

Legacies of the 2016 Olympic Games: Perception of Public Policies Researchers on Sport and Leisure

Legados dos Jogos Olímpicos 2016: Percepção de Pesquisadores de Políticas Públicas de Esporte e Lazer

Nathalia Sara Patreze^a; Cinthia Lopes da Silva^{*a}; Tomeka Michelle Robinson^b

^aMethodist University of Piracicaba, Graduate Program in Human Movement Sciences. SP, Brasil.

^bHofstra University. NY, United States.

*E-mail: cinthiasilva@uol.com.br

Recebido em: 26/02/2020

Aprovado em: 04/07/2020

Abstract

Sports megaevents generate both positive and negative impacts to the host nation, and it is fundamental that the country have elements and research to have a base for the public policies construction of sports and leisure, aimed at broadening the positive impacts and reducing the negative ones which stem from such events. The objectives of this research were: to identify and analyze the meanings and positive and negative social impacts of Olympic Games Rio 2016 for public policies researchers of sports and leisure. Bibliographic and field research were used as methodological procedures and this is a qualitative study. The field research was carried out with 10 Brazilian public policies researchers of sports and leisure. The main positive social impact was the sport itself. The main negative impact mentioned was related to the absence of legacy for the sport. The interviewees also mentioned as positive and negative impact the infrastructure created in function of the sports megaevents. For researchers, the creation and / or improvement of the city structure and the host country can improve people's lives: access to means of transport and the right to sports and leisure. However, factors such as high costs and works over-billing, the removal of people, corruption and lack of actions that allow access to the spaces and equipment built are pointed out as negative by the researchers regarding the infrastructure.

Keywords: Sports. Public Policy. Leisure Activities. Culture.

Resumo

Os megaeventos esportivos geram impactos positivos e negativos para o país anfitrião, sendo fundamental que o país sede tenha elementos e pesquisas para ter uma base para a construção de políticas públicas de esporte e lazer, visando ampliar os impactos positivos e reduzir os impactos negativos que decorrem de tais eventos. Os objetivos desta pesquisa foram identificar e analisar os impactos sociais positivos e negativos dos Jogos Olímpicos 2016 para pesquisadores de políticas públicas de esporte e lazer. Pesquisa bibliográfica e de campo foram utilizadas como procedimentos metodológicos e trata-se de um estudo qualitativo. A pesquisa de campo foi realizada com 10 pesquisadores brasileiros de políticas públicas de esporte e lazer. O principal impacto social positivo foi o próprio esporte. O principal impacto negativo mencionado foi relacionado à ausência de legado para o esporte. Os entrevistados também mencionaram como impacto positivo e negativo a infraestrutura criada em função dos megaeventos esportivos. Para os pesquisadores, a criação e / ou melhoria da estrutura da cidade e do país hospedeiro pode melhorar a vida das pessoas: acesso a meios de transporte e direito ao esporte e lazer. No entanto, fatores como altos custos e excesso de faturamento das obras, afastamento de pessoas, corrupção e falta de ações que permitam o acesso aos espaços e equipamentos construídos são apontados como negativos pelos pesquisadores em relação à infraestrutura.

Palavras-chave: Esportes. Política Pública. Atividades de Lazer. Cultura.

1 Introduction

Sports megaevents has received much attention since the 1960s. Getz¹ defines these events as temporary occurrences, either planned or unplanned. They have a finite length, and for planned events this is usually fixed and publicized. Events are transient, and every event is a unique blending of its duration, setting, management, and people. The experience in hosting sports megaevents in Brazil started with the University World Games in 1963 (U63) in Porto Alegre and the Pan-American Games in 1963 in São Paulo. From 2000 on, Brazil resumed hosting sports megaevents, among them the three main megaevents: Pan-American Games and Parapan-American Games in 2007, which represented Brazil's maturity in the

hosting of sports megaevents and led to the 2014 FIFA World Cup and to Rio 2016 Olympic Games and Paralympic Games.

In the 1990s, sports megaevents started to be used more and more in both developing and developed countries as a means to promote economic development, boost tourism, enhance national identity, and social cohesion, and promote healthy lifestyles²⁻⁴. As a result, there has been a lot of competition amongst nations for the chance to host these. The hosting of sports megaevents generates both positive and negative impacts and legacies for the host nation. Therefore, it is extremely important to study and plan sports megaevents and public policies of sports and leisure in order to maximize the positive impacts and legacies while minimizing the

negative impacts. This is important because careful planning can generate many benefits to the city and its population, especially in more impoverished areas with bad infrastructure, so that the lower classes can have access to services as well as sports and leisure.

The responsibility of hosting sports megaevents has been motivated primarily by the development in various sectors such as economic, social and environmental ones. Even though most attention is given to economic and financial “returns” from these big scale events, research shows that the long term results may be eminently social⁵. Therefore, there must be a change in order to examine the social impacts related to sports instead of examining only the economic benefits of such events. In other words, the priority of the event must be the creation of national programs focused on the community which serves the population of the country in order to guarantee a long-lasting legacy to the Brazilian people.

Preuss *et al.*⁶ evaluates “impacts” as the effects which occur during the event preparation and execution, *i.e.*, in the short term, whereas the “legacies” are the results that endure after the end of the event, in the long term. The impacts and legacies may be positive and/or negative for a certain social class inside a historical context and such occurrence can modify itself in the long term. Therefore, it is difficult to measure and classify the positive and negative impacts and legacies of a determined sports megaevent because it may cause different results to the host city/country at different times.

The realization of megaevents demands a high financial investment. These conceptions are of importance because matters related to costs and distribution of construction in urban areas are the main points to be planned and they can interfere directly on the impacts and legacies. Research has shown that the economic benefits that many hope for are often overestimated⁷. Additionally, according to Malfas *et al.*⁸ infrastructural development that is not directly related to the event often takes place, such as leisure facilities, commercial centres, and open spaces, which aim to improve the physical appearance of the host city or region. Consequently, it has become increasingly common for mega-sporting events to be used as a trigger for large scale urban improvement.

Therefore, the public policies take on importance because they are present in sports megaevents and must acknowledge the needs and possibilities of intervention in order to improve people’s lives. The public policies of sports and leisure in the context of sports megaevents must democratize matters related to the population social rights, minimize social, economic and cultural barriers, make leisure venues available for public use, provide equipment maintenance and train personnel to assist the audience⁹.

Based on these considerations, the objectives of this research were to identify and analyze the positive and negative social impacts of the 2016 Olympic Games for researchers in

public policies of sports and leisure.

2 Material and Methods

This investigation is a qualitative study. According to Minayo¹⁰ the qualitative research works with the “universe of meanings, aspirations, beliefs, values and attitudes, which correspond to a deeper realm of relations, processes and phenomena that cannot be reduced to the operationalization of variables”.

The first stage of the investigation was centered on the bibliographic research about sports megaevents in Brazil and the public policies of sports and leisure (it was carried out from August 2016 – November 2016). Livraries were used of both private and public universities for access to books, papers, articles, dissertations and thesis and, journals of Physical Education, sports and public policies were also checked using as Keywords: Olympic Games, Sports Megaevents, Public Policies, Leisure, Sport, Society, Culture were used. In order to analyze the texts, the five analytical stages from Severino were used¹¹: textual, thematic and interpretation, problematization and personal synthesis.

The second research stage was to conduct interviews with public sports and leisure policies researchers. 10 people with experience in the field of public policies on sport and leisure over a 10-year period (2006 to 2015) were interviewed. The criterion for selecting the subjects was to identify the publications of these researchers, so our selection was based on subjects who developed works related to public policies on sport and leisure. In order to recruit the interviewees, data were collected about master’s and doctorate’s thesis which had been published between the years 2006-2015 from the Database of Thesis from CAPES and from the Brazilian Digital Library of Thesis and Dissertations (BDTD) from the Brazilian Institute of Information in Science and Technology (IBICT). Contact with researchers was made through the lattes platform. The researchers who agreed to participate signed a written consent statement. The interviews were conducted by phone or via Skype, taking into account the interviewee’s distance and availability. The interviews were recorded, so that the transcripts could be analyzed.

These subjects brought at a about their vision of public policies of sports and leisure and also the social impacts of sports megaevents. 10 was considered as the minimum number of interviewees since there was data saturation as the criterion. In order to reach data saturation, at least 6 answers were considered that were approximate. If this number had not been reached in the group of 10, there would have been continuation to carry out the interviews. This criterion of data saturation was based on Duarte¹².

Data were gathered by means of the semistructured interview technique by Triviños¹³. The choice for qualitative inquiry was to allow the researchers to understand multiple, socially constructed realities. Several characteristics are

inherent in naturalistic inquiry: natural setting, use of a human instrument, utilization of tacit knowledge, qualitative methods, purposive sampling, grounded theory, inductive data analysis, emergent design, and criteria for insuring trustworthiness¹⁴.

The interviews were based on questions such as: 1) What is your experience with research related to sports megaevents and public policies of sport and leisure? and 2) What are the positive and negative impacts of Olympic Games 2016? In the third and last stage of the field research, a qualitative analysis of the interviews was carried out based on bibliographic research.

The field research did not present any risk to the interviewees once their opinions as participants were respected. The research was approved by the Ethics Committee through protocol 05/2016.

3 Results and Discussion

Alphabetical order “A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I and J” will be used to refer to the interviewees when presenting the results to respect their privacy.

The first question was “what is your research experience related to sports megaevents and public policies of sport and leisure?” Tables 1 and 2 show the answers to this question.

Table 1 - Research experience related to public policies of sport and leisure

Subject of the research	Researchers
“Programa Segundo Tempo (PST)” (government program)	A, F & G
Program of sport and leisure in the city	A
Financing and budget for public policies of sport and leisure	B
Public policies of sport and leisure for alternative sport modalities	C
Intersectoral public policies of sport and leisure and PRONASCI	D
Public policies of the Ministry of Sport	E
National Policy of Sport	F
Municipal public policies of sport and leisure	G & H
Public policies of sport and leisure aimed at youngsters from poor neighborhoods in the city of Rio de Janeiro	I
Impact of the 2014 FIFA World Cup on the public policies of sport in São Paulo city	J

Source: Research data.

Table 2 - Experience related to sports megaevents

Subject of the study	Researchers
Voluntary work	A & H
Legacy to the public policies of sport and leisure	B & E
Legacy of sports megaevents	D
Olympic Games and the transformations in the cities	C
Scholarship and financial support for Olympic athletes	F
Public policies of sport and leisure from 2000 to 2008	G
Olympic Village	I
2014 FIFA World Cup	J

Source: Research data.

All the interviewees have experience with research related to public policies of sport and leisure and sports megaevents. They have pointed out that this research is of importance, and that it must be published, and that they feel happy to contribute with this kind of investigation, mainly because of the fact that Brazil has hosted sports megaevents in the past few years. “It’s great you’re doing a research about public policies and their relation to megaevents. Now that those megaevents have already happened, we have a lot to study and gather data to see what was really left behind” (Interviewee D). In addition to the experience related to this research, the interviewees pointed out that they have already discussed about sports megaevents in their study groups (Interviewees A, C and F). Some have already taught courses about sports megaevents (Interviewee B); some have been involved with management and policies (Interviewees A, D, E, F and G) and some have taken part in events and publications (Interviewees D and E).

The researchers have already mentioned the fact that sports megaevents are present in public policies of sport and leisure. “The public policy makes us the axis through which we can understand the megaevent. Therefore, the megaevent is understood as the public policy of sport and leisure.” (Interviewee A). Interviewee G said that sports megaevents are a part of public policies of sport and leisure proposed by the Federal government from 2000 to 2016, and that such events comprise and unify sports, economic and social policies. The researchers have studied megaevents and public policies of sport and leisure from social and anthropological perspectives.

The second question from the semistructured interview was “what are the positive and negative impacts of Olympic Games 2016?”. There were some similar and some very different answers, but they all agreed it was a complex question to answer.

3.1 Positive Social Impacts

Table 3 below presents the main positive social impacts from Olympic Games 2016 in the interviewees’ opinion. Then, analysis was carried out regarding the data obtained.

Table 3 – Positive social impacts described by the researchers

Positive Social Impacts	Researchers
Sport	A, B, D, E, G & I
Knowledge about the organization of events	A, D, E & F
Infrastructure	B, E, G & H
Country’s visibility	B, D & F
Tourism	B & E
Social mobilizations	A
Investment increase for high performance sport	B
Brazilian supporters involvement	D
There are no social positive impacts	J

Source: Research data.

3.1.1 Sport

Interviewees A, B, D, E, G, I mentioned sport in itself as a positive impact from Rio 2016. Interviewee A says for those who live and breathe sport, organize themselves and idealize it as their identity, it was really nice to see that moment; so we could see that there were very committed sports people and athletes and the general public who also love sport and went there to celebrate it.

Interviewee G says that the Olympic Games allow other sport modalities, not only the traditional ones. It is the moment when people are in touch with the culture of sport, and get to know other sports, including the Brazilian athletes who are more often unknown figures, and all that contributes to the people's mobilization around the event⁷.

As another positive impact, interviewees D and F mentioned the Paralympic Games talking about the athletes' stories of overcoming their disabilities, and about the possibility of the sport for people with disabilities to get more visibility, since people got carried away with the Paralympic Games, from a social point of view, the games contributed a great deal for their own public policies, or at least to raise awareness for athletes with disabilities because the public was paying more attention to them. (Interviewee F). When we watch, follow and see all the very distinct body shapes and all the challenges they have to overcome, both physically and emotionally, we get surprised and in awe of their potential, performance, achievement and adaptation to compete, that we cannot imagine how all of that is even possible¹⁵.

3.1.2 Knowledge about the organization of events

Interviewees A, D, E and F mentioned as a positive impact from Rio 2016 the knowledge acquired by the organizers, volunteers and others involved in the accomplishment of the Games, as to planning, organizing and carrying out of the event. For Preuss the local population gets knowledge and develops skills when hosting a sports megaevent. Employees and volunteers become more knowledgeable and skillful when dealing with the events organization, and people become more aware of what is happening in the host city and in the host nation as well¹⁶.

3.1.3 Infrastructure

Interviewees B, E, G and H mentioned as both positive and negative impacts the infrastructure of the Olympics. Interviewee D says that the infrastructure is positive, but interviewees C and I think that the infrastructure is a negative impact.

Interviewee B says it is easy to relate the Games with the infrastructure and thinks it is a positive impact due to the construction and/or renovation of several venues, as well as the creation of an Olympic Center. On the other hand, in order to have all that infrastructure built, thousands of people were displaced and this is a negative impact. She also mentions that

the infrastructure can become a positive or negative impact depending on the management of those venues after the event; if the places are to be maintained and to what kind of audience. Interviewee E also talked about infrastructure as a positive impact in Rio 2016. However, she also points out as a negative impact the difficulty accessing to such venues for the general population, and that the management of such places is challenging.

Interviewee H thinks that the infrastructure is a positive impact because of the construction and revitalization of places in the city of Rio de Janeiro, such as "Porto Maravilha" (Wonderful Port) which is positive because it is a new space in the city. Interviewee D thinks it is a positive impact due to the challenge of building great construction work.

It is a consensus in the literature that infrastructure is one of the main social impacts and legacies of holding sports megaevents, and the urban restructuring of host cities in order to exhibit and position them worldwide has been the main characteristic of the latest editions of megaevents held in recent years¹⁷⁻²³.

3.1.4 Country's visibility

Interviewees B, D and F cite as a positive impact the country's visibility, the international exposure. For Preuss¹⁶ the sports megaevents solidifies the city image, the host nation, and they can generate a positive image if they are successful, or generate a negative image if for instance, there is a terrorist attack, or lack of resources, or bad organization, high crime rates – all of these could affect the image of the event. For Almeida¹⁷, the Olympic Games are an international platform for visibility, and the realization of this event in Brazil was part of the country's foreign policy, in which the country wanted to show itself to the world, its image, economy, political and social growth, strengthen and establish multilateral relations with other countries, in addition to the fact that the country won the candidacy for the megaevent, competing with developed countries, such as the United States, Spain and Japan, which positions it among global leaders in the symbolic and discursive sphere, guaranteeing its visibility.

3.1.5 Tourism

For interviewees B and E, the increase in tourism is a positive impact since many people from all over the world came to the event. According to Fagerlande²⁰, the tourism sector has improved due to technological advances, as well as in the means of communication and transport. Thus, countries and cities have developed urban restructuring processes to attract and stir the real estate market and tourism, in which they seek to produce new spaces and financial and consumption centers. The need to revitalize and recover degraded areas has been a common process worldwide, and tourism has been a central activity for the triggering of these processes, associated with the attempt to generate economic benefits and

to leverage the cities' economy, or part of them, especially in the central areas, which become cultural and leisure spaces.

In the case of Rio de Janeiro, the Olympic Games were used as a way to attract tourists, mainly for the revitalization of the downtown area and the Olympic park in Barra da Tijuca. Among the revitalizations in the central area of the city, there was the restructuring of "Porto Maravilha", which has consolidated itself as one of the main tourist points, concentrating several options and attractions, such as "AquaRio" (the largest marine aquarium in South America), the "Museu do Amanhã", "Orla Conde", "Praça Mauá", the "Museu de Arte do Rio (MAR)", "Rio Star" (the largest ferris wheel in Latin America, with its own website for publicizing the place - <https://portomaravilha.com.br/portomaravilha>).

In addition to these restructurations in the central area and in the Olympic Park, the process of building a new image and showing off the city of Rio de Janeiro includes using slums as places of intervention and tourism, which can generate income and jobs, as well as a commodification of that environment, excluding the least favored. For Wise et al.²⁴, the slums are seen as undesirable, dangerous and high risk, but they are also communities that participate in a dense urban environment, in which practices from different sectors are developed, including tourism, which can alter the activities of that environment, and consequently, generate processes of social inclusion or exclusion, causing both positive and negative impacts. At the same time that it provides financial income for some, it can also commercialize the place, making life more difficult for people who cannot keep up with the changes.

3.1.6 Social mobilizations

Interviewee A points out as a positive impact the way the population understood that it was a very fundamental moment to the state, federal and even municipal governments. It was a strategic moment to mobilize socially. There were a series of mobilizations from the garbage collectors, bank clerks, and so on, a bunch of people asking for their rights. I think that social movements are a strategic and very interesting way of making people more aware".

The sports megaevents in Brazil were marked by political and social conflicts that resulted in public demonstrations, in which more investments were demanded in some areas, such as health, education, safety, transportation and lower tariffs, and also criticizing the sport megaevents, emphasizing the high public spending for their realization^{17,22,26-29}.

3.1.7 Involvement of the Brazilian supporters

Interviewee D presents the participation, involvement and passion of Brazilian fans as a positive impact of the 2016 Olympic Games. Adherence and popular participation in sports megaevents seem to be positive when they happen^{29,30,31,26}, and the opposite of that also occurs, that is, the lack of consensus and popular participation (in its various forms, whether in

decision-making or as a spectator, volunteer, among others) can produce negative aspects in people's perception, even generating aversion to the event^{18,31,19,28,26}.

3.2 Negative social impacts

Table 4 below presents the main negative social impacts from Rio 2016 in the opinion of the interviewees.

Table 4 - The main negative impacts from Rio 2016

Negative social impacts	Researchers
1 – Absence of legacy for the sport	A, C, D, G, H, I & J
2 – People's displacement	B, C, E, G & I
3 - Corruption / Overbilling of construction work	C, D, E, F, G / C, F & G
4 – Lack of planning and preparation	A, G & I
5 – Increase in real state speculation	C, G & I
6 – Lack of democratization with society	A & I
7 – Infrastructure	C & I

Source: Research data.

3.2.1 Absence of legacy for the sport

Researchers A, C, D, G, H, I and J talked about the absence of legacy for the sport as a negative impact from Rio 2016 because after the event there was a cut in investments for sport, lack of public policies of sport and leisure and the unification and/or closing of sport departments.

Sports are the main attractions of the Olympic Games, however, they are not the only reason why countries justify their candidacies to host megaevents, which involve other types of interest, such as socioeconomic development, urban restructuring, political benefits, media coverage and country exposure globally^{17,18,29}. Thus, the types of legacy can receive different emphases in different editions, such as encouraging sports, leisure and physical activity²⁷.

The fact that the interviewees mentioned the lack of a legacy for sports can be associated with these considerations, because in the case of Brazil, the motivation for the Games in 2016 was mainly related to two aspects: part of the foreign political agenda, which aimed to demonstrate the country's strength and growth, as well as signing international partnerships¹⁷; and the fact that it is the first South American edition of the Summer Olympic Games^{17,22,27,30}. Thus, the incentive and increased practice of physical, sports and leisure activities were not taken as priorities by the Brazilian governments, which focused on socioeconomic and urban development^{17,27}.

3.2.2 People's displacement

Interviewees B, C, E, G and I talked about the people's displacement as a negative impact from Rio 2016. Preuss¹⁸ points out that the places where the construction works happen are normally poor neighborhoods and that their removal causes loss of the social environment, also mentions that the removal is an attempt to expel unwanted people such as street vendors,

the homeless, prostitutes, who will be conflicting with the government vision of the modern city open to tourism.

With the objective of restructuring and “launching” a new image of the city’s beautification, the holding of sports megaevents foresees the elimination of manifestations of poverty, as well as the people’s impetus and the extinction of popular settlements, considered as aesthetically negative^{18,19,21}. Regarding the Games in Rio de Janeiro, there was a significant people’s displacement and removal due to the event, and there was also disrespect and violation of the human rights of these individuals^{18,19,21}. According to Almeida¹⁷, the social movements that accompanied the sports megaevents in Brazil, estimated that about 14 constitutional rights were violated for more than 170 thousand people, 77 thousand of whom in the city of Rio.

3.2.3 Corruption / Overbilling of construction work

As another negative impact from the Games, interviewees C, D, E, F and G mentioned corruption and overbilling of construction work. This is a huge problem in the Brazilian scenario and it ends up being intensified when there are sports megaevents which will affect the positive legacy. The researchers said:

Miagusko³² talks about the 2007 Pan-American Games – the initial budget for the project would be around R\$ 410 million and ended up costing R\$ 3.7 billion, i.e., nine times higher than the initial estimate and according to a government report, there were losses of R\$884,7 mi in overbilling and services that were not accomplished. Silva and Pires³³ mention complaints filed to the Court of Auditors about overbilling, illicit spending and calls for opening Inquiry Parliamentary Committees in Rio and Brasília.

3.2.4 Lack of planning and preparation

Another negative impact from Rio 2016 cited by the interviewees (A, C, G, I) relates to the lack of planning and preparation for the event. For interviewee A, the lack of planning can be observed along with the absence of legacy and investment in sport, and also by the bad financial situation of Rio de Janeiro. For example, delays in staff salaries and other matters that have made things even harder for people in general, there was a lack of planning and talking to the community about what was going to happen in the city. Interviewee C says that the population is often neglected and that the construction works does not always correspond to the original projects. Interviewee G talks about the lack of planning highlighting the political aspect, especially politics in the city of Rio de Janeiro, the negative aspects related to investments, embezzlement, overbilling, corruption, the financial situation of the city, the lack of planning as to resources distribution that were centralized. For interviewee I, it is possible to identify the works related to the Games because there are some unfinished constructions, forlorn places, changes in traffic, to name a few, that have not been

used in an adequate way after the Games.

3.2.5 Intensification of real state speculation

The increase in real state speculation was mentioned by researchers C and G as a negative impact from Rio 2016. For C real state speculation, mainly in Rio de Janeiro, went through some transformations in the regions that received more investments, which caused the ousting of the population who could not afford to live in those regions anymore. For G, the main investments were centralized in areas that were already overvalued, which only contributed to increasing the original value even more and thus causing real state speculation. G says that real state speculation is part of a process called gentrification, which is the indirect expelling of people from places where they cannot afford to live. C also commented on that. Preuss¹⁸ describes that the infrastructure improvement which is created for sports megaevents ends up expelling dwellers who cannot afford to maintain themselves in those places anymore.

Indirect displacements and removals are called gentrification, and refer to the increase in housing costs, which expels people who are unable to stay in these places^{21,24}. The areas revitalization due to megaevents, values places previously considered popular and thus become valued by the real estate sector, increasing rental and purchase prices, thus expelling people who are unable to live in those places. These individuals are forced to move to other regions - mostly in the suburb - and without due compensation for their loss - which results in demographic changes, as residents lose their community and social ties and have their opportunities to access goods, services, leisure and study reduced, as their travel expenses and transportation time increase²¹.

3.2.6 Lack of democratization with society

Interviewees A, I consider as a negative impact of Rio 2016 the lack of communication about the transformations that would occur because of the event. the population was never consulted about the changes that were going to take place for the hosting of the Games, and now they have to bear the burden. As already mentioned in this work, the lack of popular participation, adhesion and popular consultation can symbolize negative aspects of holding sports megaevents, and the main problems that can be triggered refer to the lack of participation in decision-making and processes related to the events^{20,21,30,31}. In the case of Brazil, studies have found that this happened at the Pan American Games in 2007, and also at the Olympic Games in 2016^{20,30,31}.

3.2.7 Infrastructure

The infrastructure created for Rio 2016 is considered as a negative impact for researchers C, I. C points out problems related to corruption, overbilling of construction works, the lack of matches and other events at the stadiums, the lack of planning which neglect the needs of the population and do not

always follow the original projects, the increase in real state speculation and the people's displacement. For I, it is possible to see the forlorn equipment, little use, little accessibility to venues to which so much was invested in. Researcher I says that she worked at the Olympic Village and that it had great visibility during the Games. However, after the event was over, the venues remain closed and the staff was laid off because of lack of resources to maintain them.

According to Rolnik¹⁹, if the facilities are planned for the use of the population after the event, close to the communities, the built infrastructure can provide greater appropriation of the place and bring cultural and social opportunities, such as sports and leisure. Despite this finding, Almeida¹⁷ study found that there was a lack of public policies that considered and contemplated issues regarding the use of spaces and equipment after the 2016 Olympic Games, such as the lack of indication of who would do the administration, about maintenance costs, which policies would be developed and who would foster, since the author did not find these actions in the application documents or in others, a factor that may have hindered the use of the infrastructure after the Games.

4 Conclusion

Sports megaevents generate positive and negative impacts and legacies for the host nation. The greatest positive social impact pointed out by researchers of public policies was related to sports. They say that the Olympic Games are a prosperous moment for people who work with sports, for the ones who like them, it spreads the practice of various modalities including the ones which are not so known to the general population hence contributing to a broader sports culture. The interviewees also said that the Paralympic Games contributed a lot because they enabled social inclusion, the creation of new concepts and ideas about the Paralympic athletes and also brought more visibility to the public policies related to people with disabilities.

In the same way that the sport was the greatest positive impact from Rio 2016 pointed out by researchers of public policies of sport and leisure, the absence of legacy for the sport was the greatest negative impact. The researchers said that after the end of the megaevent there were budget cuts, lack of public policies of sport and leisure and unification and/or closing of sport departments.

The interviewees also mentioned as both positive and negative impacts from Rio 2016 the infrastructure to host the event. On the one hand, the infrastructure, which is identified in the literature, is talked about by the researchers and was created to host the Olympic Games, could improve people's lives with the construction of avenues, changes in the transportation sector, airports and sports centers. On the other hand, aggravating things which are found in the literature as well as in the interviews, encompass high construction costs, people's displacement, overbilling, corruption and the absence of effective public policies which allow access

to the venues. The social impacts from Rio 2016 like the sport and infrastructure are mentioned by the researchers and can become positive or negative, which will depend on the implementation of governmental actions, construction and the execution of public policies, which enable the population to practice sports and leisure activities and allow them access to the venues.

The public policies are of importance because they are present in sports megaevents and must recognize the needs and possibilities of intervention in order to improve people's lives. The public policies in the context of sports megaevents must democratize matters related to the population's social rights, minimize social, economic and cultural barriers, inter and intra social classes, guarantee better access to leisure venues, make the venues available for public use, carry out the maintenance of equipment and train professionals to assist the public.

As from such findings about sports and infrastructure created to host sports megaevents in Brazil, more specifically Rio 2016, the contribution of our research is emphasized in the fields of Physical Education and leisure and highlight the use of public policies in order to ensure rights and a better quality of life to the population. It is necessary to consider that we have been living after a recent megaevent, and that data from the semistructured interviews with researchers of public policies of sports and leisure are embedded in their conception, i.e., we have had access to data that has not been published yet, and because of this fact it is emphasized the need for future studies to analyze the Rio 2016 legacies, so it is possible to have a understanding whether the actions for public policies were substantiated or not.

References

1. Getz D. Event management and event tourism. New York: Cognisant Communication Corporation; 1997.
2. Robinson T, Lopes da Silva C, Garnett R, Patreze NS. Rio 2016 Olympic Games and the social impacts of megaevents: a qualitative study. *Licere* 2017;20(3):348-66. doi: <https://doi.org/10.35699/1981-3171.2017.19902>
3. Kasimati E. Economic aspects and the summer Olympics: a review of related research. *Int J Tourism Res* 2003;433-44. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1002/jtr.449>
4. Bob U, Swart K. Social events and social legacies. *Alternation* 2010;2:72-95.
5. Junod T. Sports events as tools of public policies: is it the right event for the right region? In: Torres, D. Major sports events as opportunity for development. Valencia: Valencia Summit Proceedings; 2006. p.83-9.
6. Preuss H, Gutenberg J, Villano B, Miragaya A. Economia, gestão e definições básicas. In: Da Costa LP, Corrêa D, Rizzuti E, Villano B, Miragaya A. Legados de megaeventos esportivos. Brasília: Ministério do Esporte; 2008. p.79-120.
7. Gratton C, Shibli S, Coleman R. The economic impact of major sports events: a review of ten events in the UK. In: Horne J, Manzreiter W. Sports mega-events: social scientific analyses of a global phenomenon. Oxford: Blackwell

- Publishing; 2006. p.41-58.
8. Malfas M, Theodoroaki E, Houlihan B. Impacts of the Olympic Games as mega-events. *Proc Inst Eng* 2004;157(3):209-20.
 9. Marcellino NC. Legados de megaeventos esportivos. Campinas: Papirus; 2013.
 10. Minayo MCS. Pesquisa social: teoria, método e criatividade. Petrópolis: Vozes; 1994.
 11. Severino AJ. Metodologia do trabalho científico. São Paulo: Cortez; 2016.
 12. Duarte R. Pesquisa qualitativa: reflexões sobre o trabalho de campo. *Cad Pesq* 2002;115:139-54. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1590/S0100-15742002000100005>
 13. Triviños ANS. Introdução a pesquisa qualitativa em ciências sociais: a pesquisa qualitativa em educação. São Paulo: Atlas; 1987.
 14. Lincoln YS, Guba EG. Naturalistic inquiry. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications; 1985.
 15. Porto ETR, Azzini EP. Jogos Paraolímpicos de 2016: um mundo de possibilidades. In: Marcellino NC. Legados de megaeventos esportivos. Campinas: Papirus; 2013. p.241-56.
 16. Preuss H. Aspectos sociais dos Megaeventos esportivos. In: Rubio K. Megaeventos esportivos, legado e responsabilidade social. São Paulo: Casa do Psicólogo; 2007, p.13-35.
 17. Almeida BS. Megaeventos esportivos, política e legado: o Brasil como sede da Copa do Mundo Fifa 2014 e os Jogos Olímpicos e Paralímpicos Rio 2016. *Espacio Abierto* 2016;25(2):68-80.
 18. Mendes AF, Legroux J. BRT Transoeste: conflitos urbanos e contradições espaciais na cidade atrativa. *Rev Direito Práxis* 2016;7(4):13-42. doi: <https://doi.org/10.12957/dep.2016.25653>
 19. Rolnik R. Jogos Olímpicos e direito à moradia adequada. *Rev Ciênc Cultura* 2016;68(2):31-6. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.21800/2317-66602016000200012>
 20. Fagerlande SMR. A favela é um cenário: tematização e cenarização nas favelas cariocas. *Rev Arquit* 2017;19(1):6-13. doi: <https://doi.org/10.14718/RevArq.2017.19.1.90>
 21. Vazquez ACB. De cidade maravilhosa à cidade mercadoria: o Rio de Janeiro como valor de troca. *Em Pauta* 2017;39(15):224-38. doi: <http://doi.org/10.12957/rep>
 22. Mascarenhas G. Justiça ambiental e produção do espaço nos Jogos Rio 2016: o paradoxo do Golfe Olímpico. *Geo UERJ* 2018;32:1-23. doi: <https://doi.org/10.12957/geouerj>
 23. Vico RP, Uvinha RR, Gustavo N. Sports mega-events in the perception of the local community: the case of Itaquera region in São Paulo at the 2014 FIFA World Cup Brazil. *Soccer Soc* 2018;20(6):810-23. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/14660970.2017.1419471>
 24. Wise N, Polidoro M, Hall G, Uvinha RR. User-generated insight of Rio's Rocinha favela tour: authentic attraction or vulnerable living environment? *Local Econ* 2019;34(7): 680-98. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0269094219889881>
 25. Graeff B, Bretherton P, Piggin J. Atividade física e jogos olímpicos: reflexões a partir de Londres 2012 e Rio 2016. *Rev Ciênc Cultura* 2016;68(2):37-43. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.21800/2317-66602016000200013>
 26. Sebastião S, Lemos, A. A voz da comunidade na preparação de Megaevento: RIO 2016. *Cuad Info* 2016;39:209-24. doi: [10.7764/cdi.39.679](https://doi.org/10.7764/cdi.39.679)
 27. Lima E, Maia TST, Lobosco A, Moraes M B. Megaeventos esportivos frente a pequenos eventos: reflexões considerando-se a realidade brasileira recente. *Podium Sport Leisure Tourism Rev* 2016;5:89-110. doi: [10.5585/podium.v5i3.202](https://doi.org/10.5585/podium.v5i3.202)
 28. Américo M, Margadona LA. A fotografia dos Jogos Olímpicos Rio 2016: mídias sociais, memes e enajamento. *Rev Discursos Fotográficos* 2017;13(23):112-38. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5433/1984-7939.2017v13n23p112>
 29. Facina T. Algumas Olimpíadas. *Antípoda Rev Antropol Arqueol* 2018:156-8.
 30. Uvinha RR, Chan CS, Man CK, Marafa LM. Sport tourism: a comparative analysis of residents from Brazil and Hong Kong. *Rev Bras Pesq Turismo* 2018;129(1):180-206.
 31. Reppold Filho A R. Jogos Olímpicos Rio de Janeiro 2016. *Rev Ciênc Cultura* 2016;68(2):22-6. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.21800/2317-66602016000200010>
 32. Miagusko E. Antes da Copa, depois do Pan: o Rio de Janeiro na era dos megaeventos esportivos. *Civitas* 2012;12(2):395-408. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.15448/1984-7289.2012.2.11935>
 33. Silva MR, Pires GL. Do Pan RIO/2007 à Copa 2014 no Brasil, que Brasil? E para qual Brasil?. *Motrivivência* 2006;27:9-17. doi: <https://doi.org/10.5007/%25x>