


Back to the Roots of Sports Management: 1980 Moscow and 1984 Los Angeles Organizing Committee of Olympic Games

*Ege Direnç ERKAN 

**Zafer ÇİMEN 

ORJİNAL ARAŞTIRMA

Abstract

This research aims to compare the 1980 Moscow and 1984 Los Angeles Olympic Games (OG), which continued their activities in parallel with the ideologies of the two superpowers of the Cold War, the USA, and the USSR, with public and private sector sports management approaches. The research model is a comparative case study. The findings were reached by single and cross analysing the data sources, including OCOG's official reports. Moscow and Los Angeles OCOG activities were compared under organizational structure, facilities, financing, and expenditures headings. Despite the blurred lines of intersectoral distinction, Moscow OCOG (OCOG-80) stands out as a distinctively dominant example of the public sector and Los Angeles OCOG (LAOOC) LAOOC as a distinctively dominant example of the private sector sport management approach. Despite the contrasting approaches, both OCOGs have completed realizing an OG from the planning stage to the closing ceremony. The activities of the sports organizations that achieved this success by meeting the expectations of the state and the system to which they belonged demonstrated the importance of focusing on the positive effects on sports management success of the right people taking the steps that meet the needs, rather than a superiority comparison between the requirements of the private or public sector. In conclusion, these two sport organizations, which offer two contrasting and successful ways of doing the same job, offer a good start for new journeys to the roots of the discipline of sports management.

Keywords: Organizational history, Private sector, Public sector.

This research is based on Ege Direnç ERKAN's master's thesis titled The Sport Front of the Cold War: The Cases of the Moscow 1980 and Los Angeles 1984 Games, presented at Gazi University in 2022

*Research Assistant, Kırıkkale University, Faculty of Sport Sciences, Kırıkkale-Turkey. E-mail:

direncerkan@kku.edu.tr

**Professor Doctor, Gazi University, Faculty of Sport Sciences, Ankara-Turkey. E-mail: zcimen@gazi.edu.tr

Spor Yönetiminin Köklerine Dönüş: 1980 Moskova ve 1984 Los Angeles Olimpiyat Organizasyon Komiteleri

Özet

Bu araştırmanın amacı Soğuk Savaş'ın iki süper gücü ABD ve SSCB'nin ideolojileriyle paralel biçimde faaliyetlerini sürdürmüş 1980 Moskova ve 1984 Los Angeles Oyunları Olimpiyat Organizasyon Komitelerini kamu ve özel sektör spor yönetimi yaklaşımları eşliğinde karşılaştırmaktır. Araştırmada nitel araştırma yöntemlerinden karşılaştırmalı vaka modeli kullanılmıştır. OOK resmi raporlarından oluşan veri kaynaklarına tekli ve çapraz analiz yapılarak bulgulara ulaşılmıştır. Moskova ve Los Angeles OOK faaliyetleri örgüt yapısı, tesisler, finansman ve harcamalardan oluşan başlıklar altında karşılaştırılmıştır. Sektörler arası ayrımın bulanıklaşan çizgilerine karşın Moskova OOK kamu, Los Angeles OOK özel sektör spor yönetimi yaklaşımının ayırt edici derece baskın örnekleri olarak ön plana çıkmıştır. Karşıt sayılabilecek derecede farklılaşan yaklaşımlara rağmen bir Olimpiyat Oyunu'nu planlama aşamasından kapanış törenine varana dek eksiksiz gerçekleştirme işini iki OOK de başarıyla tamamlamıştır. Ait oldukları devletin ve sistemin beklentilerini karşılayarak bu başarıyı elde eden spor örgütlerinin faaliyetleri özel ya da kamu sektörünün gerekleri arasındaki bir üstünlük karşılaştırması yerine; ihtiyaçları karşılayan adımların, doğru kişilerce gerçekleştirilmesinin spor yönetimi başarısı üzerindeki olumlu etkilerine odaklanmanın önemini göstermiştir. Sonuç olarak , aynı işi yapmanın iki zıt ve başarılı yolunu sunan bu iki spor organizasyonun, spor yönetiminin disiplinin köklerine yapılacak yeni yolculuklar için iyi bir başlangıç sunmaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Organizasyon tarihi, Özel sektör, Kamu sektörü.

Introduction

The 1970s represent a period when the Olympics became associated with various aspects of the Cold War beyond political tensions, such as terrorism and economic attrition. This period, which started with the terrorism and violence in Mexico in 1968 and Munich in 1972, was followed by the financial crisis and boycotts in Montreal in 1976, and the demand for hosting the Olympic Games (OG) was significantly reduced (D'Agati, 2013, pp. 89-90). With these effects, only the cities of Moscow and Los Angeles were candidates for the 1980 OG, and Moscow won the vote; in 1984, when Tehran withdrew as a candidate, Los Angeles was the only candidate city to host the OG (Perelman, 1985a, p. 7).

Thus, two rival states seized the opportunity to host the world's biggest sporting event in succession. These hosts have been significant examples of the power struggles of the United States of America (USA) and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR), the dominant states of the Cold War, on the axis of capitalism and socialism in the field of sports (Öncü, 2017; Rider, 2012; Riordan, 1993).

The USA initiated a boycott movement against the 1980 Moscow Olympics on the justification of the USSR's intervention in Afghanistan, and the Games were boycotted; similarly, the USSR and the Eastern Bloc states decided to boycott the 1984 Los Angeles Games and did not participate in the Games (D'Agati, 2013).

Instead of these two boycott decisions and their political impacts, the study will focus on the sports management approaches shaped by the two opposite governance systems of the two states at the endpoints where the 1980 and 1984 OG occurred. Of these two governance systems, the public sector sport management approach represented by the USSR involves a system in which investments in mass and elite sports are shaped in line with the national and economic benefits that sport represents for states. The other is the USA's private sector sport management approach: it emphasizes a system shaped by the relationship between markets and stakeholders, focusing on elite sport and the commercial dimension of sport (Varmus et al., 2021, pp. 40-47).

Although these two systems are not strictly divided today, they would provide a different perspective on sports management to evaluate the activities of the Organizing Committee for the 1980 Olympic Games in Moscow (OCOG-80), the first OG held in a socialist state, and the 1984 Los Angeles Olympic Organizing Committee (LAOOC), the first OG dominated by the private enterprise model.

Taking two cases as a historical opportunity to examine two different ways of OG organization, this research aims to create a bridge for new sport management approaches by

transferring historical knowledge from the period of sharp distinction to the current blurred structure of sport management. Re-examining the two-sectoral structures of cases that have often been examined in the literature from the political perspective of boycotts and the Cold War in relation to the economic structure and sustainability of today's Olympics will accelerate the beneficial transfer of historical knowledge to contemporary norms in sports management. In this way, it is thought that the discipline can contribute to the process of moving from an over-focused view of the private sector to a structure that produces insights by making in-depth connections from the past to the present by investigating its roots and contemporary implications.

Methods

1980 Moscow and 1984 Los Angeles OG in terms of sport management approaches, the comparative case study model, which is one of the qualitative research methods, was used due to the benefit of in-depth investigation and comparison (Campbell, 2010, pp. 174-175; Yin, 2018, p. 350).

The research cases were OCOG-80 and LAOOC. The research source documents are the official reports of the two OCOGs: Official Report of the Organizing Committee of the Games of the XXIIInd Olympiad: Organisation (237 p.) ; Official Report of the Organizing Committee of the Games of the XXIIInd Olympiad: Moscow, Tallinn, Leningrad, Kiev, Minsk (531 p.); Official Report of the 1984 Olympic Games: Organization and Planning (881 p.); Olympic Retrospective: Th Games of Los Angeles (596 p.).

In order to compare cases that are considered to diverge within the political and economic framework of the socialist and capitalist system, we focused on the material decisions of the organizations. After introducing the organizational structures, common headings were extracted from the official reports to discuss the expenditure decisions and rationales for holding the Olympics. Findings were also drawn from the revenues generated and the position of the organizations within the systems in which they took place. The main headings obtained from the reports are; organizational structures, venues, revenues, expenditures.

The reports were obtained from the LA84 Foundation Library and the Olympic World Library. In the first phase of the research, cases were analyzed one by one under the guidance of categorized headings and subheadings for the comparison of private and public sector sport management approaches. In the second stage, cross-case analyses were made, explanations and comparisons were made, the two management approaches were discussed, and conclusions were reached.

Results

Organizational Structures

OCOG-80 was established as a public organization endowed with rights and powers based on the Constitution of the Soviet Union. It was empowered to coordinate the activities of all state agencies and related organizations for the success of the OG organization. Senior Soviet bureaucrats served as managers (Novikov, 1981a, pp. 7, 10-12). The Moscow OG was held in Tallinn for the boat races and in Leningrad (St. Petersburg), Kyiv and Minsk for the football matches (Novikov, 1981b). Four additional auxiliary OCOGs were established for these four cities outside Moscow (Novikov, 1981a, pp. 23-24,30).

The government, members of Congress, and the people of the region opposed using public funds in establishing LAOOC (Congress, 1976, p. 18094; Eizenstat & Watson, 1979, pp. 5-9). This situation necessitated the establishment of LAOOC as a private company. LAOOC differed from all previous OCOGs in that it was independent of all state institutions, and its governing bodies did not include state officials (Perelman, 1985a, p. 14,313).

Therefore, LAOOC became the first example of a sports management approach in which the organization was carried out by a privatized group instead of the city itself (Boykoff, 2016, p. 124). Due to the absence of the federal and state governments within LAOOC, a private company, the organization's bureaucracy has emerged as an administrative problem. To fulfill several complex public tasks, a Government Relations Department was established within LAOOC with a wide range of responsibilities that had not previously been available to other OCOGs. The Government Relations Division coordinated work with many government agencies, except for a few agencies under the responsibility of the Security Division. It also monitored Olympic-related bills in California and participated in legislative drafting (Perelman, 1985b, pp. 146-162).

Venues

OCOG-80 associated all of the facilities to be built with long-term urban and development plans (Novikov, 1981b, p. 8). In the context of the USSR's welfare state approach, the Olympics became an urbanization movement beyond sports facilities. Hotels and campsites were built, new businesses were established, the capacities of airports and railway stations were increased, and the range of telephone, television, and radio stations was extended (Foreign Broadcast Information Service [FBIS], 1980; Novikov, 1981a, p. 43).

LAOOC focused on minimal construction and utilization of existing facilities (Perelman, 1985b, p. 34). LAOOC approached the organization process professionally to prevent policies influenced by nationalist sentiments from inflating costs. Businesspeople with limited budgets were

preferred as site managers to coordinate sports branches at minimum cost (Perelman, 1985b, pp. 35-36,325).

Olympic Villages

The Olympic Village in Moscow was built as part of the city development plan. Schools, restaurants, shops, cultural centers, and health facilities were built in the Olympic Village, consisting of 18 apartment buildings with 16 stories, ready to be transformed into a high-capacity micro district (CIA, 1980, p. 10). After the closing of the Olympics, 14,000 Moscow residents were housed in the area (FBIS, 1980; Novikov, 1981a, p. 8,308).

LAOOC did not build an Olympic Village. The Dormitory facilities of the three universities of the city of Los Angeles were rented for accommodation for 5-6 weeks. The campuses of the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA), the University of Southern California (USC) and the University of California, Santa Barbara (USCB) took on the silhouette of the Olympic Village with decorations and temporary structures for the Games (International Olympic Committee [IOC], 2017; Perelman, 1985a, p. 161,168,171,177,179,182; Perelman, 1985b, p. 368).

As an obvious consequence of the two different approaches to sports management, Moscow has seen many new facilities brought to the city in line with the welfare state approach. In Los Angeles, on the other hand, a profit-oriented approach prevailed with temporary capacity increases and regulations.

Sports Facilities

OCOG has constructed twelve sports facilities and renewed thirteen facilities. A total of 25 facilities have been prepared for competitions. 82 sports facilities in Moscow, 2 in Leningrad (St. Petersburg), 2 in Kyiv, 2 in Minsk, and 11 in Minsk have been prepared as training sites through construction and renovation. The planning of all sports facilities focused on their usefulness in serving public health and mass sport after the Olympics (Novikov, 1981a, p. 7, 43- 44, 124). To meet the labor needs of the simultaneous construction works, 23,000 Soviet citizens were directed to the constructions as volunteer workers (CIA, 1980, p. 14).

LAOOC has renovated the Memorial Coliseum, which was also used in the 1932 Los Angeles Games, with sponsors to use it for ceremonies and track and field competitions. Only two sports facilities were built for cycling and swimming competitions, and sponsors covered the costs. Both facilities were donated to universities after the OG. A foundation renovated a hockey facility, while LAOOC renovated a shooting facility. Except for the four facilities listed above, all

competition venues were prepared with temporary capacity increases and cosmetic improvements on existing sports facilities (Perelman, 1985a, p. 28,72-80,83-90; 1985b, p. 72-75; IOC, 2017).

The baseball, fencing, handball, volleyball, and gymnastics competitions are remarkable examples of temporary sports facilities. In preparation for the LA Dodgers stadium, where baseball matches would be held, Olympic rings were drawn with only chalk. The Forum, where basketball matches were played, was converted into a handball court the day after the basketball finals and hosted the handball final. Fencing competitions and volleyball matches were held simultaneously at the Long Beach Convention and Entertainment Centre. All structural elements were shared except for the playing and athlete waiting areas. Volleyball warm-up courts were prepared by separating the exhibition hall with walls to reduce the cost. Due to the proximity of the competition areas, the inability of the walls to have sound isolation was criticized by the International Fencing Federation. Although there were difficulties in organizing the two disciplines, this facility completed the competitions. In the Pauley Pavilion at UCLA, where gymnastics competitions were held, the gymnastics platform purchased by LAOOC after the 1976 Montreal Games was used (Perelman, 1985a, p. 28,31,99,102,123-124,132-133).

Revenues

As an organization under the auspices of the state, OCOG-80 has been provided with many public funds beyond the amounts reported in the reports. It is not possible to determine the exact cost of the 1980 Moscow OG due to difficult-to-trace financial fluctuations, such as the financing of about one-third of the expenditures on communication infrastructure by the OCOG-80 and the rest from the state budget (Novikov, 1981a, pp. 524-525) as well as the allocation of a fund of 350,000 Soviet Ruble (pyб) to cover the costs of accommodation, food, transport, etc. for guests from international organizations (CPSU, 1980).

The financial data in the OCOG-80 report are available only in pyб. This made it even more challenging to understand the fiscal situation with the budget uncertainty. Given the lack of public exchange in the USSR and the limited US-USSR trade, to determine the value of the pyб against the \$, the US Treasury Department's Exchange Rate Reports were used to average the exchange rate for 28 quarters from 1974, when the USSR's hosting of the Moscow Games was announced, to 1980, when the OG ended (Financial Management Service [FMS], 1974, 1975, 1976, 1977, 1978, 1979, 1980). According to the average exchange rate, approximately 1 pyб = 1.413 or 1\$ = 0.707 pyб.

OCOG-80 generated revenue through "classic" commercial practices similar to those of the OG that preceded it" (Chepurnaya, 2017, p. 454). OCOG-80's total revenue of 744,800,000 pyб

(~\$1,052,402,400) was generated from 50% lotteries, 27% licensed product agreements, 9% souvenir money, 8% broadcasting rights, 3% ticket sales, and the remaining 3% from suppliers, sponsors and other sources (Novikov, 1981a, p. 524).

In contrast to the OCOG-80, LAOOC took on the organization's task as a private company in an environment where public resources were absent. In addition to the need for more state resources, LAOOC had to allocate resources for the public services it demanded; beyond what state institutions were obliged to do for society. This made it imperative for an OCOG to adopt unorthodox practices in its financing efforts (Perelman, 1985b, p. 34). LAOOC found that the OCOG of Moscow, Montreal, and Munich derived approximately 90% of their revenues from government sources, funds, commemorative coin and stamp programs, and lotteries and faced various restrictions under US law.

The illegality of the lottery in California, the uncertainty of the commemorative coin program as a long untried initiative, and the lack of public funds have forced LAOOC to develop a new approach to the other 10% of the OCOGs revenue sources. LAOOC has concentrated on broadcasting rights, ticket sales, the licensees, suppliers, and sponsors, constituting a small part of past OCOG's revenues. The state of the private sector in the USA and the public's income status were also affected by the decisions taken (Perelman, 1985a, p. 304). As a result, elements that occupied a low place in the revenues of other OCOGs became the primary sources of income for LAOOC.

LAOOC revenues totaled \$768,644,000. The revenues comprised 39% broadcasting rights, 19% ticket sales, 17% suppliers, sponsors, and license agreements, 14% commissions and taxes, and 11% interest from companies' tender participation fees (Perelman, 1985b, p. 119).

License Agreements

OCOG-80 has separated the rights of domestic and foreign companies. 6,972 domestic companies were granted license rights to 17,500 types of products. For foreign companies, copyrights to the 1980 Olympics emblems and license rights to receive a profit share from the revenues were granted to 19 foreign agents. Agents brokered more than 300 contracts in this context (Novikov, 1981a, pp. 500-501).

LAOOC granted licenses to only 65 of the 8000 applicant companies. Twenty-six of these licenses were granted to companies from minority communities, aiming to develop local communities (Perelman, 1985a, pp. 233-236).

Suppliers and Sponsors

OCOG-80 differentiated contracts with domestic and foreign companies, restricting the participation of foreign capital by including foreign companies in the system only in critical areas (CIA, 1980, p. 15). OCOG-80 granted the title of Official Supplier to 206 Soviet companies and the title of Official Sponsor to 16. Regarding advertising rights, official sponsors and official suppliers had the same rights (Novikov, 1981a, pp. 506-507).

OCOG-80 has signed 84 official supplier agreements and 19 official sponsor agreements with foreign companies to provide sports and technological products that were not produced in the USSR and must be outsourced. Most companies supplying technological products stipulated the post-Olympic return or purchase of the equipment they supplied, citing the limitations of the Soviet market. Thus, the USSR purchased most of the technological equipment supplied (CIA, 1980, p. 17; Novikov, 1981a, pp. 504-505).

LAOOC separated the supplier and sponsor company agreements according to the company's market share and size. The supplier companies paid a lower commitment amount than the sponsors in return for the right to use only the Star in Motion, the symbol of the Los Angeles Games. The suppliers, which provided goods and services that the sponsors could not offer, included 64 companies operating in a restricted marketplace (Perelman, 1985a, pp. 232-235,305).

The sponsor companies of the LAOOC paid higher contract fees but enjoyed privileges and high brand visibility. In the sponsorship system, the benefits are not limited to financial gain for the companies; they also include marketing benefits such as image improvement, increased recognition, and preventing rival companies from associating themselves with the OG.

The amount of commitment required for sponsorship varied depending on the importance of the benefits to the company, the size of the company, and the nature of the product or service produced. Because of the evaluation of the variables, sponsorship fees were determined separately for the companies. A collection of sponsors of 35 companies was formed with a lower limit of \$4 million (IOC, 2019; Perelman, 1985a, pp. 28,232-234,305).

Sponsor companies obtained exclusive rights as the sole representatives of the product groups in which they are involved. The sponsorship agreements ensure that the company is referred to alone in the product or service group in which it is involved with the "official" forename. Exclusive rights were offered in many product categories, such as Official Mineral Water, Official Motor Oil, Official Snack Foods, and Official Beer (Perelman, 1985a, p. 31,232).

Broadcasting Rights

OCOG-80 had to invest in the country's inadequate broadcasting infrastructure. Even when broadcasting rights agreements were being finalized, the need for more technological equipment and expertise necessitated planning for the purchase of services. NBC paid \$35,000,000 to broadcast the OG in the USA. Simultaneously, the USSR state broadcaster Gosteleradio purchased \$50,000,000 worth of services from NBC (Novikov, 1981a, pp. 502-503).

LAOOC managed the broadcasting rights processes with a new approach to raising start-up capital. A deposit of \$500,000 per company was collected as a goodwill gesture from companies interested in bidding for US broadcasting rights, to be returned interest-free at the end of the bidding process. Five companies sent the amount, resulting in an initial revenue of \$2,500,000. For a comparison of the size of the goodwill amounts, it is noted that the total revenue of broadcasting rights sold to 156 countries totaled \$286,740,000. For the US broadcasting rights, the American Broadcasting Company (ABC) paid \$225,000,000 (Perelman, 1985a, p. 28,760). The IOC added detailed regulations to the Olympic Charter to prevent other broadcasting organizations from violating ABC's exclusive rights (Der Spiegel, 1984).

Ticket Sales

OCOG-80 prevented foreign visitors from buying only tickets or only accommodation. They were required to purchase tickets to at least one competition per day during their stay for the Olympics. Tourists, the country's only official tour company, organized tours combining accommodation, travel, and competition tickets (Novikov, 1981a, p. 521). Moreover, the USSR stipulated that at least half of US tourist flights to be operated by the USSR airline Aeroflot (CIA, 1980).

Ticket sales within the USSR's borders used youth, trade unions, and communist party organizations. OCOG-80 generated a total revenue of 20,200,000 pyб (~\$28,542,600) from ticket sales (Novikov, 1981a, p. 525). Discounts and gift tickets were distributed to trade unions, industrial enterprises, and state institutions. According to the CIA report, the total number of tickets in the USSR was 4.1 million, and the government subsidized 70% of ticket costs (CIA, 1980, p. 14).

LAOOC used mail orders to increase ticket sales. Only through this method was approximately \$ 98,000,000 revenue obtained. Total ticket sales revenue totaled \$139,929,000. LAOOC achieved approximately 6 times more revenue compared to the average ticket sales revenue of \$20,000,000 for the OG in Munich, Montreal, and Moscow (Perelman, 1985a, p. 307,794, 1985b, p. 36,47,116-117). LAOOC has developed ticket sales, one of the limited methods at its disposal to generate revenue, through the widespread use of mail order. It can be said that the demographic structure of the US also had a supportive effect on this success.

Expenditures

The total announced expenditures of OCOG-80 totaled 862,700,000 pyб (\$1,218,995,100). The most significant part of the expenditures is the construction-renovation of sports facilities with 50%, which amounts to 431,300,000 pyб (~\$609,426,900). Organizational spending accounted for 17%, amounting to pyб 150,300,000 (~\$212,373,900). In sum, more than 70% of the expenditures were allocated to the construction of sports facilities and other service structures that would be a legacy for the people of the USSR. According to the data published in the official reports, OCOG-80 closed the organization with a loss of 117,900,000 pyб (~\$166,592,700) (Novikov, 1981a, p. 524).

LAOOC's total expenditures amounted to \$545,928,000. Other than the \$50,145,000 invested in the IOC, expenses are categorized under operating costs and payments for venues and facilities. Operating costs, which cover the expenses of many parts of LAOOC, totaled \$398,394,000. This amount is 73 percent of the total expenditure. The distribution of departments in expenditure is in order: Security, technology, tickets, food and beverage, transport, office administration, ceremonies, and the Olympic Arts Festival. Spending on the use of Olympic venues and facilities totaled \$97,389,000. This is 18 percent of the total expenditure (Perelman, 1985b, p. 118,308,310). LAOOC's savings and profit orientation resulted in a profit of \$222,716,000.

As a result of the agreement between LAOOC and the US Olympic Committee (USOC), LAOOC's income is divided into 3 parts. LAOOC transferred 40% of its revenues to the USOC, 40% to the Amateur Athletics Foundation, and 20% to the National Governing Bodies of Olympic sports in the USA (IOC, 2019; Perelman, 1985b, p. 119). In addition to contributions to sports development, equipment of the LAOOC worth more than \$2,000,000 was donated to organizations for use in community services (Perelman, 1985a, pp. 11,14,68,320).

Discussion

The operations of OCOG-80 aim to provide social service and create lasting legacies before profitability. These aims should also be considered when evaluating OCOG-80's large-scale expenditures on facilities and infrastructure. Some projects related to the development of the city and its people, which were already in the state's plans, were brought forward under the pretext of the OG. Similarly, OCOG-80's actions in the field of marketing, such as its agreement with many national companies, the subsidization of ticket prices, the construction of a large district such as the Olympic Village, etc., align with the system to which it belongs. An alternative overview of OCOG-80 activities from the perspective of sports marketing and private-sector sports management may result in excessive use of resources, high costs, losses, potential profitability sacrifice, and

excessive bureaucracy. However, in the case of the public sector, a mega sports event was organized, and the public's long-term interests were successfully integrated into the organization processes.

Due to the challenging circumstances in which LAOOC was established, it operated as a whole company focusing on minimum loss, maximum profit, and optimum performance. The LAOOC has transferred the practices and expertise of the business community to organize mega-events without public support. Evaluation of LAOOC activities from a public sector perspective: over-commercialization of OG and lack of planning for national and public impacts can be criticized. However, in terms of the private sector (Boyne, 2002), the organization was completed with limited resources, and the LAOOC made a profit. LAOOC, like OCOG-80, is successful within the system to which it belongs. The fact that LAOOC shares its profits with the community has also resulted in positive outcomes for the public sector.

The IOC modeled LAOOC's revolutionary sports marketing practices and became an important milestone in the industrialization process of sport (Jensen, 2015). With the impact of the collapse of the USSR, the OCOG has yet to be as public-orientated as the OCOG-80. In management science, the convergence of public and private sector approaches (Murray, 1975) has often been debated with the potential for the sectors to benefit and potentially harm each other (Boyne, 2002; Rainey et al., 1976). Similar discussions in management science also exist in sport management (Misener & Misener, 2017). The main concerns are the over-focusing of sport management on industrialization by turning towards business and marketing science under the influence of increasing commercialization, and its public-related aspects remaining in the background (Gammelsæter, 2021).

According to the sustainable sport management perspective (IOC, 2020), which encompasses the positive aspects of public and private sector sport management and whose influence is progressively increasing, some practices that align with the OCOG-80 and LAOOC cases. Prior to the emergence of the concept of sustainable sports management, both organizations had already adopted practices akin to contemporary best sustainable management practices. As illustrated by the examples from the 2024 Paris and 2028 Los Angeles Olympic Games, the activities of the OCOGs are shaped by various constraints, including historical context, systemic factors, and the organizational environment.

Referring back to sustainability in the Olympics, the concept has been on the IOC agenda in the 90s with concerns about environmental issues. For the first time, sustainability in the Olympic organization was included in the Lillehammer OCOG activities in 1994 (Güloğlu et al., 2023). For

more than a quarter of a century, the sport's sustainable management has been institutionalized and deepened in the economic and social pillars as well as the environment. Among the institutionalization, one of the main focuses of the IOC has been the commitments made by the host cities for the sustainable organization of the OG (Güloğlu, 2023). The requirements of the IOC for Olympic hosting included practices in three pillars of sustainability.

The IOC's expectations are not unilateral. In particular, the increase in Olympic bid withdrawals over the past decade has highlighted concerns about economic attrition, environmental degradation, and social impacts. Residents of candidate cities also expect the IOC and OCOGs to commit to organizing the OGs with comprehensive plans addressing the three dimensions of sustainability. The IOC has leveraged these mutual expectations to develop the “New Norms,” aimed at safeguarding the future of the OGs (Erkan and Çimen, 2024). The New Norms encompass preparations with minimal construction, future planning for venue use, reuse of existing facilities, ensuring the Games leave a positive social and economic legacy for local communities, minimizing environmental damage, and reducing the economic burden on the cities and national budgets (IOC, 2018; 2020; 2021).

The LAOOC will hold the OG the third time in 2028, following the 1932 and 1984 Games. In 1984, LAOOC used many facilities inherited from the 1932 OG. The 2028 LAOOC aims to organize the first OG without constructing any permanent venues. At the time in 1984, LAOOC's decision not to build at all was a consequence of the challenging circumstances in which it found itself. As a private sector company operating within a capitalist system, this was a standard task that the LAOOC needed to perform. LAOOC's "game plan" for 2028 aligns with the IOC's requirements to hold its zero-carbon footprint and protect the environment (LAOOC, 2024).

The Paris OCOG has designed and built a sustainable district to serve as the Olympic Village for the 2024 OG. While this may seem to conflict with sustainability from a minimal construction view, the commitment to constructing with a low carbon footprint and addressing the city's housing problem aligns with sustainable sports management (POCOG, 2024). 1980 Moscow OG is another example of the construction of a large district for analogous purposes. USSR integrated the project of the Village into Moscow's long-term city plan, with OCOG-80 building micro-districts to fulfill the socialist state's responsibilities to its citizens. While the activities of the OCOGs in 1980 and 2024 seem similar, the conditions surrounding the aims are different, as noted in the preceding paragraph.

Conclusion and Recommendations

In 1980 and 1984, public and private sector sports management approaches successfully organized the Olympic Games. This situation shows that there is no one right way in sports management. This comparison between OCOG-80 and LAOOC argues that both approaches' characteristics are worth emphasizing in sports management.

Sport management needs to go beyond being a discipline that transfers public or private sector management and follows the trends of other fields. The dynamics of the public and private sectors and the origins of sport management should be re-examined. The relationship between the public sector and sport management should be kept on the right track. These two sports organizations, which in this research present two contrasting and successful ways of doing the same business, can offer a good jumping-off point for new journeys into the discipline's roots.

Based on the discussion from the Cold War to the contemporary context, it can be posited that sports management has been undergoing historical transformations that await conceptualization. Sustainability would appear to be the fundamental norm of the current phase in this transformation. New theories specific to the discipline should be developed with historical insights to ensure steady steps toward the future of sports management.

Researchers have positioned OCOGs as unique cases for sports management as organizations that perform the same work in different time periods and under different political and economic conditions. In line with the importance given to OCOGs, it is recommended that more case studies be carried out that examine, compare and interpret management from different perspectives, as they are useful for the creation of new theories and insights.

Ethics Committee Approval

Ethics committee: The Ethics Committee of Gazi University

Date and Decision Number: June 22, 2021/11

Protocol No: E-77082166-302.08.01-199717

Author Contributions

Concept -E.D.E. Z.Ç.; Design-E.D.E., Z.Ç.; Supervision-Z.Ç.; Resources-E.D.E.; Data Collection and/or Processing-E.D.E.; Analysis and/or Interpretation-E.D.E., Z.Ç.; Literature Search- E.D.E.; Writing Manuscript-E.D.E., Z.Ç.; Critical Review-E.D.E., Z.Ç.

Declaration of Interests

The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare.

References

- Boykoff, J. (2016). *Power Games: A Political History of the Olympics* (First edition). London; New York: Verso Books. 124.
- Boyne, G. A. (2002). Public and Private Management: What's the Difference? *Journal of Management Studies*, 39(1), 97-122.
- Campbell, S. (2010). Comparative case study. In A. J. Mills, G. Durepos ve E. Wiebe (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Case Study Research*. Los Angeles: SAGE Publications. 174-175.
- Central Intelligence Agency [CIA]. (1980). USSR: Olympic Games preparations. Freedom of Information Act Electronic Reading Room (Report No: F-2010-00530). USA.
- Chepurayana, O. (2017). The Moscow Olympics, 1980: Competing in the context of the Cold War and state dirigisme. In A. Bairner, J. Kelly ve J. W. Lee (Eds.), *Routledge Handbook of Sport and Politics* (First edition). London: Routledge. 449-458.
- Congress. (1976, June 17). *122 Congress record extensions of remarks* [Government]. U.S. Government Publishing Office (Volume 122, Part 15). Washington D.C., USA.
- Communist Party of the Soviet Union [CPSU]. (1980). *About specific requests from several countries related to their participation in 1980 Olympic Games* [Top Secret Report]. Secretariat of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Report No: St 218/4). Moscow, USSR.
- D'Agati, P. (2013). *The Cold War and the 1984 Olympic Games: A Soviet-American Surrogate War* (First edition). New York: Palgrave Macmillan US.
- Der Spiegel. (1984, August 6). Wer nicht da ist, kann nicht gewinnen. *Der Spiegel*, (32)
- Eizenstat, S. E. and Watson, J. (1979). *Meeting with Mayor Tom Bradley regarding the 1984 Olympic Games in Los Angeles* [Memorandum]. Office of Staff Secretary Collection (Series: Presidential Files; Folder: 12/3/79; Container 140). Jimmy Carter Library, Atlanta, USA.
- Erkan, E. D., and Çimen, Z. (2024, May 15-19). *Unwelcome Guests, Withdrawn Olympic Bids* [Conference presentation abstract]. 5th International Recreation and Sport Management Congress. Antalya, Türkiye.
- Foreign Broadcast Information Service [FBIS]. (1980). *Moscow Capital of the 1980 Olympic* [Report]. Office of Staff Secretary Collection (Series: Presidential Files; Folder: 2/12/80[2]; Container 150, Requirement No: 8144/0590). Jimmy Carter Library, Atlanta, USA.
- Financial Management Service [FMS]. (1974, December 31). *Treasury Reporting Rates of Exchange 1974* [Government]. Treasury Department. Washington D.C., USA.
- Financial Management Service [FMS]. (1975, December 31). *Treasury Reporting Rates of Exchange 1975* [Government]. Treasury Department. Washington D.C., USA.
- Financial Management Service [FMS]. (1976, December 31). *Treasury Reporting Rates of Exchange 1976* [Government]. Treasury Department. Washington D.C., USA.
- Financial Management Service [FMS]. (1977, December 31). *Treasury Reporting Rates of Exchange 1977* [Government]. Treasury Department. Washington D.C., USA.
- Financial Management Service. [FMS]. (1978, December 31). *Treasury Reporting Rates of Exchange 1978* [Government]. Treasury Department. Washington D.C., USA.
- Financial Management Service. [FMS]. (1979, December 31). *Treasury Reporting Rates of Exchange 1979* [Government]. Treasury Department. Washington D.C., USA.
- Financial Management Service. [FMS]. (1980, December 31). *Treasury Reporting Rates of Exchange 1980* [Government]. Treasury Department. Washington D.C., USA.
- Gammelsæter, H. (2021). Sport is not industry: Bringing sport back to sport management. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 21(2), 257-279.
- Güloğlu, N. (2023). *Sürdürülebilirlik Perspektifinden Olimpiyat Oyunları: 2020 Tokyo Yaz ve 2022 Pekin Kış Olimpiyatları'nın İncelenmesi* [Yüksek Lisans Tezi]. Gazi Üniversitesi, Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü.
- Güloğlu, N., Erkan, E. D., and Çimen, Z. (2023). Lillehammer 1994'ten Günümüze Kış Olimpiyatları'nda Karbon Ayak İzi Azaltma Uygulamaları ve Değerlendirilmesi. *Sportive*, 6(1), 14-27.
- International Olympic Committee [IOC]. (2017, September 13). *Los Angeles 1984: An indelible legacy*. Retrieved June 20, 2024, from <https://olympics.com/en/news/los-angeles-1984-an-indelible-legacy>.
- International Olympic Committee [IOC]. (2018, February 6). *The New Norm: It's a Games changer*. Retrieved July 22, 2024, from <https://olympics.com/ioc/news/the-new-norm-it-s-a-games-changer>
- International Olympic Committee [IOC]. (2019, November 6). *Los Angeles 1984: An Influential Legacy*. Retrieved June 20, 2024, from <https://olympics.com/ioc/legacy/los-angeles-1984/los-angeles-1984-an-influential-legacy>.
- International Olympic Committee [IOC] (2020). *Sustainability Management in Sport*. Lausanne: International Olympic Committee.77.
- International Olympic Committee [IOC]. (2021, April 28). *What is the New Norm?*. Retrieved July 20, 2024, from <https://olympics.com/ioc/faq/roles-and-responsibilities-of-the-ioc-and-its-partners/what-is-the-new-norm>
- Jensen, J. A. (2015). *Historical Evolution of Olympic Commercialism: The Evolution of Attitudes Towards Commercialism Within the American Olympic Movement: A Historical Perspective* [Final Report]. International Olympic Committee (IOC) Olympic Studies Centre 2015 PhD Students Research Grant Programme, Switzerland

- Los Angeles '28 Organizing Committees for the Olympic Games [LAOOC]. (2024). *LA28 Olympic and Paralympic Sports Venues*. Retrieved July 25, 2024, from <https://la28.org/en/games-plan/venues.html>
- Misener, K. E., & Misener, L. (2017). Grey Is the New Black: Advancing Understanding of New Organizational Forms and Blurring Sector Boundaries in Sport Management. *Journal of Sport Management*, 31(2), 125–132.
- Murray, M. A. (1975). Comparing Public and Private Management: An Exploratory Essay. *Public Administration Review*, 35(4), 364-371.
- Novikov, I. T. (Ed.). (1981a). *Official Report of the Organizing Committee of the Games of the XXIInd Olympiad: Organisation*. Moscow: Fizkultura i sport.
- Novikov, I. T. (Ed.). (1981b). *Official Report of the Organizing Committee of the Games of the XXIInd Olympiad: Moscow, Tallinn, Leningrad, Kiev, Minsk*. Moscow: Fizkultura i sport.
- Öncü, E. (2017). Olimpizm ve Milliyetçilik: İlk Yüzyıl. T. Öztürk (Editör), *İlkeler, İdeolojiler ve İsyanlar*. Trabzon: Karadeniz Teknik Üniversitesi Yayınları. 423-466.
- Paris '24 Organizing Committees for the Olympic Games. [POCOG] (2024). *The Olympic and Paralympic Village*. Retrieved July 25, 2024, from <https://olympics.com/en/paris-2024/the-games/village>
- Perelman, R. B. (Ed.). (1985a). *Official Report of the 1984 Olympic Games: Organization and Planning*. Los Angeles: Los Angeles Olympic Organizing Committee.
- Perelman, R. B. (Ed.) (1985b). *Olympic Retrospective: Th Games of Los Angeles*. Los Angeles: Los Angeles Olympic Organizing Committee.
- Rainey, H. G., Backoff, R. W., & Levine, C. H. (1976). Comparing Public and Private Organizations. *Public Administration Review*, 36, 233
- Rider, T. C. (2012, October). It is not a simple matter to keep aloof: Avery Brundage and the U.S. Government in the early Cold War years. *Problems, Possibilities, Promising Practices: Critical Dialogues on the Olympic and Paralympic Games*. International Centre for Olympic Studies, Western University, Canada. 12-18.
- Riordan, J. (1993). Rewriting Soviet sports history. *Journal of Sport History*, 20(3), 12.
- Varmus, M., Kubina, M., and Adámik, R. (2021). *Strategic Sport Management: Sustainability of Sports Clubs*. (First edition). Cham: Springer. 15-144.
- Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case Study Research and Applications: Design and Methods* (Sixth edition). Los Angeles: SAGE Publications. 72-354.