

Bid Group Assignment

Overview - This assignment gives students the opportunity to inhabit the role of a mega-event stakeholder. It is adaptable, allowing for addition or subtraction of groups that fit the course's overall theme; scaffolding the assignment gives the students multiple opportunities to interact with their peers and update their own efforts.

Objectives - Students, by the assignment's completion, will be able to recognize the consequences, positive and negative, that results from the interaction of International Sporting Organizations (ISOs) and governments (this could be at the local, sub-national, or national levels); operationalize contemporary political science theories about the behavior of governments when seeking to host, and eventually hosting mega-events; generate original predictions and theories about the behaviors of stakeholders in relation to mega-events.

Grade Items - In demonstrating their comprehension of course content, students will be asked to a) present a written bid component, b) a verbal, presentation component, and c) participate in active learning exercises across groups.

The Timeline

Stage 1 - Early in the semester students are broken into groups representing existing stakeholders, government actors, *etc.* (see Figure 1). Based on the role of their assigned group, the students will create a mega-event bid.



Figure 1 - Possible Group Structure.

Stage 2 - Students present preliminary standards/goals for their bid with supported justifications.

Stage 3 - Students submit the final bid and present their findings. With an open Q&A session across groups. Within each group a different student will be assigned to present one of the following elements to ensure everyone in the group participates:

- Local culture/demographics
- Socioeconomic conditions
- Transportation/infrastructure
- Existing venues and stadium construction
- Past city experiences with large-scale events and festivals

Assessment 1: Stakeholder Position Paper (15%)

3–5 pages.

Each group will prepare a position paper outlining its interests and objectives.

Your paper should address:

- Who your stakeholder is
- What your stakeholder hopes to gain from the event
- Potential benefits and risks
- Key political, economic, or social concerns
- At least three concepts or theories from course readings
- An initial recommendation regarding the bid

This paper will serve as the foundation for your group's future decisions.

Assessment 2: Preliminary Bid Hearing (15%)

Each group will deliver a presentation explaining its position.

Presentation Length: 10 minutes

Your presentation should include:

- Stakeholder goals
- Expected costs and benefits
- Political opportunities and risks
- Evidence supporting your position
- Relevant course concepts and theories

Following the presentation, students should be prepared to answer questions from other stakeholder groups.

Assessment 3: Final Bid Package (40%)

Each group will submit a final report presenting the bid to the IOC from the perspective of its stakeholder.

Length: 8–12 pages

The final report should include:

- Executive Summary
- Stakeholder Interests
- Political Analysis
- Economic Analysis
- Risk Assessment
- Application of Course Theories
- Final Recommendation

Groups should support their arguments with course readings, external research, and evidence.

Assessment 4: Final Summit Presentation (20%)

15–20 minute presentation plus Q&A.

Participation and Negotiation (10%)

Assessment based on:

- Attendance
- Engagement
- Inter-group negotiations
- Questions during presentations

The assignment is highly adaptable to the needs of one's specific course. Groups representing government actors, for instance, could represent the local, subnational, or national levels. Courses with topical focuses on issues such as human rights, sustainability, etc. could also adapt the project to ensure that these issues are represented.

Suggested Reading List

- Flyvbjerg, B. et al. 2016. The Oxford Olympics Study 2016: Cost and Cost Overrun at the Games. Said Business School WP 2016-20, <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2804554>
- Gold, John R. and Margaret M. Gold. (2024). *Olympic Games: City Agendas, Planning, and the World's Games*. Routledge.
- Grix, J. 2013. Sport Politics and the Olympics. *Political Studies Review* Vol. 11: 15-25.
- Lauermann, John. 2022. "The Declining Appeal of Mega-Events in Entrepreneurial Cities: From Los Angeles 1984 to Los Angeles 2028." *Environment and Planning C: Politics and Space* 40 (6): 1203–18. <https://doi.org/10.1177/23996544211066101>.
- Rose, Andrew K. & Mark M. Spiegel. 2011. The Olympic Effect, *The Economic Journal*, 121(553): 652-677.
- Shoval, Noam. 2002. "A New Phase in the Competition for the Olympic Gold: The London and New York Bids for the 2012 Games." *Journal of Urban Affairs* 24 (5): 583–99. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9906.00146>.
- Weed, Mike. 2006. Sports Tourism Research 2000 - 2004: A Systematic Review of Knowledge and Meta-Evaluation of Methods, *Journal of Sports Tourism*, 11(1): 5-30.
- Weed, Mike. 2008. *Olympic Tourism*. Elsevier.
- Zirin, D. 2013. Game Over. Chapter 3: "Today's World Cup and Olympics: Invictus in Reverse" (pp. 50-72).