)	13 (54.17%)

92 Olympians, 23-46 yrs, most male (55%), most respondents between 47-56 yrs, 52 Summer – 39 Winter, majority of sample (68%) represented a country within the Americas & the Caribbean, 26% represented a European country.





Table 2: Highlights of Team or Individual Olympic Sport of Olympians involved in the Study (N=92)



Sport Season of Olympians	Team	Individual	Sample
	f (%)	f (%)	f (100%)
Total Sample	41 (100%)	51 (100%)	92

51 Olympians in Individual sport / 41 Olympians in team sports





Table 3: Highlights of Best Career Performances in an Olympics by Summer and Winter Olympians (N=92)



Best Performance of Olympians	SUMMER	WINTER	Total
Medalist and non-medalist	f (%)	f (%)	f (100%)
Total A (Medalists)	15 (58%)	11 (42%)	26
4 th -10 th position	20 (56%)	16 (44%)	36
11 th position and lower	24 (53%)	21 (47%)	45
Total B	44 (54%)	37 (46%)	81
Total A+B	59 (55%)	48 (45%)	107

24% medalists achieving 26 medals (15 Summer/11 Winter), 34% best performance 4-10th position, 42% ranked 11th and lower – It was a strong sample with a good equal distribution among 3 categories.





Objective 1



- To determine for Olympians:
 - current status of employment
 - highest scholastic achievement
 - potential success factors





Table 4: Highlights of Current Employment Status of Olympians (N=91)



Current Employment Status	sport related		Total A	Non-sport related		Total B	Grand Total A+B
	Male f (%)	Female f (%)	f (100%)	Male f (%)	Female f (%)	f (100%)	
Full time dependent employee	15 (60%)	10 (40%)	25	16 (70%)	7 (30%)	23	48 (53%)
Self-employed	9 (50%)	9 (50%)	18	8 (47%)	9 (53%)	17	35 (39%)

High employment (53%) full time dependent employees in both sport/non-sport fields, high interest (39% of Olympians) in being self-employed in both arenas.





Table 5: Highlights of Highest Education Completed of Olympians (N=91)



	f (%)	f (%)		f (%)	f (%)		f (%)
Education	Summer			Winter			Grand Total A+B (100%)
	Male	Female	Total A	Male	Female	Total B	
University Degree	10 (33%)	9 (30%)	19	3 (10%)	8 (27%)	11	30 (33%)
Master Degree	8 (33%)	7 (29%)	15	7 (29%)	2 (8%)	9	24 (26%)
Doctoral Degree	0 (0%)	7 (100%)	7	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0	7 (8%)
Total	18	23	41	10	10	20	61

Olympians were well educated (33% University degree, 26% Masters, 8% Doctoral degree) 41 Summer Olympians reported one of the three degrees mentioned and 20 Winter Olympians reported similar educational achievements -



Table 6: Highlights of Factors That Could Have Helped Olympians' Success Beyond the Olympics (N=92)



Factors	Male	Female	Total
	f (%)	f (%)	f (100%)
Funded education	31 (52.54%)	28 (47.46%)	59
National Olympic Committee transition program assistance	24 (47.06%)	27 (52.94%)	51
International Olympic Committee transition program assistance	17 (53.13%)	15 (46.88%)	32

59 out of 92 Olympians rated funded education as having the greatest interest & value that could have helped success beyond retirement.

47% males & 53% females indicated importance for NOC transition program assistance
IOC transition program scored lowest at 32 Olympians out of 92 respondents





Objective 2

- To determine how the Olympic Movement has affected Olympians in post-athletic career.





Table 7: Perceived Leverageable Social Benefits of Olympians due to the Olympic Movement (N=92)



	1 not at all + 2	3+4+5	6+7 very much	Mean	Std. Dev.	Total
Perceived Leverageable Social Benefits due to the Olympic Movement	f (%)	f (%)	f (%)			f (100%)
Credibility towards others / Public Perception	5 (5.43%)	32 (34.78%)	55 (59.78%)	5.64	1.42	92
Status in the community	3 (3.26%)	41 (44.57%)	48 (52.17%)	5.32	1.47	92
Positive career pathways	7 (7.61%)	40 (43.47%)	45 (48.92%)	5.25	1.58	92
Influence	7 (7.61%)	43 (46.73%)	42 (45.66%)	5.15	1.55	92
Opportunities / Benefits	11 (11.96%)	37 (40.21%)	44 (47.82%)	5.15	1.65	92

Participants reported that the role as Olympian has provided them with high credibility towards others & strong public perception (5.64 mean), status in the community (5.32 mean), benefits of positive career pathways (5.25 mean) as well as perceived capacity to influence others as well as opportunities & benefits both revealing a 5.15 mean





Objective 3

- To determine which Olympic affiliated organizations are most trusted and receive more loyalty by Olympians



Table 8: Highlights of Trust and Loyalty of Olympians Towards Organizations Involved in the Olympic Movement (N=91)



Organization	Male	Female	Total
	f (%)	f (%)	f (100%)
National Olympic Committee	28 (52%)	26 (48%)	54
National Sport Federation	25 (48%)	27 (52%)	52
International Sport Federation	20 (59%)	14 (41%)	34
International Olympic Committee	18 (60%)	12 (40%)	30
None of the above	10 (83%)	2 (17%)	12

*National Olympic affiliated organizations (NOCs & NSFs) most trusted & received most loyalty (52% males identified most frequently with NOC, 52% females identified most frequently with NSF).

*International affiliated organizations (ISF & IOC) received lowest trust & loyalty (34 & 30%).

*Lowest ranked was the IOC. 10 male & 2 female Olympians were not trusting or loyal to any organization.





Objective 4



- To identify the ways Olympians are or have been active citizens in sport & non-sport related issues and activities.





Table 9: Highlights of Participatory Actions of Olympians with Reference to IOC Agenda 2020 (N=92)

Participated in:	Yes	No	Total
	f (%)	f (%)	f (100%)
Promoting 'Sport for All'	50 (57%)	38 (43%)	88
Sustainability or sport legacy project	43 (48%)	47 (52%)	90
Olympic Based Education as a mentor or ambassador	43 (47%)	48 (53%)	91
Aboriginal or refugee affairs	3 (3%)	85 (97%)	88

Results reflected a positive correlation with the philosophy of Olympism which blends sport, education & culture (a form of legacy) – which were the 3 most interested areas of engagement. Sport for All (57%), Sustainability or Sport Legacy Projects & Olympic based education as mentor/ambassador reported 48% & 47% respectively – variable least engaged in by Olympians was Aboriginal / refugee affairs at 3.41%





Objective 5



- To identify the ways in which Olympians are or have been involved expanding from the community in sport related organizations, groups and/or programs





Table 10: Highlights of Olympian Participation in Community Sport Related Organizations, Groups and/or Programs



Role	Local Sport Club	Provincial Sport Association
	f (%)	f (%)
Theme A: Leadership & Paid roles		
Leader Role	28 (23%)	17 (17%)
Paid Administration Staff	5 (4%)	9 (9%)
Coach	41 (34%)	26 (25%)
Official/Referee	10 (8%)	7 (7%)
Guest Speaker	36 (30%)	43 (42%)
Total A	120 (100%)	102 (100%)
Theme B: Nonprofit & cause related support		
Member	29 (17%)	21 (16%)
Volunteer	40 (24%)	31 (23%)
Mentor / Role Model	40 (24%)	32 (24%)
Donated Money / Gifts In Kind	20 (12%)	14 (10%)
Attended Games, Events, Programs	40 (24%)	36 (27%)
Total B	169 (100%)	134 (100%)
Total A + B	289	236
Respondents not Involved	10	22

Results grouped into Theme A – Leadership roles / B – Cause related support – Local Sport Clubs attracted the greatest engagement at 289 roles – most frequent roles Speaker, Coach, Mentor, Role Model & Attendance at events



Conclusion – Key Findings



- Olympians' national sport governing bodies (referring to their Olympic Committee and Sport Federation) are most trusted and given the most loyalty;
- grassroots community sport related organizations, groups and/or programs receives the most engagement overall by Olympians
- education was among the highest rated in value to Olympians;
- Olympians having been part of the Olympic Movement has left perceived leverageable social benefits pertaining to public perception, credibility and status.
- This study is expected to contribute to the creation of new knowledge in the field of sport, social sciences and Olympians.





RUSSIAN
INTERNATIONAL
OLYMPIC
UNIVERSITY



Thank you for
your undivided
attention 😊
Questions?

