The 2012 Olympic Ambassador Programs: Enhancing the Visitor Experience and Local Government Development of a Tourism Volunteering Legacy

Abstract

This paper examines how Ambassador volunteer programs during the London Olympics were constrained in their ability to create a sustainable tourism legacy. Interviews conducted in 2013 with managers of the 11 'Ambassador' programs at London and 10 other regional venues of the 2012 London Olympic and Paralympic Games show how the volunteer Ambassadors enhanced the tourism experience during the Games through the Ambassadors' pride in their home city, enthusiasm and local knowledge. However, although the Ambassador programs had aspirations to create a sustainable legacy of a pool of volunteers to support further tourist visits, this was severely constrained by cuts in local government budgets. The Government Olympic Executive provided a co-ordinating role leading up to the Games, but neither they nor the London Organising Committee for the Olympic Games (LOCOG) provided practical assistance with developing a legacy. This was a missed opportunity to channel the enthusiasm of mega-event volunteers into further volunteering to promote tourism.

Keywords: volunteer, Olympic Games, legacy, London 2012, funding

Introduction

This paper examines how the Ambassador program involved volunteers in enhancing the tourism experience of visitors during and after the 2012 Olympic Games. It explores the potential role of volunteers within sustainable tourism provision and limitations to realising this. Research on volunteering and tourism has grown substantially over the past 16 years since the publication of Wearing's seminal text 'Volunteer Tourism' in 2000. Indeed, the field could be said to be achieving maturity with major review papers (e.g. Wearing & McGehee, 2013) and special issues on the topic (e.g. issue 22(6) of this journal). However, much of this research has focused on volunteer tourism, that is, individuals travelling to a destination to volunteer. In comparison there has been little attention given to individuals volunteering within tourism contexts in their home destination (Holmes & Smith, 2009) and in particular, how this can be developed as a legacy of mega sports events, such as the Olympic Games.

This paper addresses this imbalance by investigating how local government established and managed volunteers at the host cities of the 2012 Olympic Games as 'Ambassadors' to enhance the visitor experience, and how it attempted to develop a pool of volunteers to promote further tourism. While the London Organising Committee of the Olympic Games and Paralympic Games (LOCOG) was focused solely on delivery of the Games (Nichols & Ralston, 2015) local governments had a long-term interest in promoting the image of their cities and, supported by a legacy of volunteers, encouraging repeat visits.

Promoting repeat tourism is an important potential legacy of mega-sports events, creating longer term benefits for both host cities and local residents from the major investment in the event. A positive legacy was achieved in Manchester following the 2002 Commonwealth Games, in part by the development of a pool of specialist local event volunteers (Nichols &

Ralston, 2012b). Other studies of event volunteers have suggested the considerable potential for engendering repeat volunteers in this way (Fairley, Kellett, & Green, 2007). The UK government attaches considerable importance to tourism as the third-largest export earning industry, providing 4.4% of the nation's jobs. The 2012 Olympics were seen "as a once-in-a-generation chance to boost Britain's tourism industry by attracting 4 million extra visitors to our country and creating 50,000 extra jobs over the next four years" (DCMS, 2011, p. 15), a legacy in which volunteers might be expected to play an important role.

First this paper outlines previous research on volunteering and tourism. Next, the importance of mega-events for tourism and the challenges for developing event legacies are discussed. An overview of the London Ambassador's program is provided. The methods are presented, followed by the findings and discussion.

Literature Review

Volunteering and tourism

Research on volunteering and tourism to date has primarily focused on volunteer tourism that is volunteers as 'guests' or tourists in a destination other than their home (Wearing & McGehee, 2013; Taplin, Dredge & Scherrer, 2014). In contrast, the role of volunteers as 'hosts', welcoming tourists into their home town has been largely overlooked (Smith & Holmes, 2009; Olsson, Therkelson & Mossberg, 2013). However, volunteers play an integral role in supporting tourism in their home destination. Volunteers meet and greet tourists arriving in a destination at airports and cruise ship terminals (Smith & Holmes, 2009) and operate visitor information centres (Smith & Holmes, 2012) as well as giving guided tours of local attractions (Holmes, Smith, Lockstone-Binney, & Baum, 2010). At visitor attractions, volunteers are active at zoos and aquaria (Holmes & Smith, 2010), museums and historic attractions (Orr, 2006). Volunteers assist tourists in emergencies, serving as surf life savers and in mountain or wilderness rescue teams (Uriely, Schwartz, Cohen & Reichel, 2002). Volunteers are also essential for many events and festivals, with smaller events entirely volunteer run (Davies, 2011) while mega-events recruit enormous volunteer workforces (Lockstone-Binney & Baum, 2009), the largest of which are associated with Olympic Games.

Volunteer tourists who travel to a destination to volunteer are typically involved in projects designed to support sustainable development within that destination. Projects can include environmental conservation (Cousins, 2008), working with wildlife (Broad & Jenkins, 2008), building new facilities within a community or facilitating community development (Zahra & McGehee, 2013) or supporting sustainable ventures such as organic farming (Yamamoto & Engelsted, 2014). In contrast, host volunteering within the volunteer's home destination is focused on promoting and sustaining that destination to improve the tourists' experience and support the tourism infrastructure. Volunteers provide services that the government or private operators are either unable or unwilling to provide. In England, recent cuts in public sector budgets means volunteers are increasingly being asked to deliver museums, libraries and leisure facilities as an alternative to closure (Nichols et al., 2015). A survey of visitor information centres in Western Australia revealed that volunteers were deployed because the workload exceeded the capacity of paid staff (Smith & Holmes, 2012). However, research suggests that volunteers offer an additional service to tourists, which is different from that provided by paid staff as well as cost savings (Jago & Deery, 2002). At the Western Australian visitor centres, volunteers fostered a sense of community ownership of the visitor centres. The volunteers enhanced the visitor experience because they enabled visitors to

interact with local people and they contributed passion and enthusiasm as "ambassadors for their town" (Smith & Holmes, 2012, p. 566).

In spite of the extensive role that volunteers play in the tourism sector within their home destination, few studies have examined this role. Rather the focus within extant research has been on the motivation of volunteers. While this is important, this does not address key questions around the value of the volunteers' contribution to the visitor experience or how sustainable these services are for the destination. Thus the potential of local resident volunteers to provide a service to tourists visiting their home destination has been recognised, but is underdeveloped. Volunteers can offer experiences that augment the tourists' visit and may allow a service to continue in the face of funding cuts, but those cuts may themselves limit the capacity to manage volunteers.

Volunteers at mega-events

The Olympic Games is the largest event globally to deploy volunteers. The London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games are commonly accepted to have deployed 70,000 'Games Makers' (House of Lords, 2013), although this total double-counts people who volunteered at both the Olympics and Paralympics. Similar to other studies of tourism volunteering, research on mega-event volunteers is focused on the motivation of mega-event volunteers. The unique size and status of the Olympic Games qualifies the application of theory from other events. Volunteering at the Olympic Games is generally a 'once-in-a-lifetime' experience for the volunteers, so their motivations and expectations are extremely high, as noted at the 2000 Sydney Olympics (Green & Chalip, 2004). Similar motivations were found at the 2002 Commonwealth Games (Downward & Ralston, 2005), and the Vancouver Winter Olympic Games (Dickson, Benson & Terweil, 2014).

Research into motivations of volunteers at London 2012 is important background to our analysis as it suggests the distinctive contribution these volunteers might make to the tourism experience. A survey of volunteers' motivations at the London 2012 Olympic Games used a principal component analysis of 11,451 responses to produce 8 components. The component with the highest mean score was labelled 'It's all about the Games'. Of the four motivation questions included in this component, three emphasised the distinctiveness of the Games (Dickson, Benson & Terweil, 2014). A completely independent factor analysis of the same data set (Alexander, Kim, & Kim, 2015) identified a motivational function which also contained these same three components. A second motivational cluster, identified by both Dickson et al. and Alexander's analysis of Dickson's data set, included motivational statements about 'giving something back' to London and the UK, and being proud of London and the UK. In the Dickson analysis this was the second strongest cluster of motivations, measured by the mean score on responses.

The collective sense of euphoria and camaraderie amongst volunteers at this scale of event can lead to a sense of emptiness once it is over. These emotions were reported at the Sydney Olympic Games (Cashman, 2006; Fairley at al., 2007) and the 2002 Commonwealth Games (Lumsdon, Ralston, & Downward, 2003; Ralston, Lumsdon & Downward, 2005). The number of volunteers and the strength of their emotional involvement suggest the potential for developing a legacy of continued volunteering is considerable. The Sydney Olympics did not have a formal mechanism for channelling this emotional energy into further volunteering although it was apparent in those who subsequently volunteered for the 2004 Athens Games (Fairley *et al*., 2007). After the 2002 Commonwealth Games, formal structures were put in

place to develop a volunteering legacy through the establishment of Manchester Event Volunteers, a broker service for event managers and event volunteers (Nichols & Ralston, 2012). To date this is the only successful mega-event volunteer legacy.

Mega-event volunteering legacies

The enormous cost involved in hosting a mega event means that there has been an increasing emphasis on creating a longer term benefit for the host community in the form of an event legacy. Initially, mega-event organisers focused on hard legacies such as new venues and infrastructure (Preuss, 2007). However, more recent attention has been given to the softer legacy, including feelings of pride among residents of the host city and community benefits such as an increase in post-event volunteering (Minnaert, 2012). Each host city will have a unique Olympic legacy potential because of its particular circumstances (Preuss, 2004). The International Olympic Committee lists possible legacies of hosting the Olympic Games to include sporting, social, environmental, urban and economic (IOC, 2013). There remains limited academic studies of these softer legacies, particularly volunteering (Doherty, 2009; Nichols & Ralston, 2015).

However, a genuine legacy must be shown to be the consequence of a strategy to achieve it (Weed, 2014). Creating a volunteer legacy was claimed to be an aim of the London 2012 Olympics, with the Deputy Prime Minister, Nick Clegg, stating (DCMS, 2012, 51):"At London 2012, we're looking not only to celebrate this Olympic spirit, but use it to get more people volunteering in future". Yet at the London 2012 Olympic Games, a draft volunteering legacy strategy, which drew on the experience of Manchester after the 2002 Commonwealth Games, was presented to LOCOG but was not adopted (Nichols, 2012). This was because LOCOG's function was to facilitate the delivery of the event and enhance the experience of visitors within the Olympic venues, with no remit for delivering a legacy (Girginov, 2012; Nichols & Ralston, 2014a).

As with all Olympic organizing committees, LOCOG was disbanded rapidly following the Games and no other organisation took a lead in a national strategy to develop a volunteering legacy (Nichols & Ralston, 2014b). Secondly, the 2005 Olympic bidding round for 2012 was the first in which legacy aspirations were a formal criteria for selecting host cities, and there were domestic political pressures to justify the expenditure on the Games both before and after the event. These political pressures lead to a 'legacy inflation' in government documents (Horne and Whannell, 2016, p40) as claiming a 'legacy' becomes a political project. An analysis of references to sports participation legacies in government documents prior to the Games has shown consistent high legacy aspirations, although "few, if any, organisations were willing to take accountability for any specific legacy outcomes" (Bloyce & Lovett, 2012, p. 361). As early as 2008 a tension between legacy rhetoric and reality was noted (Macrury, 2008). This inflated legacy discourse has been termed 'legacyspeak' (Cohen, 2013) and was noted in previous Olympic Games (MacAloon, 2008).

Nevertheless, an actual — although unplanned — legacy might have lessons for future events (Preuss, 2007; Dickson, Benson, & Blackman, 2011). A study of the volunteering legacy of the 2002 Commonwealth Games in Manchester, conducted in 2010 (Nichols & Ralston, 2012) detailed the establishment of an event / volunteer broker organisation which enabled a pool of experienced event volunteers which could be deployed at further events in Manchester over the following ten years. The availability of these volunteers was a factor in

attracting new events to Manchester, and contributed to Manchester being 'crowned' the World's Best Sports City 2008 for its successful hosting of six international sports events during the year (UK Sport, 2008). Although local government in Manchester had general aspirations for 'event themed' regeneration (Smith & Fox, 2007) it had not planned for the establishment of this organisation, which was referenced in the un-adopted volunteer legacy strategy for the 2012 Games and in plans for the Glasgow 2014 Commonwealth Games (Scottish Government, 2012).

A critical factor in establishing an event volunteering legacy following the 2002 Commonwealth Games was that Manchester City Council was in place both before and after the event and had an interest in developing a legacy (Nichols & Ralston, 2012). There was a separate budget for legacy programs, dedicated staff and a continuity of staff who shared these social objectives before and after the Games. Further, additional funding was generated through favourably received bids following the euphoria around the Games. In contrast, at the Olympic Games, 'for all the fine promises of legacy, when the circus leaves town, the organising committee shuts up shop, the budget for staging the games has been used up, and all too often in the past no public bodies are prepared to shoulder the responsibilities, and more significantly the costs, of ensuring that legacy promises can be fulfilled.' (Horne and Whannel, 2016, p 38.)

The 2012 Olympic Ambassador Programs

The official volunteer program for the London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games was the Games Makers, which was organised by LOCOG and provided an enormous range of support roles at the event. However, several other volunteer programs were established during the London Olympic Games of which the largest was the Team London Ambassadors. These were 8000 volunteers who were located at airports, rail station concourses and other tourist centres to support visitors to the 2012 Olympic Games in London and at the ten other regional locations for Olympic events (Harris, 2012). The regional venues, where Ambassadors were stationed, hosted football, water sports, cycling and mountain biking events. Both in London and at the regional venues the role of Ambassadors was not in the Olympic venues themselves but in the surrounding areas. Their high profile, ensured by their distinctive purple uniform (similar but distinct from the Gamesmakers), made it clear who they were and that they could offer advice to visitors trying to find their way around the city. Their roles varied in the different cities, depending on the Olympic events. For example, in Cardiff there were 11 football games over eight days but Ambassadors were also deployed to support pre-games training camps in this area. Table 1 shows the number of Ambassadors in each host location.

Insert table 1 about here

By far the largest number of Ambassadors was in London, where the main Olympic venues were situated, but numbers in the other ten regional locations were also significant
The London Ambassador Program was instigated by the Mayor of London following his visit to the Beijing Games where he experienced a similar program of host volunteers (Greater London Authority, ud; Harris, 2012). He commissioned Deloitte to produce a scoping plan in 2009, leading to the recommendation for a Host City Volunteer Program which was envisaged to work closely with LOCOG. The first program was established in 2010. That provided a role model for the other ten programs which were established during 2011 by

local government, city or county councils, although the London program was much larger and better resourced than the others. The management of the program has been praised as following good practice in volunteer management, in contrast to the official Games Maker program (Harris, 2012). The Ambassador program is still operating as it was established by an ongoing organization – the Mayor of London's office - unlike the Games Maker program.

The Ambassador program offers an opportunity for using a mega event to develop a longer term volunteer legacy to support tourism within the host destination. Previous studies of Olympic volunteers suggest that the Ambassadors would feel a strong motivation to volunteer at this unique event, but possibly a greater sense of pride in their home city as — unlike the Games Makers — all Ambassadors were residents of the cities in which they were volunteering. While the enthusiasm of volunteers is an important contribution to the event experience for visitors and competitors (Preuss, 2004), one might expect Ambassadors to offer something distinctive because they were all local people. One would similarly expect a sense of camaraderie to provide a potential volunteer event workforce — especially if reinforced by generating a distinct sub-culture of local city volunteers, as found in the Sydney Olympics (Fairely, *et al*., 2007) and after the 2002 Commonwealth Games.

Therefore this study had two questions:
1. How were the Ambassador Programs able to enhance the tourist experience during the Games?
2. How was local government able to sustain a legacy of volunteers to support tourism after the Games?

Methods

The Ambassador programs were unique to the 2012 Olympic Games and their host locations. Each developed independently, reflecting the individual circumstances of the city or region. Little previous research had considered the role of volunteers at mega-sports events in promoting tourism and the research into how volunteering legacies have been developed was extremely limited (Doherty, 2009; Nichols & Ralston, 2015). For these reasons, and because the sample of Ambassador Program managers was restricted, an exploratory inductive approach was adopted in this study using semi-structured in-depth interviews (Bryman, 2004; King & Horrocks, 2010). Interviews were conducted with each of the 11 Ambassador Program managers. Ten of these were conducted in the year following the 2012 Olympic Games and one (Manchester) was conducted shortly before the Games.

Interviewees were purposively sampled and approached directly to arrange interviews (Bryman, 2004). In some cases this was difficult as they had been relocated to other work or because reduced staffing levels meant they were under increasing time pressure at work. The majority of interviews were conducted face-to-face to gain the benefit of personal interaction and to allow researchers to visit some of the Olympic facilities. Where that was not possible telephone interviews were conducted for three locations (Surrey, Eton Dorney and Weymouth). Complete transcripts were sent back to interviewees so they could edit details they would not want to be publicly attributed and correct any inaccuracies. The research was conducted under the ethics procedures of the researcher's universities.

Interviews were between an hour and 100 minutes in length. The interviews were structured by the following themes:
1. The aims of the local authority in running the program

2. Descriptions of the Ambassadors' role and numbers
3. Procedures for recruitment and training
4. The relationship with LOCOG
5. Volunteering legacy aspirations and actions to achieve the legacy
6. Funding of the program
7. Links to other Olympic related program
8. Problems in delivering the program, and learning points.

Consistent with an inductive approach there was considerable scope for Ambassador managers to develop the themes in relation to their own experience (Bryman, 2004). These included the use of the Ambassadors to promote tourism and the legacy aspirations and constraints that participants experienced. Interviews lasted between one hour and 100 minutes and were held at the time and location convenient to the interviewees (King & Horrocks, 2010). The interviews were recorded and transcribed for analysis. The research team analysed the data thematically, using the approaches typically adopted in qualitative research that is reading sand re-reading the transcripts searching for themes (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Two researchers initially identified a set of codes to categorise the interview material. Codes were either derived from the literature or emerged iteratively from the interviews. Two researchers each independently coded four transcripts. These were then compared and the codes refined. Both researchers then independently coded a further two transcript each to ensure consistency. The NVivo 11 package was used for this process.

The volunteer Ambassadors themselves were not interviewed. This method was not central to the research objectives, which focused on the aims and organisation of the program and not all programs had the capacity to arrange focus groups. A questionnaire survey of Ambassadors' motives might have offered a comparison with motives of the 2010 Paralympic Games volunteers and the 2012 Games Makers (Dickson, Benson, & Terwiel, 2014). However, in making a comparison, the timing of the survey in relation to the event is important (the 2012 survey was distributed 2 days after the Paralympics, so a 'rosy glow' effect would have been at its greatest); the program managers would not have had the capacity to assist in this survey distribution; and the Olympic survey questions were not publicly available at the time. Extensive efforts were made to contact the GOE manager, but she had been redeployed to a different government department very soon after the Games and it was impossible to trace her through this or personal contacts. In respect to the aims of our research, this complete discontinuity of a central government officer with responsibility for a program legacy in the Department for Culture, Media and Sport suggests a low commitment to a Games legacy.

Findings

The findings are organised according to the two research questions. Sub-headings are used to present the key themes that were identified through the data analysis.

How were the Ambassador Programs able to enhance the tourist experience during the Games?

Local government aspired both to enhance the tourist experience and develop volunteering capacity

The interviews revealed that the Ambassador programs were both designed to contribute to tourism and to boost volunteering within the destination. The programs were planned to contribute to the visitor experience at the Games through providing information and an enthusiastic welcome to Ambassadors' home towns. There was a general aspiration that visitor return might thereby be affected positively. In Essex (a county level of local government whose area included the venue for the mountain biking event) a specialist Olympic legacy officer had been employed since January 2008 with a remit to use the Olympics to generate legacies of economic and sports development. Developing volunteers was central to this strategy:

> We felt passionate about creating a legacy infrastructure of some kind post 2012. So it wasn't just about the venue, it was about everything to do with 2012 and how we could utilise our volunteers. We saw that the Olympics could be that catalyst to create and embed a stronger infrastructure so that we could look at a legacy beyond 2012. So it really acted as a catalyst. (Essex)

Similarly in London, where the first program was established, with officers in post two and a half years before the games:

> Legacy was always key for us. We planned the legacy right from the very beginning. All the way through we didn't see the point of getting to the end of September 2012 waking up and going 'Hi what are you doing with them.' So for example this summer (2013) we had 750 Ambassadors out at 11 locations across London who were volunteering again, providing a visitor welcome service. (London)

And Coventry, where the manager claimed:

> [We] always had legacy in our thoughts and plans from the very beginning about what would happen next. We didn't want it to be a start and finish project that was seen as, as soon as the flame went out the project died. (Coventry)

London and Glasgow were particular cases because of London's status as a world tourist destination and Glasgow's impending hosting of the 2014 Commonwealth Games. A priority of the Mayor of London was: "to ensure a world class welcome to London to visitors, residents and commuters during the period of the Games" and "Delivering a legacy for London of improved and integrated services and welcome to London" (Greater London Authority, undated, p. 3).

Glasgow anticipated further tourists associated with the 2014 Commonwealth Games:

> Glasgow Sport also saw it as an opportunity to develop a skilled volunteer workforce that had hands-on events experience particularly as we are leading up to 2014 with the Commonwealth Games. So it was a good opportunity. (Glasgow)

Thus aspirations of inspiring repeat visits and developing volunteer support were apparent. But, as discussed below, five programs that explicitly mentioned these aspirations were restricted by local government's need to adapt to significant budget cuts.

Local volunteers made a distinctive contribution

The programs typically applied selection criteria of working, living, volunteering or being a student in the local area, which was defined by post code. A major function was to give visitors basic advice on how to get to venues and around the cities. So, because there was time for only one or two formal training sessions, it was important that Ambassadors had local knowledge – an attribute mentioned by 7 programs: "All the people that were picked … physically lived in the area…." (Surrey)

The programs were promoted as an opportunity for volunteers to express pride in their own city:

> *There was a lot of that coming through, saying it's a great opportunity to sell the city and tell people about the pride of Glasgow. [Our criteria were] just enthusiasm and knowledge about Glasgow. We set our criteria as either living, working, studying or volunteering in Glasgow so they had a connection with the city. (Glasgow)*

There was also an aspiration to develop local people through the experience of volunteering: *"We want to … give local individuals an opportunity to build some skills, to experience something new and to get involved"* (Newcastle).

Thus the programs were promoted as an opportunity to express civic pride, and five programs reported specifically that local pride was an attribute Ambassadors brought with them, linking in to the motivation that Olympic volunteers frequently mention in surveys (Dickson et al, 2014). An aim was to use volunteers' enthusiasm to enhance the visitor experience, in the same way it had motivated volunteers at the 2002 Commonwealth Games and in Australian visitor centres (Smith & Holmes, 2012). Nine of the programs explicitly stated that the role of the Ambassadors was to provide a positive atmosphere for visitors, for example:

> *Very much the aim was to provide a happy welcome face of the city to visitors that were coming in and to offer help around what's on, where to go, things to do, but also directions to the ground … That was the idea of the Ambassadors, to support the visitors that came in. (Newcastle)*

The interviewees were able to report that this had been achieved:

> *I think visitors really appreciated it. It was fantastic, they were lovely, it was really great to have people around to help them and give them information. It was like a walking tourist information centre. They were really smiling and welcoming and visitors said it was really really good. (Weymouth and Portland)*

However, unlike the involvement of volunteers in the Australian visitor centres, none of the UK programs regarded the Ambassadors as providing a service which paid staff were unavailable to do. In all cases the volunteers were seen as an additional service; that is, the original aim was to provide an additional service to the tourists which was not essential to the running of the Games:

"We wanted to make it clear that if there wasn't an ambassador on the street the Games would still run but the visitor experience would be nowhere near as good." (Newcastle)

How was local government able to sustain a legacy of volunteers to support tourism after the Games?

An approach to management was adopted to enhance the experience of the volunteers and to encourage repeat volunteering

The excess of supply over demand and the strong motivation for the 'once-in-a-lifetime experience' allowed LOCOG to treat volunteers in an unconventional way — for example, by giving them minimal choice over role, not paying travel expenses for interview or training, charging for refreshments at training events, communicating impersonally, allowing no flexibility over shifts, and requiring volunteers to make a separate trip to London to pick up their uniforms (Nichols & Ralston, 2014c). In contrast, the local Ambassador Programs adopted a much more 'membership management' approach (Meijs & Hoogstad, 2001) which took account of volunteers' needs. Ambassadors were offered choices over their shift times which were normally six hours long, starting at 9.00am, with a half hour meal break. Games Makers' shifts tended to be longer and could start at 5.30am or finish at 1.30am. Ambassadors were also offered choices over their deployment, given that there were few options. The process of application, recruitment and training of Ambassadors was much shorter than the 18 months for Games Makers.

One interviewee reported explicitly that the more volunteer-focused management style was intended to ensure a good experience for the public:

I had the visitor management and visitor information side of it ... from the outset they were teaching me how you look after your volunteers and that if you treat them the best you can you'll get the best out of them. (Eton Dorney)

Two reported that they wanted to treat volunteers well to encourage repeat volunteering, in one case explicitly with the 2014 Commonwealth Games in mind:

We always emphasised the thank you and telling them we realise you're giving your time that you're giving to us just to be here and that's really appreciated. ... Which is why with the survey that we did at the end ... all of them that returned the survey wanted to continue to volunteer which is fantastic. (Coventry)

We didn't want people to stop volunteering. The 2014 team from the Commonwealth Games ... their application process [was] starting within six weeks so it was a really good opportunity to let people know. (Glasgow)

Six programs specifically mentioned they felt volunteers should be treated with respect, for example:

> *Obviously an operational aspect was that if you don't treat these people the right way they're not going to turn up. But from the personal aspect .... I wanted people to have a good experience. If I'm responsible for that I have a moral obligation for that. (Newcastle)*

Constraints for creating a sustainable legacy

The role of the GOE in co-ordinating programs and facilitating sharing of experiences was noted above. Its post-Games report stated that a 'legacy' would be "Ongoing from September 2012" (Wanogho, 2012, p. 2), however this was clearly a case of 'legacyspeak' (Cohen, 2013). The GOE made "no central Olympic funding available to create the volunteer schemes in venue cities" (Wanogho, 2012, p. 5) and no Ambassador Programs reported having received direct advice on generating a legacy. Neither was such advice provided by LOCOG. As noted above, the GOE lead officer for Ambassador Programs was quickly redeployed to unrelated duties; a personal contact of hers reported in 2013 that she had "gone back to work in agriculture and the environment." The officer had produced a valuable post-Games report on the Ambassador Programs (Wanogho, 2012) in October 2012, but this was not available on a central government web site, only via Glasgow Life, a policy making section of Glasgow City Council who had referred to it in planning for the 2014 Commonwealth Games. This report concluded with a section entitled 'legacy / next steps'. This stated that:

> *All schemes are now looking at strategies for future volunteering. .... In the next few months schemes will be working with their local authority leaders to decide the future of their volunteer schemes. It is unlikely that local authorities will be able to provide funding, and a common theme amongst schemes is for commercial organisations putting on events to fund volunteering. The government cannot continue to provide the level of support to local authorities as during the lead up to the Games. However, the Office for Civil Society within the Cabinet Office will lead work to maintain government oversight of Games legacy including volunteering. (Wanogho, 2012)*

However, other than Coventry, where the City council had provided a grant to enable the Ambassador Program to continue until 2015 as a social enterprise, none of our interviewees reported receiving either funding from commercial organisations or support from central government to develop a volunteering legacy from the Ambassador Program. Although legacy was discussed at the Ambassador managers' coordination meetings, it was informal and ad hoc:

> *Yes we did talk legacy. I don't remember that there was much advice coming from them[LOCOG and GOE] but around the table we were all sharing our experiences and what our future plans were and we exchanged contact details ... (Eton Dorney)*

Although Central government did provide funds for other post-games volunteering initiatives —for example, the Big Lottery Fund gave £1.5m to develop the Join In program and £40m to the Spirit of 2012 Trust (2014), which also promotes volunteering — none of this funding was available to the ambassador managers. This indicates a lack of sustainable planning for volunteer legacies as there were funds for new initiatives but none for continuing programs, which had already demonstrated value.

The only resources provided by the GOE were the basic uniforms of Ambassadors but through its policy of 'brand protection' of the rights of the official Olympic sponsors (James & Osborn, 2012) it prevented local government generating income from local sponsorship deals with caterers or clothing manufacturers. For example, Newcastle had been offered sponsorship in kind by a prominent local bakery, to provide sandwiches and snacks, but were told by the GOE that "you'll have to get [the bakery]… to put them in plain bags." Similarly, it was suggested that to protect the brand of Adidas "if anybody turned up with trainers that were not Adidas then we issued them with black sticky tape to cover over the branding." (Eton Dorney)

Thus local government was left to develop any volunteering legacy by itself, with no practical support from central government. This reflected the lack of a volunteer legacy strategy for the Games as a whole (Nichols & Ralston, 2014c).

Local government legacy planning

The most common way in which local government could manage a volunteering legacy was to maintain a database of the Ambassadors and offer them further opportunities, in a similar manner to the Manchester Event volunteer organisation after the 2002 Commonwealth Games. The ability to do this depended on having staff in position with responsibility for this task before and after the Games. There were a number of different scenarios, each reflecting the resources available.

In Essex a specific officer — and in London a group of officers — had been appointed before the Games to develop a volunteering program; these were also in post after the Games with responsibility for a volunteering legacy. In London the officers managing the program were employed specifically for this role in January 2010. London was the most extensive and successful program. A web-based brokerage service called Team London was established in October 2012 and re-launched in April 2013. About 8,000 volunteers registered with it, representing 7,000 who had been Ambassadors in 2012 and 1,000 who had been Games Makers. This number grew to 14,500 by September 2013 when 500 volunteering opportunities were being promoted. This was by far the most extensive volunteering legacy program, reflecting the London program's resources, the number of Ambassadors, and the large number of events in London.

More specifically, to promote tourism, London ran a visitor welcome program from 27th July to 9th September 2013 at 11 key tourist locations involving 750 volunteers. This replicated the model delivered in 2012, using portable stands at which volunteers distributed maps and gave out information that answered questions such as: "what time is the Changing of the Guards; what time does the British Museum open and close; what to do today". According to the London interviewee, "It was hugely successful, volunteers loved it, and Londoners loved it." This filled a significant gap in the service to visitors in one of the world's leading tourist destinations:

> *The only official tourist centre [in London] closed down in June 2012 because the lease closed and because of all the budget cuts. The main two centres of information that we have left now are opposite St Paul's Cathedral … run by … the Corporation of London.* (London)

Similarly, but on a much smaller scale, Essex developed a database of volunteers, recruiting 270 from the 300 Ambassadors in 2012, and used a web site to link them with local events.

In other cases, responsibility for the Ambassador Program was added to the role of an existing officer because of the perceived natural synergy with present work and because the officer would be in place following the Games, providing a continuity of relationship between the officer and volunteers. For example, in Glasgow the three officers responsible for the Ambassador Program had this added to their roles as sports development officers. These officers already managed a small database of volunteers who had volunteered in previous sports events in the city. The Ambassador Program was seen as an opportunity to expand this service:

> *We've got a huge family of organisations … We have Sport, Museums, Libraries, Music and Art. The Ambassador Program simply lent itself to a variety of volunteers with a different make up that didn't have to be sports specific. What we were looking for was a passion for Glasgow. That includes a lot of people [for whom] sport wasn't necessarily their first priority.* (Glasgow)

Another location where local tourism was important was Eton Dorney, where the Ambassador Program supported the rowing events on the River Thames. Responsibility for continuing the post-event program was added to those of the Windsor volunteer centre manager. The Royal Borough of Windsor has 7.3 million visitors a year, mainly visiting Windsor Castle, a royal residence. The manager had a database of the Ambassadors from 2012 and used this to recruit volunteers for further sporting events and formal events at the castle and throughout the Royal Borough. For example, some had become volunteers at Ascot races and Lord's Cricket, others were Ceremonial Wardens for the guard change ceremonies at Windsor Castle and some had "become Street Angels. This is where they go out with the community support teams at night looking after people who may be in trouble through drink or whatever." However it had not been possible to establish a formal program because:

> *My workload has just gone through the roof this year so it's difficult because I don't have strong backing from any other part of the authority at the moment because local authority pressures on budgets and delivering services is so acute.* (Eton Dorney)

In Weymouth and Portland the Ambassador manager had aspired to develop a Dorset Event Volunteers program similar to Manchester Event Volunteers but had been unable to gain funding to do so. She had made an unsuccessful bid to the National Lottery:

> *We have got a paper with 10 key areas for a legacy of which volunteering is one of them … it's written down in black and white but what's going to happen with that without any support is pointless.* (Weymouth and Portland)

In other cases an officer had been deployed to manage the Ambassador Program, but was redeployed to another role after the Games and was unable to continue work with volunteers or manage a data base. An example was Newcastle, where the officer responsible for the Ambassador Program had been seconded from the volunteer support services, so had expertise and experience in volunteer management, but after the games was redeployed as a

night-time noise abatement officer – a completely unrelated role. Another similar example was Surrey (cycling), where the Ambassador team was disbanded in August 2012 and the manager redeployed to an unrelated shared service centre within the local authority. Nevertheless, the Ride London organisation continued to deploy Ambassadors for their cycling events. In Eton Dorney the intention to develop a scheme for Ambassadors to continue to support the visitor information team at the visitor centre was unable to be realised, despite the area having 7.3 million tourists a year. Following a 74% budget cut immediately after the Olympics, the manager had to refocus and prioritise activities to compensate for this deficit.

While a continued role for Ambassador managers may have been directly constrained by local government expenditure cuts, this also applied to organisations local government might have wished to partner with. For example, some programs recruited through local volunteer centres could have offered a viable organisation for managing a data base of Ambassadors and linking them to volunteering opportunities: as is the case in Essex. However local volunteer centres also experienced cuts in funding from central government — almost a quarter received income from central government sources in 2010/11, compared to seven per cent in 2011/12; and 63 per cent experienced a reduction in income in the year to 2013 (Civil Society.co.uk, 2013).

As illustrated above, a theme reoccurring throughout the interviews was how the management of the programs had been influenced by considerable cuts to local government expenditure imposed by central government from October 2011. Cuts to public expenditure are aimed to contribute 77% of the plan to reduce the national deficit over four years, and the largest share of this comes from local government budgets which have been cut by an average of £130.06 per person over the period 2010–2015 (SPERI, 2014). This climate of financial constraint affected all aspects of management of the Ambassador Programs and its ability to deliver a legacy.

Conclusion

Volunteers deployed as Ambassadors at key locations across the UK during the 2012 Olympics made a distinctive contribution to the tourist experience. Ambassadors were able to contribute pride in their city, local knowledge and enthusiasm, as do local volunteers in tourist and heritage attractions (Orr, 2006; Smith & Holmes, 2012). However it is impossible to tell what difference the Ambassadors made to visitors' intentions to return.

Program managers realised that Ambassadors had the potential to continue after the Games as repeat volunteers at other events and at tourist destinations. The most significant contribution in this respect was in London where the biggest program was able to fill a major gap in the service offered to tourists in one of the world's leading tourist destinations. The government policy on developing tourism through the Olympics recognised "an opportunity to create a continuous and sustained improvement in our visitor economy" using "the major international cultural and sporting events which Britain is expecting to host over the next 10 years" (DCMS, 2011, p. 15). Of course, as not all the Ambassador Programs were able to contact the Ambassadors to ask if they would like to volunteer again, it is not possible to quantify the lost potential in repeat volunteers at these events. After the 2002 Commonwealth Games just under 20% of volunteers replied positively to an invitation to "find out about other volunteering opportunities" (Nichols & Ralston, 2012a, p. 173) so the motivation for volunteering at such a prestigious event may have limited transferability to less prestigious

ones. On the other hand, if the Ambassadors were strongly motivated by an identification with their home city, then the potential for repeat volunteering is significant.

The ability to develop Ambassadors into a pool of volunteers to support further tourism depended on having the staff available to manage this effort. As in the London Olympics generally, changed economic circumstances reduced the ability to translate legacy aspirations into reality, and by the time the Ambassador Programs were delivered local government was already having to adapt to major cuts in its budgets. However, where there were staff in place to manage the volunteers before and after the Games and there were resources to deliver a program, or at least maintain a data base, it was possible to direct the energy and enthusiasm of Ambassadors into further tourism related volunteering. This was enhanced if the managers' pre-Games role had synergy with a volunteer development program — as for example in Glasgow, Coventry and Cardiff. However, even if synergy existed, lack of resources could prevent a program being developed, as in Eton Dorney, Weymouth and Portland. This emphasises the simple lessons from the development of the Manchester Event Volunteering program after the 2002 Commonwealth Games: a legacy requires staff, resources, vision and a political will.

Where these came together it was because local government took the lead. LOCOG's role was limited to delivering the Games, this limitation being understood as a consequence of regulatory capitalism (Nichols & Ralston, 2014a). The Government Olympic Executive also had no remit for a legacy. At national level by August 2010 "there were no politically legitimate legacy plans in place" (Weed, 2012, p. 94) for any aspect of the Games, as responsibility fell into a political vacuum. As Gold and Gold put it, in relation to previous Olympic Games, "what is certain is that the circus will have left town long before the day of reckoning arrives" (Gold & Gold, 2007, p. 320). The organisations with the greatest interest in developing a volunteering legacy were the local governments, who, as in the example of the 2002 Commonwealth Games, would be in place before and after the Games. However, while Manchester City Council was able to gain post-games grants to support a volunteer program after the 2002 Commonwealth Games and then sustain it until 2012, in 2013 local government had to respond to significant funding cuts so volunteer development projects had to be grafted on to existing work, if staff were still available to manage them.

This paper used a qualitative, exploratory approach, which involved interviewing all the program managers. However, it was not possible to interview the GOE officer, which is a limitation of this study. It is a challenge with event legacy research to contact all relevant participants as after the event much of the event infrastructure is disbanded and staff redeployed. Research on event legacies has been limited by the use of cross-sectional research, as in this paper. Further research could include a longitudinal approach. It would also be valuable to gather data on the contribution of the Ambassadors to the experience of the tourists who they interacted with, to gain a broader understanding of their contribution to tourism in the host destination.

Further research could explore if it was possible to generate a sustainable legacy of volunteers to support tourism from the 2014 Commonwealth Games in Glasgow which used 15,000 'Clydesiders', as the Games volunteers were termed. Compared to the 2012 Olympics Games Makers, a larger proportion of 'Clydesiders' are likely to be available and willing to take this role as they were more likely to be recruited locally. However, the potential to develop this group of volunteers depends on the extent to which the Glasgow organisers replicate the approach of LOCOG in managing volunteers purely as a resource to

deliver the Games, or the extent to which the city council can replicate Manchester's forward-looking model from 2002, which remains the most successful mega-event volunteer legacy program to date. Glasgow City Council will also have had to adapt to the same cuts in public funding which constrained the Ambassador programs in our sample.

Mega-event legacy planning remains contentious, while host governments continue to develop specific plans and assign appropriate resources.

References

Alexander, A., Kim, S., & Kim, D. (2015). Segmenting volunteers by motivation in the 2012 London Olympic Games. *Tourism Management*, *47*, 1–10.

Bloyce, D., & Lovett, E. (2012). Planning for the London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic legacy: A figurational analysis. *International Journal of Sport Policy and Politics, 4*(3), 361–377.

Broad, S., & Jenkins, J. 2008. Gibbons in their midst? Conservation volunteers' motivations at the Gibbon Rehabilitation Project, Phuket, Thailand. In K. Lyons & S. Wearing (Eds.), Journeys of discovery in volunteer tourism: international case study perspectives (pp. 72-85). Wallingford: CABI.

Bryman, A. (2004). *Social research methods*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cashman, R. (2006). *The bitter-sweet awakening: The legacy of the Sydney 2000 Olympic Games.* Petersham NSW: Walla Walla Press.

Civil Society co.uk. (2013). *Volunteer centres' income has fallen 'substantially', NCVO survey finds.* http://www.civilsociety.co.uk/finance/news/content/15152/volunteer_centres_see_income_fall_finds_ncvo_survey (accessed 6 May 2014).

Cohen, P. (2013). On the wrong side of the track? East London and the post Olympics. In V. Girginov (Ed.) *Handbook of the London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games, Volume Two: Celebrating the Games* (pp. 297–302). London: Routledge.

Cousins, J. (2007). The role of UK-based conservation tourism operators. *Tourism Management, 28*, 1020-1030.

Davies, A., (2011). Local leadership and rural renewal through festival fun: the case of Snowfest. In Gibson, C. & Connell, J. (Eds). *Festival places: revitalising rural Australia*. Wallingford: Channel View, pp.61-73.

Deloitte. (2010). A lasting legacy. How major sporting events can drive positive change for host communities and economies. https://www.google.co.uk/webhp?ie=utf-8&oe=utf-8&gws_rd=cr&ei=47XVVd62Mc_e7AbKgKXIBA#q=Deloitte+A+lasting+legacy+How+major+sporting+events+can+drive+positive+change+for+host+communities+and+economies+Global+Public (accessed 20 August 2015).

Department for Culture, Media and Sport. (2012). *Beyond 2012: the London 2012 legacy story.*
https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/77993/DCMS_Beyond_2012_Legacy_Story.pdf (accessed 2 May 2013).

Department for Culture, Media and Sport. (2011). *Government Tourism Policy*
https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/78416/Government2_Tourism_Policy_2011.pdf (accessed 18 July 2014).

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

Dickson, T., Benson, A., & Terwiel, A. (2014). Mega-event volunteers, similar or different? Vancouver 2010 vs London 2012. *International Journal of Event and Festival Management, 5*(2), 164–179.

Doherty, A. (2009). The volunteer legacy of a major sport event. *Journal of Policy Research in Tourism, Leisure and Events, 1*(3), 185-207.

Downward, P., & Ralston, R. (2005). Volunteer motivation and expectations prior to the XVII Commonwealth Games in Manchester, UK: A quantitative study. *Tourism and Hospitality: Planning* and *Development, 2*(1), 17–26.

Fairley, S., Kellett, P., & Green, B. C. (2007). Volunteering abroad: Motives for travel to volunteer at the Athens Olympic Games. *Journal of Sport Management, 21*, 41–57.

Girginov, V. (2012). Governance of the London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games. In V. Girginov (Ed.), *The London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games, Volume One: Making the Games* (pp. 130–144). London: Routledge.

Gold, J., & Gold, M. (Eds) (2007). *Olympic cities: City agendas, planning and the world's games 1896–2012.* London: Routledge.

Greater London Authority. (undated). *London Ambassadors, welcome to London and accessibility programs*, Mayoral Decision – MD808.
http://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/MD808%20London%20Ambassadors%20PDF.pdf (accessed 2 May 2013).

Green, B., & Chalip, L. (2004). Paths to volunteer commitment: Lessons from the Sydney Olympic Games. In R. A. Stebbins, & M. Graham (Eds), *Volunteering as leisure/ leisure as volunteering: An international assessment* (pp. 49–67). Wallingford: CABI Publishing.

Harris, M. (2012). London's Olympic Ambassadors: A legacy for public policy implementation. *Voluntary Sector Review, 3*(3), 417-242.

Holmes, K. & Smith, K. (2009). *Managing volunteers within tourism: Attractions, destinations and events.* Oxford: Elsevier.

Holmes, K., Smith, K., Lockstone-Binney, L., & Baum, T. (2010). Developing the dimensions of tourism volunteering. *Leisure Sciences*, *32*, 255–269.

House of Lords. (2013). *Keeping the flame alive: The Olympic and Paralympic Legacy —
Select Committee on Olympic and Paralympic Legacy, Chapter: The Economic Social and
Cultural Legacy.*
http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/ld201314/ldselect/ldolympic/78/7811.htm
(accessed 26 June 2014).

Horne, J. & Whannel, G. (2016). *Understanding the Olympics*. Routledge: London.

IOC. (2013). *Factsheet, Roles and responsibilities during the Olympic Games*. Lausanne:
International Olympic Committee (IOC).

Jago, L., & Deery, M. (2002). The role of human resource practices in achieving quality
enhancement and cost reduction: An investigation of volunteer use in tourism organisations.
International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 14(5), 229–236.

James, M., & Osborn, G. (2012). The Olympic laws and the contradictions of promoting and
preserving the Olympic ideal. In V. Girginov (Ed.), *The London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic
Games, Volume one: Making the Games* (pp. 74–86). London: Routledge.

King, N. & Horrocks, C. (2010). *Interviews in qualitative research*. London: Sage.

Lockstone, L. & Baum, T. (2009). The public face of event volunteering at the 2006
Commonwealth Games: the media perspective. *Managing Leisure,* 14(1), 38-56.

Lumsdon, L., Ralston, R., & Downward, P. (2003). *An evaluation of the motivations,
expectations and experiences of volunteers prior to and during the XVII Commonwealth
Games, Manchester, UK, Report 2: Qualitative Analysis.* International Tourism Centre,
Manchester Metropolitan University.

MacAloon, J. (2008) 'Legacy' as managerial/magical discourse in contemporary Olympic
affairs. *The International Journal of the History of Sport*, *25*(14): 2060–2071.

Macrury, I. (2008) Re-thinking the Legacy 2012: The Olympics as commodity and gift.
Twenty-First Century Society: Journal of the Academy of Social Sciences, 3(3), 297–312,
DOI: 10.1080/17450140802447238.

Meijs, L., & Hoogstad, E. (2001) New ways of managing volunteers: Combining
membership management and program management. *Voluntary Action, 3*(3), 41–61.

Miles & Huberman (1994). *Qualitative Data Analysis: An Expanded Sourcebook*. London,
Sage publications.

Minnaert, L. (2012). An Olympic legacy for all? The non-infrastructural outcomes of the
Olympic Games for socially excluded groups (Atlanta 1996–Beijing 2008). *Tourism
Management, 33*(2), 361-370.

Nichols, G. (2012). Volunteering for the Games. In V. Girginov (Ed.), *The London 2012
Olympic and Paralympic Games, Volume One: Making the Games* (pp. 215–224). London:
Routledge.

Nichols, G. & Ralston, R. (2015). The legacy costs of delivering the 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games through regulatory capitalism. *Leisure Studies* 34(4), 389–404.

Nichols, G., Forbes, D., Findlay-King, L. & MacFadyen, G. (2015) Is the asset transfer of public leisure facilities in England an example of associative democracy? *Administrative Sciences. 5*(2), 71–87.

Nichols, G., & Ralston, R. (2014 a). The 2012 Ambassadors: Second class Olympic volunteers or the best potential for developing a volunteering legacy from the Games? In K. Smith., L. Lockstone-Binney, K. Holmes & T. Baum. *Event Volunteering, International Perspectives on the Event Volunteering Experience* (pp. 167–181). Abingdon: Routledge.

Nichols, G., & Ralston, R. (2014b). Volunteering for the Games. In V. Girginov (Ed.) *Handbook of the London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games, Volume two: Celebrating the Games* (pp. 53-70). London: Routledge.

Nichols, G., & Ralston, R. (2012). Lessons from the volunteering legacy of the 2002 Commonwealth Games. *Urban Studies*, *49*(1), 165–180.

Olsson, A., Therkelsen, A., & Mossberg, L. (2013). Making an effort for free – volunteers' roles in destination-based storytelling. *Current Issues in Tourism,* Published online: 19 April 2013.

Orr, N. (2006). Museum volunteering: Heritage as 'serious leisure', *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, *12*(2), 194–210.

Preuss, H. (2007). The conceptualization and measurement of mega sport event legacies. *Journal of Sport and Tourism*, 12(3/4), 207–227.

Preuss, H. (2004). *The economics of staging the Olympic Games: A comparison of the Games 1972–2008.* Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Ralston, R., Lumsdon, L., & Downward, P. (2005). The third force in events tourism: Volunteers at the XVII Commonwealth Games. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 13*(5), 504–519.

Scottish Government. (2012). *Legacy lessons from past large-scale sporting events: review of evidence.* http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Resource/0040/00408160.pdf; http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2012/10/7250/1 (accessed 10 December 12).

Sheffield Political Economy Research Institute (SPERI). (2014). Local authority spending cuts and the 2014 English local elections. http://speri.dept.shef.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2014/07/Brief6-local-authority-spending-cuts.pdf (accessed 19 January 2015).

Smith, A., & Fox, T. (2007). From 'event-led' to 'event-themed' regeneration: The 2002 Commonwealth Games legacy program, *Urban Studies*, *44*(5/6), 1125–1143.

Smith, K., & Holmes, K. (2012). Visitor centre staffing: Involving volunteers. *Tourism Management, 33*, 562–568.

Smith, K., & Holmes, K. (2009). Researching volunteers in tourism: Going beyond. *Annals of Leisure Research, 12*(3/4), 403–420.

Spirit of 2012 Trust. (2014). http://www.spiritof2012trust.org.uk/what-we-do/ (accessed 26 June 2014).

Taplin, J., Dredge, D. and Scherrer, P. (2014). Monitoring and evaluating volunteer tourism: a review and analytical framework. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, *22(6),* 874-897.

UK Sport. (2008). *Manchester named World's Best City for Sport*. http://www.uksport.gov.uk/news/manchester_named_world_best_city_for_sport (accessed 6 May 2014).

Uriely, N., Schwartz, Z., Cohen, E., & Reichel, A. 2002. Rescuing hikers in Israel's deserts: community altruism or an extension of adventure tourism? Journal of Leisure Research, 34(1), 25-36.

Wanogho, M. (2012). *Volunteering (UK-wide Ambassador schemes):Lessons learnt.* Government Olympic Executive, DCMS. http://www.glasgowlife.org.uk/about-us/Service%20Review/Glasgow%20Sport%20Service%20Review/Documents/GOE%20Volunteering%20lessons%20learnt%20report%20v3.docx.pdf (accessed 2 May 13).

Wearing, S., & McGehee, N. (2013). Volunteer tourism: A review. *Tourism Management*, *38*, 120–130.

Weed, M. (2014). London 2012 legacy strategy: Did it deliver? In V. Girginov (Ed.), *Handbook of the London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games. Volume Two: Celebrating the Games* (pp. 281–294). London: Routledge.

Weed, M. (2012). London 2012 legacy strategy: Ambitions, promises and implementation plans. In V. Girginov (Ed.), *Handbook of the London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games. Volume one: Making the Games* (pp. 87–98) London: Routledge.

Yamamoto, D. & Engelsted, A. (2014). Worldwide opportunities on organic farms (WWOOF) in the United States: Locations and motivations of volunteer tourism host farms. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 22*(6), 964-982.

Zahra, A. & McGehee, N. (2013). Volunteer tourism: a host community capital perspective. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 42:22-45.

Table 1. Location and Scale of Ambassador Programs

Program Host Location	Olympic Venue	No. Ambassadors
Cardiff	Football stadium	400
Coventry	Football stadium	690
Essex	Mountain bike course	400
Eton Dorney	Rowing	500
Glasgow	Football stadium	240
Kent	Paralympic cycling course	300
Newcastle	Football stadium	400
Old Trafford and Manchester	Football stadium	700
Surrey	Cycling course	450
Weymouth and Portland	Sailing	800
London	Main Olympic venues	8,000

Source: Adapted from Wanogho, M. (2012) *Volunteering (UK-wide Ambassador schemes)*