

Bond University
Research Repository



Entrepreneurial leveraging in liminoidal olympic transit zones

Duignan, Michael B.; Down, Simon; O'Brien, Daniel

Published in:
Annals of Tourism Research

DOI:
[10.1016/j.annals.2019.102774](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2019.102774)

Licence:
CC BY-NC-ND

[Link to output in Bond University research repository.](#)

Recommended citation(APA):
Duignan, M. B., Down, S., & O'Brien, D. (2020). Entrepreneurial leveraging in liminoidal olympic transit zones. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 80, Article 102774. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2019.102774>

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

For more information, or if you believe that this document breaches copyright, please contact the Bond University research repository coordinator.

ENTREPRENEURIAL LEVERAGING IN LIMINOIDAL OLYMPIC ZONES

Author biographies

Dr Michael B. Duignan is a Senior Lecturer in Management and Programme Director of the MSc Sports Management and MSc International Event Management at Coventry University. Mike's research examines event, festival and visitor economy-led regional development and related socio-economic impacts on small businesses.

Corresponding author: Mike.Duignan@coventry.ac.uk



Prof Simon Down is a Professor of Entrepreneurship and Organisation at Birmingham Business School, University of Birmingham.



Dr Danny O'Brien is an Associate Professor in Sport Management at Bond Business School, Bond University.



ENTREPRENEURIAL LEVERAGING IN LIMINOIDAL OLYMPIC ZONES

ABSTRACT

Our paper throws new light on how entrepreneurial leverage is achieved in Olympic Transit Zones. Specifically, we investigate: i) contextual features enabling and constraining ‘immediate leveraging’ efforts, ii) tactics deployed to leverage, and iii) how local-entrepreneurs encouraged visitors to connect and interact with localities. We deployed a walking-methodology and interviews with local-stakeholders during Rio 2016 to do this. Findings indicate that less securitised and regulated Olympic Transit Zones allowed entrepreneurs to leverage spaces they would be typically excluded from, whilst simultaneously producing spaces that encouraged greater dwell-time for visitors to interact with local-culture and traders. We draw on concepts of liminality, liminoidal and *communitas* to explain these contrary findings and suggest how future events can foster such environments.

1. INTRODUCTION

Brazil’s Olympic mega-sport event sought to position Rio as an international visitor destination by showcasing urban and rural cultural tourism assets, places and spaces (Rio Candidature Bid, 2009). Encouraging tourism to the city was a key rationale for hosting. Defined as a “city of discovery”, Rio’s 2016 Candidature-Bid (2009) outlined a project “determined to demonstrate Brazil’s full character” (2009: 3); designed to encourage tourists to sample Brazil’s “unique character and spirit” and to enjoy “total day out” with active participation opportunities in city celebrations” (...) “celebrations [that] will extend beyond venues to communities” (2009: 37).

Unquestionably, achieving such objectives is challenging. Mega-sport events are inherently complex with respect to organisational objectives, structure, and processes, particularly as they possess a significant number of cross-cutting, stakeholder interests. Muller (2017) goes-so-far-as-to-say mega-sport events contain a series of contradictory interests that cannot be easily reconciled. A central paradoxical challenge of mega-sport events surrounds the conflict between satisfying the needs and demands of global- *and* local-interests (e.g. Giulianotti, Armstrong, Hales & Hobbs, 2015; Armstrong, Giulianotti & Hobbs, 2017). For this paper, global interests include the International Olympic Committee and ‘The Olympic Programme’ coterie of official sponsors, supporters and suppliers; meanwhile, local-interests include existing residents, regular businesses and local-entrepreneurs residing in and across the host-city and its communities. Indeed, a growing body of research points to the ways such projects exclude and marginalise host-communities from leveraging event opportunities (McGillivray & Frew, 2015; Pappalepore & Duignan, 2016). Yet, we argue that little research examines how local-contexts enable and constrain entrepreneurial action generally (Garcia-Lorenzo, Donnelley, Sell-Trujillo & Miguel-Imas, 2017), and specifically in a mega-sport events context (O’Brien, 2006) – a central concern and contribution of this article. Such analysis is vital as there is systematic evidence demonstrating how local-stakeholders inhabiting Olympic Transit Zones are locked out from predicted mega-sport event benefits (Clark, Kearns & Cleland, 2016; Financial Times, 2012). Here, we define Olympic Transit Zones as, “the last part of a spectator’s journey from a transport hub to Games’ venue” (Commission for Sustainable London, 2012: p. 41 – who referred to this as ‘Last Mile’ in the London context), often subject to intense event regulation, security measures and control (Armstrong, Giulianotti & Hobbs, 2017).

McGillivray & Frew (2015) argue that mega-sport event organisers create a legal and regulatory environment that protects corporate interests they see as central for achieving success, as also identified by Boycoff (2012) and Kelly, Fairley & O'Brien (2019). Research shows how such conditions divert visitor engagement and consumption away from less visible local-businesses and entrepreneurs toward official sponsors (e.g. McGillivray & Frew, 2015; Frew & McGillivray, 2008). Thus, local-stakeholders are effectively excluded from accessing commercial opportunities (Clark et al, 2016). In addition to the reengineering of visitor engagement and behaviour at the local-event venue level, spending is frequently disrupted at the host-city level (i.e. international tourists decide not to travel to the city due to increased hotel and flight prices) – causing tourism displacement and a 'substitution effect' (Weed, 2008). Moreover, 'aversion markets' emerge whereby domestic visitors and locals may decide to avoid official event precincts and avert local-spending (Giulianotti et al, 2015; Boycoff, 2012: 17).

Although immediate visitor economy benefits are used to justify mega-sport events, heightened securitisation and regulatory conditions mean that local-small businesses are often disappointed (Pappalepore & Duignan, 2016). Indeed, far from any sense of a feel-good factor, Clark et al (2016) showed that local-residents perceived highly securitised environments at the London 2012 Games as "alienating and disrespectful" (2016: 95). Duignan, Everett & Pappalepore (2019) argue that such measures lead to a 'forcefield' effect that directly excludes pre-existing socio-economic activity. Kelly et al (2019) also noted such effects in the context of the Cricket World Cup, illustrating how formal agreements imposed by event owners on local-contexts act to dissuade local-supply chain involvement and leveraging opportunities. Together with authors' work discussed above illustrating how local-businesses are locked out of Olympic spaces and transit zones during the London 2012 Olympics, research evidence has been remarkably consistent.

Yet, our research at Rio 2016 revealed that local-entrepreneurial opportunity was prominent, thus questioning the seeming inevitability of host-community exclusion highlighted above. Based on our findings of locally-based entrepreneurial prominence, we sought to utilise Chalip's (2004) notion of 'event leveraging': the act of cultivating and maximising events-related economic opportunity. Kirby, Duignan and McGillivray (2018) state that if events are appropriately leveraged, local-businesses can secure immediate trading benefits stimulated by the visitor economy through event tourism. Chalip (2004) calls this 'immediate leveraging'. Indeed, those who manage events may well seek to promote local-leveraging as a way of creating positive social and economic benefit for host-communities in the short-term, alongside longer-term economic legacies (O'Brien, 2006). Armed with the possibility of immediate leverage and building on the argument that sports event spaces can be considered liminal in nature (O'Brien and Chalip, 2007; Speigel, 2015), our empirical research examines local-conditions and entrepreneurial leveraging tactics across Olympic Transit Zones at the Rio 2016 Olympic Games. We draw on the concepts of liminality, the liminoidal and *communitas* to explain our findings. We do this as extant literatures outlined above, (a) have not discussed liminality, liminoidal and *communitas* in the context of the hyper-securitisation of the modern mega-sporting event; and, (b) have not demonstrated how these concepts can explain the inclusion and productive entrepreneurial leveraging efforts of typically-marginalised community actors. Specifically, the article was guided by the following research questions:

- 1) What contextual features enable and constrain local-entrepreneurial engagement in immediate forms of event leveraging across Olympic Transit Zones?
- 2) What tactics were used by local-entrepreneurs to optimise their leveraging efforts across Olympic Transit Zones?
- 3) How did local- entrepreneurs produce liminal and/or liminoidal spaces to generate *communitas*, thereby encouraging visitors to dwell, interact and connect with local-offerings and culture across Olympic Transit Zones?

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 *Crafting global business spaces: Making the local-invisible*

A mega-sport event requires the sequestration of existing resources in the host-city (Smith, 2018), often at the heart of existing residential and business districts (O'Brien, 2006): transforming local-spaces into Olympic zones for housing sports, cultural and commercial activities by applying official event regulations, spatial and security requirements (Armstrong et al, 2017). Such resources may include urban squares, parklands and other green spaces, highways, roads and pathways, commercial precincts and town centres, even beaches and existing touristic hotspots. In other words, everyday open public spaces temporarily become commoditised private spaces open only to those with a ticket and/or wishing to engage in Olympic consumption. As a result, the Olympic takeover creates an environment whereby existing smaller and local-producers are displaced by external, global-business providers. Furthermore, McGillivray & Frew (2015) argue that the visitor gaze is purposefully directed toward officially designated Olympic zones: complete with corporate branding, global messaging and desirable images of event and city.

Although studies of mega-sport event impacts on host-communities that specifically address local-entrepreneurship and small businesses are rare, industry (e.g. Federation of Small Businesses, 2013) and academic research (Duignan et al, 2019) has started to emerge. For example, in the post-London 2012 Games period, the Federation of Small Businesses (2013) found that the pre-planned management systems for visitor foot traffic deliberately funnelled visitors through routes that effectively discouraged them from accessing unsanctioned areas during London 2012. Therefore, many small operators around Olympic Park struggled to even maintain normal business, let alone benefit from the expected Games windfall. McGillivray & Frew's (2015) empirical analysis of London 2012 corroborates such analysis, claiming that the city was "kneeling at the altar" (2015: 2658) of The Olympic Programme of sponsors, supporters and suppliers, effectively ignoring local-small business interests.

Raco & Tunney (2010) and Steinbrink (2013) argue that mega-sport events intentionally deprioritise, ignore or even 'invisibilise' local-interest, whilst mega-sport events disrupt, displace, and disserve pre-existing socio-economic activity. Duignan et al (2018) highlight how mega-sport events can fast-track government policy and decision making often giving rise to less-than-democratic outcomes, effectively "allowing democracies to behave like dictatorships – if only for a short time" (Mohdin, 2016: 1). Moreover, the pressure of strategic project timing also exerts overbearing power over local-businesses since post-bid decision-making generally becomes subject to a non-negotiable *fait accompli*: "... a tidal wave crashing over local-businesses (...) their low visibility making them relatively

easy targets for ‘decisive action’” (Raco & Tunney, 2010: 2082). It is in light of these challenges that mega-sport event organisations are facing growing pressures to justify fair and equitable impacts. Yet, whilst significant evidence illustrates the systematic and structural ways mega-sport events marginalise host-communities our research suggests that the complexity of social and economic transformations required to stage may well open up liminal, perhaps liminoidal spaces. As host-cities become disrupted, particularly in the live staging phase of delivery, novel and creative entrepreneurial activities may open up opportunities for those caught in the marginalising melee of mega-sport events.

2.2 Liminal and Liminoidal Spaces

We now detail and disentangle three theoretical concepts framing this article: the liminal, liminoidal and the emergence of *communitas* – and how these relate to visitor experiences and opportunities for entrepreneurial leveraging.

The concept of liminality continues to gain considerable traction in the tourism literature (Pritchard & Morgan, 2006), highlighting the transitional nature of touristic experience as a creative and playful opportunity to break away from the norms of daily life (Turner, 1983; Shields, 2013). As tourists leave the comfort of home to travel, they cross time and space thresholds from ‘the known’ to the ‘unknown’ (Lew, 2012), or what Hunter and Shaw (2007) refer to as a ‘transit zone.’ Turner (1974) called the ‘object’ (in our case, the event visitor) the ‘liminar’ who transitions through space. Turner posits that liminars are typically stripped of individuality favouring uniformity and anonymity. In this case, individuals become Olympic spectators, subject to direction and control across Olympic Transit Zones by Olympic officials and regulations as if they were an undifferentiated mass.

Turner (1974) referred to such transitional space as the ‘limen’, a transitional arrangement that requires the liminar to be physically separated from the rest of society and everyday practices. Characterised by its ambiguity, the limen typically possesses few of the attributes of either the known or unknown. O’Brien and Chalip (2007) emphasise the limen and liminar’s disconnect from the quotidian. They emphasise how the celebratory aspects of events make it possible to create extraordinary experiences far removed from everyday life, perhaps even an experience of something ‘sacred’ (2007). Sometimes, such transitions might require a long pilgrimage (Turner, 1974). At others, as illustrated by our case, it can be a short passage in time and space which reflects Beech’s (2011) conception of liminality as, “a temporary transition through which identity is reconstructed, and/or can be thought of as a more longitudinal experience of ambiguity and in-between-ness within a changeful context” (2014: 288).

Mega-sport events represent a unique opportunity for visitors to break away from everyday life and regular touristic consumption practices. They open up new lines of entrepreneurial opportunity for those that can alter “current resources and strategies of action” (Lorenzo-Garcia et al, 2017: 376) seeking to leverage new and temporarily disrupted business environments (O’Brien, 2006). Yet, at the Olympic Games, the norms of consumption are heavily influenced by The Olympic Programme of official product offerings: sponsors, supporters and suppliers (Giulianotti et al, 2016). Indeed, the sheer volume of spectators is what attracts the involvement of global corporations as sponsors and official partners. In the resulting homogenised, corporatised and securitised context,

the prospect of mega-sport events producing liminal spaces rich in community pride and celebration and other playful or even 'sacred' spaces seems somewhat contradictory.

Due to the disruptive nature of mega-sport events, they also produce the potential for ambiguous and in-between spaces. For example, Duignan & McGillivray (2019) noted how Rio's host event zones were highly disorganised and disorderly, producing less controlled spaces relative to previous mega-sport event cities. Weaker controls open up the opportunity for 'anti-structure' to emerge (Turner, 1974: 60). Anti-structure refers to the dissolution of normative social structure (roles, status, rights, duties) that liberate capacities of cognition, affect, volition and creativity from normative constraints. Anti-structure has the potential to generate innovation and novelty in such less-controlled spaces. In our case, anti-structure finds expression in new leisure experiences and cultural offerings that form the basis of our findings below. It is, as Garcia-Lorenzo et al (2017) also imply, "betwixt and between" space that we can "better observe how creating organising actions, play and improvisational entrepreneurial processes occur" (2017: 374) – a central feature of our empirical findings.

Whereas Turner (1974) positioned the liminal and liminoidal in a binary relationship, Speigel (2015) argues that they should be seen as a continuum: one at either end, between two ideal states. Liminoid means liminal-like, and thus resembles, without being identical to, the liminal (Speigel, 2015). A key difference between the two is that, liminality infers a more structured and obligatory transition, whereas liminoidal infers optionality over transitional arrangements (Turner, 1974). Additionally, liminal phenomena tend to be collective – the transition of a group. Liminoidal phenomena may be collective but are usually individual products that can have a collective or 'mass' effect. That is, individuals can have different transitional experiences yet transition as a group, which we propose was the case of event visitors who moved through the Olympic Transit Zones in our case. Complementing this view, Turner (1974) states that liminoidal phenomena are not cyclical but are continuously generated in times and places assigned to 'leisure' activity, which supports our emergent idea that Olympic Transit Zones are more liminoidal than liminal.

Whereas the liminal is typically found in initiation rites of churches, sects, clubs etc., the liminoid is more associated with leisure (e.g. art, sport, pastimes) (Speigel, 2015). Hence, since leisure experiences tend to be less controlled and more idiosyncratic, they will also produce cultural ludic offerings up for sale on the free market (Turner, 1974). The intense free market dynamics one sees in the core Olympics zones (McGillivray et al, 2019), are a clear example of such offerings. Turner (1974) also made a distinction between working at the liminal and playing with the liminoid. In the latter, social order is transformed and facilitates subversive and ludic events. However, he also recognised that liminoid phenomena develop at the margins, interfaces and interstices of central and servicing institutions - hence without the disorder we observed at Rio, the plural, fragmentary and experimental spaces where improvised and creative entrepreneurial practices flourish (Garcia-Lorenzo et al, 2017: 374), would likely not have emerged.

As opposed to the longitudinal nature of liminal, our observations of behaviours in the Rio 2016 Olympic Transit Zones show the immediacy and fleeting nature of the liminoidal and the emergence of *communitas*, which is the final aspect of our theoretical framing. *Communitas* is defined as "an unmediated relationship between historical, idiosyncratic, concrete individuals" (Turner, 1974: 77) where individual distinctiveness is preserved as people subvert duties and rights by producing an atmosphere of *communitas*. It is important to note theoretically that *communitas*

is not about the erasure of all structural norms. Rather, the distinctive style of *communitas* is based on the way it symbolises the abrogation, negation or inversion of the participants' everyday normative structures. As Garcia-Lorenzo et al (2017) and Cornelissen (2011) argue, liminal space opens up more authentic, unique cultural interactions. Such depth of engagement, when transferred to the visitor economy, may well give rise to greater engagement between event tourists and local host-community culture, particularly, we show below, those residents, small businesses and local-entrepreneurs looking to leverage liminal spaces through improvisation and experimental entrepreneurialism (Hjorth, 2013).

Therefore, while Chalip and his various colleagues proposed the centrality of liminal spaces for achieving strategic leveraging outcomes at mega-sport events, there remains a dearth of knowledge around the nuanced, though critical, difference between the liminal and the liminoid in the mega-sport events context. And, how this knowledge relates specifically to immediate event leverage and entrepreneurial opportunities for host-communities. The liminoidal phenomena we report on below can be understood as part of a wider social critique, specifically relating to the unequal development that has emerged in mega-sport event planning and delivery, and exemplified by the pervasive critique of the management of global-local stakeholder interests at the Olympics. Thus, the challenge for stakeholders interested in planning for improved event leveraging outcomes for locals is to encourage more liminoidal experiences. Less heavily controlled spaces may also create opportunities for micro-emancipation and immediate and localised entrepreneurial leverage. Therefore, this research addresses a gap in our extant knowledge by drawing on Chalip's (2004) notion of immediate leverage and identifying contextual features that enable and constrain immediate forms of event leveraging. Furthermore, while Chalip proposed tactics for immediate leverage, neither he nor any research to date has addressed the nature of the actors most suitably positioned to enact immediate leverage and the aspects of the mega-sport event they should focus on to derive such outcomes. We posit in this paper that the actors best placed to enact immediate leverage for host-communities are local-small business entrepreneurs, and we demonstrate the central role they can play in the simultaneous creation, animation and leverage of, Olympic Transit Zones as liminoid spaces. Having explained theoretically how our observations at Rio 2016 challenge extant knowledge, we now explain the research design and methodology, before reporting our findings.

3. METHODOLOGY

In addressing the research questions outlined in the introduction, we initially analysed secondary data to ensure familiarity with the pre-Games context. These sources included: (1) strategic and policy documentation (e.g. candidature-bid, and policy documentation); (2) archival material (e.g. VisitRio and other specific websites concerning event spaces, e.g. <http://visit.rio/en/editorial/livesitemarvelousport/>); and, (3) media reports from 2014 to 2016. Qualitative, primary data were then generated through: i) real-time walking and observational methods; and, ii) 17 interviews with 17 different key stakeholders.

3.1 Observational data collection

To support naturalistic inquiry (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) the first author recorded observations in the Games build-up period (31st July – 4th August 2016) to the Opening Ceremony (5th August 2016) and into event delivery mode (6-

9th August). The first researcher is a UK-based academic familiar with Olympic and mega-sport event empirical research. The observations facilitated “the systematic description of events, behaviours, and artefacts in the social setting chosen for study” (Marshall & Rossman, 1989: 79). Learning from McGillivray & Frew’s (2015) study of the London 2012 Olympic Games, the lead researcher employed a walking methodology to explore the urban sites under investigation. Walking methodologies enable multi-dimensional sensory experiences that afford real-time analyses between researchers and the contexts. The lead researcher could thus experience the transformation of urban Rio into an Olympic city in the immediate build-up and live staging period, approximating the gaze of Olympic visitors.

The principal areas examined across the 10-day observation period were the Barra, Maracanã and Copacabana areas of Rio, alongside the official Live Site at the Olympic Boulevard in Porto Maravilha. The Olympic Transit Zone and host-communities immediately surrounding these inner-city areas were included, as were the Olympic Stadium, Maracanã Stadium, Copacabana’s temporary Beach Volleyball stadium, and the live screens, retail and hospitality units at Porto Maravilha. The lead researcher stayed in the Copacabana district and pre-booked tickets for 10 Olympic events across the venues under examination.

Observations were recorded using photography, audio description and video ethnography (Pink et al., 2015). Over 2,000 photographs and 400 short video blogs were generated and later analysed via qualitative data software Nvivo. At the conclusion of each day, the lead researcher recorded video blogs (vlogs) and posted these to a live feed which included end-of-day observation real-time updates via the use of a Twitter hashtag ([hashtag hidden for peer review]). This fostered collaborative engagement from co-authors and other interested academics and stakeholders (to date, the [link hidden for peer review](#) vlog has had over 800 unique visitors and 3500+ views). New lines of enquiry were generated as viewers contemporaneously placed in Rio directed the lead researcher to additional event sites and entrepreneurial activity. Although content on the vlog was not used as a data set for this paper, documenting the study in this way served two key purposes. First, it deepened the lead researcher’s embeddedness in the field, thus maximising effective overall data collection. Second, it helped document the pre-, during- and post-Games changes (after the closing ceremony: 21 August, 2016) that were taking place and provided insights into the nature of spaces under transformation and immediate leverage in the context of Olympic spaces.

3.2 Interview method and approach

During the real-time walking and observation phase, the authors iteratively generated a series of themes and sub-themes to structure initial empirical findings. Reflecting the final research questions and structure of the following empirical analysis, three broad themes emerged from this data analysis process: i) enabling and constraining factors (related to research question 1); ii) tactics used by local-entrepreneurs to engage in immediate event leveraging (related to research question 2); and, iii) observed interactions and benefits between event visitors and local-entrepreneurs – and how, alongside leveraging tactics, local-entrepreneurs and residents animated local-areas and created hospitable environments that encouraged visitors to dwell, connect and interact with local-traders and culture (related to research question 3).

To examine these further, we developed a set of related questions to access the views of representatives from key Rio-specific tourism and visitor economy-related organisations. Interviews were subsequently conducted post-Games across four categories of stakeholder groups: i) government policy; ii) non-government policy; iii) industry; and, iv) academic (see Table 1 for full breakdown of all interviewees and organisational affiliations). We interviewed this sample as they represent organising and/or upper echelons of the Brazilian tourism field, who offer informed perspectives on the issues at hand. A purposive, nonprobability sampling technique was used to identify stakeholders considered appropriate to comment on the research questions. Following full university ethics approval and protocol, the authors' worked with a local-researcher to collect primary who translated and transcribed all interview documents ready for qualitative analysis.

Insert 'Table 1' – Interviewee list

3.3 Data Analysis

We utilised the data sets described above to corroborate findings and examine stakeholder perspectives against the lead researcher's observations. Analysing both observation and interview data enabled us to achieve adequacy, aided by researcher triangulation as all researchers were involved with the development of final themes. All data sets were collected purposively to build on previous themes generated as identified earlier in section 3.2, develop appropriate theoretical foci for the research, and attempt to answer the research questions. We utilised Nvivo to code all textual data sets, affording a thematic networks analysis to build theory. As indicated earlier, to make sense of the data, the lead researcher developed a well-publicised vlog to disseminate initial themes across social media to both academic and policy networks. Across the data, thick descriptions emerging out of the analysis provide a way for the reader to examine the contextually rich setting. Additionally, aforementioned digital spaces utilised provided a useful platform to synthesise data sets, generate ideas and consolidate research themes. A detailed breakdown of all the digital platforms and social media approaches taken, and the benefit of this approach is outlined in a recent article entitled: '[title and author reference hidden for peer review]'.

4. RIO 2016 ANALYSIS

Olympic event spaces and official Olympic Transit Zone routes are known for being hyper-securitised and regulated by legally-binding Olympic *Host City Contracts* (Duignan & Pappalepore, 2019). Yet, although such features existed in Rio's event management, our analysis also shows a different version of the Olympic city. Aligned against the research questions, core empirical themes outlined in the methodology, and theoretical concepts framing of our paper, we split our analysis into three sections, as follows:

- 4.1) how official event spaces of Rio 2016 enabled or constrained local-entrepreneurial activity;

- 4.2) specific, creative tactics employed by local-traders across Rio's Olympic Transit Zones to engage in opportunistic immediate event leveraging activities;

4.3) what local-traders, alongside residents did to animate and create hospitable environments that helped event visitors' dwell, and how this helped connect and interact with local-trader offerings and culture.

4.1 Setting the stage: Rio's localised commercial canvas

In order to stage Rio's complex mega-sport event, official sports venues were constructed across a range of urban and rural locations. These included residential districts in Maracanã, a newly regenerated port area, and public squares at Porto Maravilha that housed cultural and commercial activities across the temporary Olympic Boulevard, right through to the world-famous Copacabana beach. As identified earlier, both residential and touristic spaces are often strategically targeted as key urban assets for mega-sport events. In the build-up to the Olympics, new event venues were erected, and/or existing venues repurposed, and security measures installed with barriers and visible deployment of police and military personnel. Such an operation entails project requirement overlaying existing environments to enact the project and successfully deliver event objectives (Armstrong et al, 2017).

Branded with the official green and yellow Rio-Olympic regalia, buildings, street signage, bus stops and billboards *et cetera* (officially referred to as 'street furniture' (Rio Candidature-Bid, 2009)) filled visitors' and residents' views of the Olympics and its official sponsors, supporters and suppliers. Indeed, reconfiguring and commercialising public assets in this way has generally served to divert visitor and residents' gaze and engagement away from local-goods, services and culture produced by small businesses and local-traders (Pappalepore & Duignan, 2016). Yet, whilst this may be the case, observation and visual evidence gathered throughout our walking methodology across three different geographically located Olympic zones and event sites, revealed local-traders selling goods, many of which directly rivalled official Olympic offerings. Thus, it was clear that Rio had significantly less corporate presence in Olympic Transit Zones than has been previously observed (e.g. Giulianotti et al, 2016). Repeatedly, interviewees claimed that: "we [residents in Rio] did not perceive legacies of these brands throughout the city" (#5), and that corporates featured, "where they were allowed, but in a narrow way" (#13). Nevertheless, the Rio Olympics did create disruption, displacement and pacification effects for existing residents, and particularly for favela communities (Talbot & Carter, 2016). However, during the live staging of the Games, Rio's Olympic Transit Zones were more inclusive of local-entrepreneurship. Rather than a "tidal wave crashing over local-businesses" (Raco & Tunney, 2010: 2082), we indicate specific ways that local-traders found avenues of inclusion in Maracanã, Porto Maravilha and Copacabana's beachside Olympic Transit Zones.

Several contextual factors contributed to both limited corporate presence and thus relative inclusion of local-entrepreneurship. First, Rio's declaration of a financial state of emergency just 40 days before the Opening Ceremony eroded public confidence in the Organising Committee's ability to produce a viable and stable Games. Second, the collapse of core security contracts just weeks before the Games and the urgent deployment of Brazil's national military force to manage security requirements did little to instil confidence. Political instability around the impeachment of President Dilma Rouseff, alongside social unrest concerning the way public funds were being allocated to the Olympics also served to undermine and complicate matters. These factors played a key role in the International Olympic Committee claiming that "the [Rio 2016] organization has been plagued by delays and security concerns" (The Guardian, 2016), and the "worst ever" organised Olympics (The Guardian, 2014). Against a

backdrop of internal turmoil, our findings may reflect the serendipitous success of weaker regulatory governance and control: presenting a less than ideal host-city canvas for corporate commercial exploitation.

Here, we argue that Rio may represent a glitch in the dominant logic of hyper-secured and highly circumscribed Olympic Transit Zones; an accidental shift toward openness and malleability in event design. Local-conditions represent what Stevens & Dovey (2004) present as the always-temporary outcomes of political, economic and institutional arrangements. Reflecting on Research Question 1, whereas prior case study evidence points to spaces produced that constrain local-leveraging opportunities, Rio's disrupted landscape represents a connection with liminality – a connection that enables, as opposed to disables, opportunity. Here, 'smoother spaces' (e.g. McGillivray & Frew, 2015) created greater fluidity and mobility for visitor movement and local-entrepreneurial leverage. Indeed, apparently poorly organised spaces enabled immediate leveraging. Building on these ideas, we now describe the specific tactics used by local-entrepreneurs looking to exploit these liminal conditions.

4.2 Tactics and serendipitous immediate leverage of liminoidal 'Olympic Transit Zones'

As discussed earlier, Olympic Transit Zones are spaces where visitors travel to and from the event's venues, cultural and commercial hubs (see Figures 1 – 6 for examples from Rio). Rio's cultural hubs consisted of public areas (e.g. Copacabana beach and the open-air plaza at Porto Maravilha), and commercial hubs that included official Games or sponsor, supporter and supplier activity (e.g. the Olympic mega-store on Copacabana beach and animated official corporate spaces). Generally, Olympic Transit Zones require visitors to travel from 'the known' (i.e. familiar environments such as airports, shopping malls and hotels) to 'the unknown' (i.e. routes to and from official venues, usually starting and ending at a local-transport hub (McGillivray et al, 2019)).

Olympic spectators move through Olympic Transit Zones – new, temporarily constructed spaces that are physically rooted in existing geographies yet different to everyday practice, norms and rules – in a form of social limbo (Turner, 1974). As we theorise above, we see Olympic Transit Zones as possessing both structure and anti-structure, known and unknown characteristics. Olympic logos, the presence of sponsors, corporate icons, Games' security typify the structures we expect to see across the host-city. Individuals require tickets to get to and enter the venue. In this sense, Olympic Transit Zones conform to liminal space by deploying structures that aid transition that are typically stable, cyclical and repetitive – closely aligning to the historical ways Olympic Transit Zones are organised and highly controlled.

Host-communities across each research site became animated and carnivalesque – as detailed further in section 5.3. Local-traders and residents were present at official event spaces and Olympic Transit Zones, filling the streets with local-goods, services and cultural offers. People on the streets used the Olympic Transit Zones to celebrate by generating an authentic Cariocan party atmosphere, whilst making money in the process: partying that pays. For clarity, Cariocan culture refers to a distinct set of cultural practices invoked by the people of Rio de Janeiro (e.g. Samba dance) as identified across section 5.3 in the findings of this paper. Based on observations and conversations in the field, traders appeared ready to engage with the Olympics in what Chalip (2004) refers to as 'immediate' forms of event leveraging.

Existing small businesses and local-opportunist traders employed various creative entrepreneurial tactics to optimise these opportunities. Respondents familiar with usual Olympic practices claimed that the relative lack of controls enabled these opportunities. An academic respondent said that, “due to the fact they were not totally controlled, many small businesses took advantage of the crowd” (#14). Repeatedly, interviewees spoke about practical, leverageable opportunities for “informal businesses” (#6) across all the sites under investigation, particularly “street vendors near the Olympic Boulevard” (#8) and across the public spaces within event precincts. A senior manager of a national business federation explained that, “there were a lot of opportunities for micro entrepreneurs to sell things for the visitor in the streets. [...] a lot of shops in south zone brought many souvenirs and clothes to [sell to] the tourists.” (#5). Even prime Olympic real-estate adjacent to core global Olympic symbols, were used as spaces to sell, as illustrated by various interviewees: “we could see lots of autonomous workers in the streets selling bottles of water, souvenirs, t-shirts and other kind of gifts. All products were related to the event and the goal was to sell things to the foreign visitors (#5) (...), and “popcorn sellers, hot dog sellers, and other like people who sold food, souvenir, drinking, T-shirt and some typical gifts from the city were all on offer” (#3).

The official Olympic rings (visible in the background of Image 2), a popular hotspot for taking ‘selfies,’ became a site for local-food and beverage traders, as did other tourist attractions in the vicinity across official event zones, like Copacabana beach. Fake Olympic merchandise was visible at virtually every event precinct (e.g. Image 1). Some traders used passive selling tactics but others aggressively pursued spectators. From flags and fake football shirts, to pop-up massage parlours and henna tattooists, all vied for business. Ever creative, one road-side trader was observed selling fake Olympic magnets just yards from Games’ officials (Image 3); yet the trader kept his stash of goods hidden just in case of regulatory enforcement.

Insert ‘Figure 1 (left).’ Peddling unofficial merchandise outside the Olympic Stadium, Maracanã (Authors’ image).

Insert ‘Figure 2 (centre).’ Candy floss seller outside main site for Olympic Rings at Copacabana beach (Authors’ image).

Insert ‘Figure 3 (right).’ Stash of unofficial hand-painted Rio 2016 magnets (Authors’ image).

One local-academic specialising in event tourism stated that, “business was good for all”, elaborating that “...in Copacabana, the local-commerce has benefited a lot as well” (#4). From the Olympic Stadium in Maracanã, to the beach side Olympic Transit Zones at Copacabana, hundreds of opportunist traders plied their trade with only half-hearted, ad-hoc pressure from security officials to move them on. According to the senior policy and industry stakeholders interviewed, such enforcement was minimal relative to the volume of entrepreneurial activity.

Despite seeming to emerge from nowhere, this rash of informal selling was considered normal by our respondents: an everyday part of the local-culture. As one respondent explained, “[street trading] is part of cariocas culture. The population is very indifferent about it” (#14). As identified earlier, weaker regulatory governance and controls found in Rio relative to previous Olympic cities aligns closely with Brazil’s latent capacity for dynamic informal economies (OECD, 2012). Here, informality is characterised by a latent capacity for opportunistic small-scale economic behaviour, contrasting with the formal, ordered and structured nature of Olympic spaces, specifically Olympic Transit Zones.

A key aspect of this culture is street food. Just metres away from the Olympic Stadium, locals prepared a banquet of culinary regional offerings. These included barbeque stands, tenants serving hot food out of apartment block gardens and stands of freshly made churros and mobile-on-foot peddlers of home-made *caipirinhas* (Figure 4). Another respondent explained that whilst local-product offerings were “not present within venue spaces, [however] they were allowed around them” (#13). Such opportunities for street food were not available at previous Games or, at least, not to the extent found in Rio. All the images presented below are situated no further than 50 metres from the Olympic Stadium, Olympic Transit Zones that would ordinarily be intensely regulated by Olympic activity and completely “locked down” thus precluding locals from immediate leveraging.

Insert ‘Figure 4 (left).’ Caipirinha micro business (Authors’ image).

Insert ‘Figure 5 (centre).’ Residents serving food outside through the bars of their apartment block (Authors’ image).

Insert ‘Figure 6 (right).’ Mobile churros van. (Authors’ image).

Insert ‘Figure 7 (left).’ Local-entrepreneur peddling caipirinhas to crowds watching the Opening Ceremony across the Olympic Boulevard (Authors’ image).

Insert ‘Figure 8 (right).’ Hot Brazilian food served from a pop-up micro business (Authors’ image).

Although much of our analysis emphasises the serendipitous nature of immediate leveraging by local-opportunist traders (Duignan, Everett, Walsh and Cade, 2017), some of the observed activity demonstrated planned and ‘strategic’ forms of leverage. Across the Olympic Boulevard, we observed a series of local-food and drink trucks (Figure 9 and 10) sitting side-by-side with official, corporate vendors. Beyond entrepreneurial locals operating within host-community residential environments, respondents claimed that the “installation of food trucks on the Boulevard Olímpico” (#8) was one of the Olympics’ main successes, and that, “vans, automobiles, micro buses and buses were all used. Food services from micro and small businesses had significant demand” (#2). Our observations immediately before and after the Opening Ceremony suggested that local-vendors were more successful in terms of sales volume than the official sponsored products and vendors. We also saw other examples of non-official products on offer, including carnivalesque Brazilian party wear, in prime positions close to Live Site public viewing screens and neighbouring official Rio 2016 official merchandise stands (Figure 9).

Beyond food and drink, we found other forms of local-cultural offerings in the form of special local-markets (Figure 11) and pop-up international stalls and meeting points situated on and close to the beach across Copacabana’s Olympic Transit Zone. Here, our findings reveal two main types of entrepreneurial activity conducted by two distinctly different types of traders: i) opportunist, local-traders engaging in serendipitous leveraging across residential host-community Olympic Transit Zones; and, ii) food, drink and retail vendors in a set of planned, strategic initiatives afforded across two separate official event precincts. Irrespective of types of activity and trader, the key conceptual point for this article is that less securitised and regulated Olympic Transit Zones afforded greater visitor-entrepreneur interaction and connectivity. Tangible benefits arose to visitors from this opportunistic behaviour in the form of perceived authentic ‘non-traditional’ modes of touristic consumption (Robinson, 2006). In this sense, this use of Rio’s liminal transit zones appeared to disrupt the dominant logic of official global business spaces and corporate consumption. It is this shift in interaction and consumption between event visitors and local-

forms of entrepreneurship that illustrates Rio 2016 as a particularly unique case supporting the production of more inclusive, liminoidal space in mega-sport event contexts.

Insert ‘Figure 9 (left).’ Local-festival dress wear and party clothing and accessories situated next to official Rio 2016 merchandise shop at the Olympic Boulevard (Authors’ image).

Insert ‘Figure 10 (centre).’ Food and drink trucks on the Olympic Boulevard (Authors’ image).

Insert ‘Figure 11 (right).’ Street market at the heart of the Copacabana event precinct (Authors’ image).

We argue that Rio symbolised the inversion of normative Olympic structures by creative leveraging attempts. Creating distinctive cultural experiences plays on the fleeting nature of *communitas*, in contrast to the corporate, pre-packaged and bland experiences that typify such zones. We argue that Olympic Transit Zones closely align with the organic and playful nature typical of liminoidal phenomena. Our observations are commensurate with the liminoid since social order was transformed, facilitating subversive and ludic events. Perhaps these are coincidental outcomes. Based on our interpretation of the data, we feel they reflect Rio’s local-culture of play and informality. Anti-structure and disorder emerge as a central feature in our analysis producing novelty and alternative cultural offerings and leveraging by local-entrepreneurs who would be typically excluded from Olympic Transit Zones. Whilst recognising risks associated with less regulation and control, we note the positive benefits for locals and suggest Olympic organisers have something to learn from being disorderly.

4.3 Animating Rio’s transit zones: Liminoidal spaces of dwelling and local-interaction

Alongside specific forms of immediate leverage in the form of opportunistic entrepreneurship, our findings reveal how local-traders and residents came together to animate event spaces and transit zones in a variety of creative ways. For local-Cariocan people and communities, the Olympics was not *just* about selling. The behaviours described above and below are specific to a range of unique cultural practices; specifically, the notion of providing a hospitable and interactive environment for visitors. Respondents repeatedly claimed that it was the Cariocan people who enhanced the visitor experience through showcasing local-culture and “Brazilianness” (#7). One respondent remarked that, “only the soul of Cariocas and the Brazilian people were truly engaged to make this event the best of all times” (#1). Interviewed as part of this study, policy makers, including one Senior Manager at Brazil’s Ministry of Tourism, echoed such ambition, claiming that: “the biggest goal of the Olympics was to generate a great commitment of the population around this goal, which would encourage greater interaction of the population with the visitors” (#17). This reflected Rio’s desire to showcase an authentic side to the city’s local-culture, as outlined in the introduction’s reference to Rio’s Candidature-Bid (2009)

Here, we can see that at the core of the carnivalesque atmosphere – created through food, music and dance – visitors were encouraged to spend locally, helping to create that atmosphere, spontaneous outbreaks of authentic Brazilian and Cariocan samba music and dancing were a common sight. Findings emphasised how locals were ultimately trying to make visitors “feel at home” (#3) through “Rio’s desire to present the ‘real’ Carioca spirit through music, dance and people” (#4). As observed through walking across Olympic Transit Zones, we even found street vendors taking to microphones, rapping and amplifying their local-food and drink offerings (see Figure 12 below). By doing so, locals produced a highly distinctive and idiosyncratic space free from highly determined and

constrained relations typically produced in Olympic Transit Zones. Whilst the cultural and commercial content was offered by individual entrepreneurs, it was also delivered as a collective since the local-community came together to produce the carnival atmosphere, evoking a fleeting *communitas* and also having a memorable ‘mass effect’ on the cohort of Olympic spectators.

Insert ‘Figure 12 (left).’ A local-trader promoting local-food offering through a microphone (Authors’ image).

Several interviewees noted that “...tourism for them, is a thrill and not a branding process - and people know this and came for this, and locals delivered on this” (#1). These activities represent alternative, grassroots and community-based actions in an attempt to optimise leverageable benefits. As noted earlier, Rio’s justification to host the Olympics was to foster a project whereby visitors could ‘discover the city’ by connecting visitors for an authentic version of local-Cariocan culture. We show that entrepreneurial and cultural responses by residents and local-traders helped to localise a global Games, balancing global business needs with Brazilian and Cariocan spirit. This global-local-balance was considered a major boon across transit zones, with some respondents claiming that, “from the point of view of cultural exchanges, the impacts were also very rich, with great interaction between residents and tourists” (#4).

Several respondents pointed to the fact that a welcoming attitude toward visitors is a regular cultural response as “the population of Rio de Janeiro is already accustomed to receiving great events and interacting with tourists” (#2) – a by-product of decades of hosting large-scale cultural events. From animating local-streets to welcoming people into their neighbourhoods and residences, Rio’s welcoming culture was widespread in the city. For example, for the Olympics, “many Cariocas opened their houses and apartments to receive tourists. The hospitality worked as always” (#2). Emphasising the need for local-grassroots proactivity, one respondent remarked:

It was successful, because the Carioca once again did the work that should have been done by the government, which is to bring excitement. I don’t mean that emotion created and plasticised by government, and by the Olympic project, but the real emotion of helping, of trying to understand another language and to welcome well and showing the Brazilian hospitality. People dream about the beaches and the human warmth and that is why the tourists and visitors came. No governmental publicity was noticed even from EMBRATUR [National Tourism Board], nor from the Government of Rio. No campaigns talking about Rio were engaged whatsoever (#1).

Within Olympic Transit Zones, a unique temporal and spatial feature of Rio’s Olympic Transit Zones emerged. Visitors were able to ‘dwell’ and had time to construct their own experience as they transitioned from one space to another. Theoretically, liminality focuses on the transitional time and space of tourists’ engagement and experience with places, spaces and attractions that characterise an individual or collective cultural experience. In the context of our findings, by ‘dwell’ we refer to the ability for visitors to slow down and engage as individuals in a more meaningful and deep manner: a playful, creative and elastic type of space where a variety of different outcomes can emerge. Olympic spectators traversing Olympic Transit Zones can be understood as members (liminar(s)) of a

spectator cohort. Yet, unlike a more liminal description of London 2012 where people were funneled and hurried through Olympic Transit Zones as if through a vacuum, a more liminoidal journey with multiple choices was available: one could choose to Samba, eat food, buy merchandise or simply stare in wonder at the carnival.

However, Olympic Transit Zones are both liminal and liminoidal. Both rely on the existence of the other. Designed on paper, the original liminal transit zone is transformed by a disordered context and playful interactions of residents, traders and visitors into a liminoidal space. Our theorising here reflects Turner's own recognition of the interplay of the liminal and liminoid, since he notes that the use of liminality in complex societies 'must be metaphorical' (1974: 62). In other words, there are few truly figurative liminal phenomena, which is why he developed the liminoid concept.

Rio's liminoidal spaces colonised the loosely controlled formal Olympic Transit Zones, enabling event visitors to connect and interact with host-community culture and local-forms of entrepreneurship, a phenomenon rarely seen before at the Olympics. Our findings sit in stark contrast to the alienating and disrespectful (Clark et al, 2016) environments described in earlier mega-sport event research where visitors are funnelled and shoehorned towards official sponsor, supporter and supplier spaces. As a result, liminoidal spaces afforded less constraining, more enabling entrepreneurial environments for local-traders wishing to engage in immediate event leveraging tactics.

5. CONCLUSIONS

Contrary to other case study settings and evidence, our findings show that where events land in less organised, regulated and securitised host-cities, liminoidal space can be produced – disrupting the normal *modus operandi* of mega-sport events that typically favours global interests over those locally. We suggest that when Olympic structures dissipate (e.g. reduction of control and fragmented event organisation), and in the relative absence of legitimate authority, opportunities for spontaneous community organisation that foster organic relations between visitors and communities can emerge opening up the potential for *communitas* to form. Thus, such conditions create an opportunity for micro-emancipation that *enables*, as opposed to *constrains* entrepreneurial leveraging in the immediate live staging of mega-sport events – whilst still delivering a safe, secure event. Findings suggest that encouraging degrees of disorder might replicate the liminoidal space that occurred serendipitously in Rio, and potentially at least, increase the likelihood for *communitas* to emerge and flourish. Yet, arguably in 'better-organised' states like the UK in 2012, such outcomes may be less likely. It is therefore important to qualify our analysis: the liminoidal phenomena we have identified might well be the confluence of such unique contexts and behaviours that it may not be reproducible as serendipity, let alone Games management.

Specifically, we conceptualise Olympic Transit Zones as liminoidal in nature since they facilitated indeterminate, serendipitous, creative and playful opportunities for residents, traders and visitors alike. As noted by Lorenzo-Garcia et al (2017) across such environments, "everything is open to question" (2017: 376) including the structures that support particular forms of global consumption. This, in turn, allowed marginal actors to exploit gaps in organisation and capture global-corporate spaces and leverage benefits usually reserved for those who pay for exclusivity. Conditions described enabled spectators to dwell for longer across event spaces and Olympic Transit Zones, encouraging engagement and interactions with enterprising locals peddling a plethora of goods, services and

cultural offerings. Such conditions are illustrative of what Lorenzo-Garcia et al (2017) goes on to note, that “liminal entrepreneurs find themselves in a space where the social structure they know dissolves, rendering them invisible and forcing them to create their own structural conditions” (2017: 389). Entrepreneurial actions outlined in this study contribute toward a latent field of analysis focused on ‘immediate’ leveraging in a mega-sport event context – a critical yet underexamined aspect of Chalip’s (2004) ‘Event Leverage Model’. We argue that said theoretical ideas and empirical focus provides a potentially useful theoretical and empirical template for future research looking at the intersect between entrepreneurial leveraging in challenging and highly determined spatial contexts.

Our findings revealed specific tactics employed by entrepreneurs and residents across Rio’s Olympic Transit Zones that sought to engender a heightened sense of connectivity between event visitors and local host-communities, largely focused around generating a sense of hospitable Brazilian-Cariocan culture. This is of significance as Chalip (2004) argues that in order for host-cities to better realise the benefit of events and reduce economic leakage effects, event organisations and host-communities need to optimise immediate event leveraging benefits. Our analysis reveals the creative ways local-entrepreneurs engaged and interacted with Olympic visitor economies. These include: i) piggybacking on and leveraging event platforms alongside global businesses; ii) using local-culture to create and animate hospitable Olympic Transit Zones enroute to official venues; iii) creative marketing techniques; and, iv) innovative, culturally-relevant product offers.

We note how Rio’s cultural norms of play and street activity, a legacy of the city’s carnivalesque culture (through hosting a range of annual and major events like the World Cup, Pan American Games and Rio Carnivale), may well have been central to fostering liminoidal spaces and *communitas*. Moreover, relative to other mega-sport event contexts, the informal enterprise we observed across Rio 2016 may well also be a product of wider indifference, ignorance and non-compliance of formal legal and regulatory conditions as highlighted by interviewees themselves. We argue that cross-cultural idiosyncrasies are rarely recognised in the context of mega-sport event analyses related to both event impact and entrepreneurial practices – a key area we suggest warrant further examination. Yet, given that the positive outcomes we describe seem to be so culturally specific, how far can mega-sport event practitioners and respective policy makers learn anything from this article’s findings? We suggest that significant work is still required to utilise theoretical and empirically informed critical-academic research to influence policy and practice at the upper echelons of event and sport governance.

We recognise, as with any research, that there are limitations to these contributions. Firstly, because of limits of time and funds, there are a number of other relevant stakeholders that might have usefully been interviewed. We focused on high-level institutional tourism stakeholders because they are expertly and closely involved with the specific issues that concern us in this paper: that is the impact of the Games on local-tourism and affected communities. However, clearly, interviewing local-community residents and, in particular, traders who operated in the Olympic Transit Zones would have significantly enhanced the richness of our data. Moreover, they would have given us insights into something we have not included in the paper’s analysis: intentions and motivations for observed behaviours. Interviewing The Olympic Programme and International Olympic Committee stakeholders at the time or after the Games would have provided insights into how the looser controls and the emergence of opportunistic entrepreneurial leveraging was regarded. Were these serendipitous outcomes seen as a failure or a success? What are the implications for structuring future Games planning? Secondly, ideally, a number of

researchers would have walked around Rio simultaneously in order to experience the full range of spaces. However, researchers can never be omniscient, in that there is always important activity taking place somewhere beyond the researchers' gaze. Funding limited our design to a single researcher walking about. There are, no doubt, many other deficits in how we designed and conducted our research. We feel, however, that given the resources at hand, the limited time to do the research, and our tight focus on a narrow aspect of a topic rife with debate and contention, the data we use adequately addresses our objectives.

We raise some critical questions warranting further analysis. First, we identify that authentic manifestations of local-culture in the Rio transit zones seemed to happen serendipitously. So an interesting question for future research is can essentially serendipitous phenomena be analyzed, dissected and transformed into operational and strategic managerial behaviour? If it can, then what would that look like in terms of resource allocations? If we assume that more liminoidal spaces are desirable, what criteria could be used to assess this? Is it realistic to assume that event organisers would want to take the risks implied by liminoidal space? And, how would more rigorously governed states be encouraged to relax habituated regulatory behaviours? Despite the daunting nature of these questions, we argue that if the promises made to local-communities by successive mega-sport event organisers are to continue to have any credibility and salience, organisers need to seriously consider how best to produce liminoidal spaces. Yet, this suggests a set of broader practical and research questions. What incentives would be required, and for whom? What are the opportunity costs? How would the spatial boundaries of mega-sport events need to be redesigned? How, in other words, can we produce similar spaces of 'organised disorder' or perhaps 'strategic chaos' that can produce safe, secure mega-sport events, yet allow attendees to enjoy authentic celebratory experiences, which also benefits local-communities. Understanding the position of local-entrepreneurs across the spatial politics of mega-sport events is a critical aspect of research warranting on-going investigation. Indeed, event organisers must be aware that opening up liminoidal conditions will be limited and affected by the need to protect tourists from both internal struggles (e.g. Rio's social, economic and political unrest) and external threats (e.g. terrorism).

Certainly, as highlighted by Duignan & McGillivray (2019), if an equal platform for both global and local-activity is seen as a desirable objective, then this requires deregulation, desecuritisation and looser control of event visitor flows across transit zones and event spaces. Whereas this article reveals that inclusive outcomes appear to be the product of either accident, local-conditions and/or cultural responses rather than the strategic intent of event organisations, we argue that alongside these felicitous, serendipitous accidental outcomes, a strategic and intentional approach may well be fostered in future Games that can increase the likelihood of inclusive, liminoidal conditions.

We note three pertinent aspects of event design managers may consider to encourage local-leverage activity:

1. Allow more latitude for, and devote the necessary resources to, include local-traders;
2. Co-opt local-food, music, art and cultures into the cultural programming of the Olympics and as an offer within the ticketed venues and venue spaces themselves; and,
3. Create connective spaces across Olympic Transit Zones to and from venues where local-traders, food, music, arts and cultures can flourish – alongside the inevitable official Olympic and sponsor offerings that come with the territory.

We suggest that if such conditions are fostered, entrepreneurial individuals and host-communities as-a-whole may be better encouraged to engage in both pro-active and reactive leveraging tactics to capitalise on associated visitor economies. Thus, helping to more equitably redistribute opportunities associated with event visitor economies back into host-communities.

REFERENCES

- Armstrong, G., Giulianotti, R., and Hobbs, D. (2017). *Policing the London 2012 Olympics*. New York: Routledge.
- Beech, T. (2011). Liminality and the practices of identity reconstruction. *Human Relations*, 64(2): 285-302.
- Boycoff, J. (2012). *Celebration Capitalism and the Olympic Games*. London: Routledge.
- Chalip, L. (2004). Beyond impact: A general model for host community event leverage. In: Ritchie B and Adair D (Eds) *Sport tourism: Interrelationships, Impacts and Issues*. Clevedon, UK: Channel View Publications.
- Clark, J., Kearns, A., and Cleland, C. (2016). Spatial scale, time and process in mega-events: The complexity of host community perspectives on neighbourhood change. *Cities*, 53, 87-97.
- Commission for Sustainable London. (2012). *London 2012: Vision to Reality*. London: City Hall.
- Duignan, M.B., and McGillivray, D. (2019). Disorganised Host Community Touristic-Event Spaces: Revealing Rio's Fault Lines at the 2016 Olympic Games. *Leisure Studies*, awaiting DOI.
- Duignan, M.B., Pappalepore, I., and Everett, S. (2019) The 'summer of discontent': Exclusion and communal resistance at the London 2012 Olympic Games. *Tourism Management* (in press).
- Duignan, M.B., Everett, S., Walsh, L. and Cade, N. (2017). Leveraging physical and digital liminoidal spaces: the case of the #EATCambridge festival. *Tourism Geographies*, 1: 1-22.
- Federation of Small Businesses. (2013). Passing the baton: How small business have been affected by the London 2012 Games [pdf online]. Available at: http://www.fsb.org.uk/policy/rpu/london/assets/passingthebaton_fsb_final.pdf. [Accessed 26-April 2013].
- Financial Times. (2012). Businesses miss out on the Olympic party [video online]. Available at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FLk-_KYsVo8. [Accessed on: 8-June 2013].
- Frew, M., and McGillivray, D. (2008) Exploring hyper-experiences: performing the fan at Germany 2006. *Journal of Sport & Tourism*, 13(3): 181-198.

- Garcia-Lorenzo L, Donnelley P, Sell-Trujillo, L and Miguel-Imas, J (2017) Liminal entrepreuneuring: The creative practices of nascent necessity entrepreneurs. *Organisation Studies*, 39(2-3): 373-395.
- Giulianotti R, Armstrong G, Hales G, and Hobbs D. (2015). Global sport mega-events and the politics of mobility: the case of the London 2012 Olympics. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 66(4): 118–140.
- Hjorth, D. (2013). Public entrepreneurship: Desiring social change, creating sociality. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 25(1-2): 34–51.
- Hunter, C., and Shaw, J. (2007). The ecological footprint as a key indicator of sustainable tourism. *Tourism Management*, 28(1): 46-57.
- Kelly, D. Fairley, S., and O'Brien, D. (2019). It was never ours: Formalised event hosting rights and leverage. *Tourism Management*, 73, 123-133.
- Lew, A. A. (2012). Tourism incognita: experiencing the liminal edge of destination places. *Études Caribéennes*, (19).
- Marshall, C., and Rossman, G.B. (1989). *Designing Qualitative Research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- McGillivray, D., and Frew, M. (2015). From Fan Parks to Live Sites: mega events and the territorialisation of urban space. *Urban Studies*, 52(14): 2649-2663.
- Mohdin, A. (2016). The Olympics allow democracies to behave like dictatorships if only for a short time. Available at: <https://qz.com/742064/the-olympics-allow-democracies-to-behave-like-dictatorships-if-only-for-a-short-time/>. [Accessed on 30-January 2018].
- Muller, M. (2017). Approaching paradox: Loving and hating mega-events. *Tourism Management*. 62, 234-241.
- Lincoln, Y. S., and Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic Enquiry*. London: Sage.
- O'Brien, D. (2006). Event business leveraging: the Sydney 2000 Olympic Games. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 33(1): 240–261.
- O'Brien, D., and Chalip, L. (2007). *Tourism Management: Analysis, Behaviour and Strategy*. CABI.
- OECD. (2012). An Estimation of the Underground Economy in Brazil. Available at: <http://www.oecd.org/ctp/tax-global/An%20Estimation%20of%20the%20Underground%20Economy%20%20in%20Brazil.pdf> [Accessed 1-February 2019].
- Pappalepore, I., and Duignan, M.B. (2016) The London 2012 cultural programme: a consideration of Olympic impacts and legacies for small creative organisations in East London. *Tourism Management*, 54(3): 344 – 355.

Pink, S., Horst, H., Postill, J., Hjorth, L., Lewis, T and Tacchi, J. (2015). *Ethnography in a digital world, Digital Ethnography: Principles and Practice*, London: Sage.

Raco, M., and Tunney, E. (2010). Visibilities and invisibilities in urban development: small business communities and the London Olympics 2012. *Urban Studies*, 47(10): 2069-2091.

Rio's Candidature-Bid. (2009). 'Candidature documentation'. Available at: <https://www.rio2016.com/transparencia/en/documents>. [Accessed 9-September, 2016].

Robinson, R. (2006). Nowhere, in particular: Kazuo Ishiguro's *The Unconsoled* and Central Europe. *Critical Quarterly*, 48(4): 107-130.

Shields, R. (2013). *Places on the Margin: Alternative Geographies of Modernity*. London: Routledge.

Smith, A. (2018). Animation or denigration? Using urban public spaces as event venues. *Event Management*. 21(5), 609-619.

Speigel, A. (2015). Categorical difference versus continuum: Rethinking Turner's liminal-liminoid distinction. *Anthropology Southern Africa*, 34 (1-2), 11-20.

Steinbrink, M. (2013). Festifavelisation: mega-events, slums and strategic city-staging. *Journal of the Geographical Society of Berlin*, 144(2), 129-145.

Stevens, Q., and Dovey, K. (2004). Appropriating the spectacle: Play and politics in a leisure landscape. *Journal of Urban Design*. 9, 351–365.

Talbot, A., and Carter, T.F. (2018). Human rights abuses at the Rio 2016 Olympics: activism and the media. *Leisure Studies*, 37(1), 77-88.

The Guardian. (2014). Rio 2016 Olympic preparations damned as 'worst ever' by IOC. Available at: <https://www.theguardian.com/sport/2014/apr/29/rio-2016-olympic-preparations-worst-ever-ioc>. [Accessed 7-September, 2017].

The Guardian. (2016). Rio 2016: sporting showpiece threatens to become emblem of Brazil's chaos. Available at: <https://www.theguardian.com/sport/2016/aug/04/rio-olympics-brazil-politics-zika-virus>. [Accessed 5-September, 2017].

Turner, V.W. (1974). Liminal to liminoid, in play, flow and ritual: An essay in comparative symbology. *Rice University Studies*, 60 (3), 53-92.

Turner, V., Harris, J. C., and Park, R. J. (1983). Liminal to liminoid, in play, flow, and ritual: An essay in comparative symbology. In J. C. Harris & R. J. Park (Eds.), *Play, Games and Sports in Cultural Contexts*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics Publishers, pp 123-164.

VisitRio (2016) Live site marvelous port: an overview. Available at: <http://visit.rio/en/editorial/livesitemarvelousport/>. [Accessed 13-August, 2016].

Weed, M. (2008). *Olympic Tourism*. Oxford: Elsevier.

Zimbalist, A. (2015). *Circus Maximus: The Economic Gamble Behind Hosting the Olympics and the World Cup*. Washington: Brookings.