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Abstract

The Olympic Games events; Summer, Winter and Youth, the International Olympic Committee and every other committee or governing body associated with the Olympics all need money to survive. In recent decades revenue has come from the commercialisation of the spectacle which, whilst it is a positive outcome to be financially buoyant, may have masked the underlying ethics and Olympic Values of the Games; the ideals of education and peace promotion, fair play and participation. This paper discusses the impact of the media and the risks of over commercialisation of the Olympics but importantly points to how the IOC might take advantage of the ‘digital revolution’ for social broadcasting and networking to promote the Olympics and its ideals to a new and ever-younger demographic in their global audience.

Introduction

Since the reintroduction of the Olympic Games in 1896 by the founder of the Olympic Movement, Pierre de Coubertin, the Olympic Games have developed into ‘the worlds biggest and most important sporting event’ (Barney, Wenn and Martyn, 2004:290). This is illustrated by the thousands of athletes competing, the excited interests of global media and in more recent manifestations of the Games, immense marketing revenues, particularly since the 1984 Los Angeles Games. Furthermore, through the educational ideas of Coubertin for promoting peace through sport, a ‘unique value system of the Olympic Movement’ (Müller, 1996:123-133) is seen to be established, meaning that the Olympics may now be regarded as something more than a regular sporting event (Grupe, 1997). However, since 1896 the Games have been continuously challenged by political pressures, ethical concerns and social conditions, such as a long debate about amateurism and professionalism, the many boycotts over the years, followed by a financial crisis in the 1970s and recurring problems of terrorism. Consequently, the burdens and stresses of these factors on the
international stage may have threatened the existence of the Olympic Movement leaving them critically endangered on a number of occasions.

Nowadays, the International Olympic Committee (IOC), as the main authority of the Olympic Movement is being challenged by ever increasing commercialization and mediatisation. This leads to a potential conflict between sustaining economic growth and the educational heritage of the Olympic Movement. Thus, it becomes apparent that in future decades a task for the IOC and its stakeholders may be to balance the competing interests between commercial profit and humanistic Olympic ideals, or as Gionnoulakis and Stotlar (2006:188) put it, between ‘sponsorship, return on investment, brand awareness, and benefits from the Olympic ideals such as sportsmanship, human scale, noble competition and solidarity’.

Therefore, this paper attempts to demonstrate potential strategies for turning the threats of over-commercialization into chances for longevity of the Olympic Movement. The effects of growing economic interest versus the traditional value system of the Olympic Movement will be considered to link the needs of marketing revenues for the preservation of the Olympic Idea. In light of potential benefits from the symbioses between sports, media and economics, proactive operations such as the use of the media as a multiplier of the Olympic Idea will be analysed. Through the digital revolution there are potential chances to link traditional and new media forms to promote the Olympic value system. Furthermore, a case for a fair and efficient distribution of the marketing revenues will be considered.

The reintroduction of the Olympic Movement and Coubertin’s educational idea

According to the Olympic Charter, ‘Olympism is a philosophy of life, exalting and combining in a balanced whole the qualities of body, will and mind […]’ (IOC 2011, fundamental principles Nr. 1). The idea of Olympism was engendered by Pierre de Coubertin who brought the Olympic Games into life again, after its demise in the hands of the Romans, to strengthen the values and attitudes of the youth through sports. The main aspects of his idea were peace, internationalism and a role-model function of the athletes (see Wassong, 2009; Lenk, 1972, 2004; Grupe, 1997; Müller, 1983, 1996; Coubertin, 1967). Based on this educational idea, the Olympic values can be seen as a ‘cultural heritage for humanity’ (Chappelet and Kübler-Mabbott, 2008:105). Thus, the preservation of its fundamental principles is one of the most important tasks for the Olympic Movement to retain the uniqueness of the Olympic Games in the world of sports. Considering the domination of economic interests currently, the preservation of Olympic Ideals has to be called into question. Therefore, the financial developments of Olympic Marketing alongside the media within the Olympic Movement are discussed in order to compare contemporary conditions to the preservation of the Olympic Idea.
Development of Olympic marketing and media factors

The process of commercialization within Olympic Marketing is not a new phenomenon; being central to the Olympic Movement from 1896 to promote their message and is presented from a sports-historical perspective. Nevertheless, *professionalism* and *commercialism* has superseded *amateurism* and *Olympic altruism*, both [of the former] becoming increasingly important after a ‘long and difficult process of transformation’ (Bertling, 2007:50). This process towards professionalism and commercialism was triggered in response to a long-term crisis of the Olympic Movement in the 1970s and early 1980s. Faced with the challenges of the amateurism-problem (state sponsored ‘amateur’ athletes training as full time ‘professionals’), terrorism at the Munich 1972 Games, a financial crisis in Montreal in 1976, and politically orientated boycotts, the IOC were perceived as a weak and ineffectual organization. Payne (2006:6) summarizes the problems of expensive and politically influenced games in stern words, ‘the Olympic Movement’s obituary was already being penned’. Thus, a reorientation of the Olympic Movement and the IOC was necessary in order to strengthen its independence, economic ability to act and credibility as an event organiser.

This process started during the IOC Presidency of Juan Antonio Samaranch (1980 to 2001). In particular, the liberalisation of amateurism at the IOC-Congress in Baden-Baden in 1981 and a wider opening in terms of the Olympic Marketing provided the impetus for a commercialized world of Olympic sports. In fact, the Los Angeles 1984 Games had a successful marketing strategy, implemented by the private organising committee (LAOOC), which created further prerequisites to ‘turn the Olympic Games from an amateur-event into a professional mega-event’ (Wassong, 2012:19-20). Broadcasting revenues which increased from $88 million in Moscow in 1980 to $286 million in 1984 raised lucrative sponsorship deals for a limited number of sponsors creating a financial surplus of around $255 million (Payne, 2006). Therefore, the L.A. Games can be characterized as a ‘commercial landmark in terms of sponsorship’ (Kenyon and Palmer, 2008:32) and are labelled as a ‘turning point’ within the Olympic Movement (Giannoulakis and Stotlar, 2006:181). From then on, the financial dimensions of Olympic Marketing developed in an enormous way. In fact, the IOC generated a turnover of around $545 billion within the four-year period from 2005 to 2008. The main sources of income were the broadcasting fees and sponsorship deals which constituted around 92 percent of the total marketing revenues (see figure 1). Consequently, these main pillars of the IOC’s marketing programme need to be considered in more detail as it has affected how the Olympics are presented and manifests itself in the 21st century.
From the 1980s broadcasting fees increased continuously (see figure 2). More recently the IOC generated broadcasting revenues of $3,914 billion within a four year period (2009-2012). Continuing growth in this area is demonstrated by the recent deal between the American NBC network and the IOC for $439 billion to retain its exclusive broadcasting rights in the U.S. market until 2020 (Hersh, 2011). According to Jacques Rogge, the President of the IOC at that time, ‘[the deal] secures the financial future for the next decade of the Olympic Movement’ (ESPN 2011) which demonstrates the huge importance of revenues from the media as a main source of income on a long-term basis.

Furthermore, the sponsorship programmes of the IOC developed as a second pillar within the Olympic Marketing programme (Ferrand et al., 2012:114). In addition to the rise of broadcasting fees in 1984, the Los Angeles Games stand as a milestone in terms of sponsorship deals. The limitation of sponsors was arranged by the OCOG (Organising Committee Olympic Games) in order to create an exclusive
and highly noted sponsorship platform for selected advertisers. This concept was adopted and advanced by the IOC in terms of an international sponsorship programme, called TOP (The Olympic Partner) in 1985. TOP offers the possibility for a limited number of companies to acquire exclusive rights in different product categories such as retail food services (e.g. McDonalds) or Information Technology (e.g. Atos). This enables the sponsors to ‘benefit from the global platform of the Olympics and the reputation/image of the Olympic brand’ (Ferrand et al., 2012:115). Hence, the IOC is in an advantageous position of negotiation to sell the sponsorship rights in bidding competitions of rival global players. A reported rise of 997 percent from 1985 to 2012 highlights the successful financial development of this programme. To be more precise, TOP VII (2009-2012) contained eleven sponsors in exclusive categories and generated record takings of $957 million within this cycle. Supplementary to this, the OCOGs implement national sponsoring programmes for each Olympic Games. In the period between 2010 and 2012, these national programmes generated revenues of around $1.4 billion in total.

![TOP Development](image)

**Figure 3:** Financial evolution of TOP in $ million, own illustration; Data: IOC (2012a)

The listed rise of broadcasting fees and sponsoring revenues are both caused by the enormous global attention and the positive image of Olympic Games so the Olympic Movement appear to be in a win-win situation in the field of a sports-media-marketing.

**Challenge of commercialization and mediatization**

Rising economic interests in the Olympics has initiated debate within the IOC about the consequences of increasing dependency on the commercial sector and media revenue. Hence, the ever-growing commercialization and mediatization may be a potential risk or threat to the fundamental principles of the Olympic Movement.
Triggered by the immense power of the media, the Olympics can be defined as ‘a product of television’s power to produce and distribute a live global spectacle’ (Horne and Whannel, 2012:47). In fact, financially strong broadcasting networks shifted from being pure broadcasters to one of the main stakeholders of the Olympics. In addition, the Olympics fulfil the requirements of a media-event, identified by Katz and Dayan (1992) as the orientation of the scheduling towards profitable broadcasting times and an inclusion of ‘telegenic sports into the Olympic programme’ (Barney et al., 2004:297). Within this sports-media complexity Stiehler, Mikos and Friedrich (2004:110) point out that various sports competitions can ‘adapt themselves to the needs and the dramaturgies of the media’. This development can be seen as a transition from ‘sports in the media’ that are simply reported upon, into ‘media-sports’ (Stiehler et al., 2004:100) and underline the transformation of the Olympics into a ‘television event’ (Fernandez Pená and del Rio, 2011:134). Similar to the effect of increased media power, the economic interests of the various Olympic sponsors can influence the actions of the IOC. Among others, the Salt Lake City bribery scandal in 2002, the so called Coca-Cola Games in Atlanta 1996 (Payne, 2006) or the increasing doping issues in the Olympic environment all of which can be cited as implications of a rising profit-seeking environment.

Considering the process of growing influences of external stakeholders and increasingly economic interests within the field of the Olympics, the main features of the Olympic Movement may be in real danger. Faced with the ‘consequences of over commercialization’ (Preuß, 2000:11) critics fear about ‘a loss of the Olympic ideals due to the assumption that the IOC entirely focuses more on profit maximization than on its responsibility to promote and develop the Olympic values’ (Austermann, 2012:50). Nevertheless, it is important to mention both sides of the coin and to consider that, despite the ostensible threats, there are several opportunities to use the IOC’s financial power and media presence to promote the values of the Olympic Movement.

Strategy for turning potential threats into opportunities for the Olympics

Considering the discrepancies between the Olympic value system; virtuous ideals, and the economic interests of various stakeholders, it may be time for the IOC to link the wide-ranging effects of its own and its partners’ growing economic interests to the Olympic value system. Currently, the IOC is forced to implement reactive sanctions such as efficient anti-doping and anti-corruption policies and proactive policing operations in order to ensure the continuity of the Olympic Games; the integrity of sporting competition and to preserve the Olympic Ideals. With this escalating state of affairs proactive action for turning threats into opportunity are considered for the continued health of the Olympic Movement.
From the outset there is a clear need for marketing incomes for the survival of the Olympic Movement. As well as Rogge (IOC, 2008:38), who considers the ‘support of the business community’ as an essential basis to cover the huge costs of the Olympic Games, the former Vice-President of the IOC, Richard Pound (1998, cited in Martyn, 2008:303) summarizes the necessity of marketing revenues, ‘take away sponsorship and commercialism from sport today and what is left? A large, sophisticated, finely tuned engine developed over a period of 100 years – with no fuel’.

Therefore, there appears to be an opportunity to utilize the high revenues to the IOC to strengthen the Olympic Movement. In its marketing objectives the IOC (2012a) commits to its stakeholders to use their financial power for the continuity of the Olympic Games and to support Olympic Movement, including OCOGs, NOCS, IFs and other sports organizations in the worldwide promotion of Olympism. Comparing the incomes and expenditures of the Olympic Movement, it is obvious that more than 90 percent of the total revenues are distributed throughout the Olympic Movement and less than ten percent are reserved for the IOC’s administrative business (IOC, 2012a). Nevertheless, the IOC has built up reserves of around $592 million (CBC, 2011). Considering the distribution coefficient in detail, the distribution of the fees is subdivided into three superior categories: (a) OCOGs, The Organising Committees for the Olympic Games, (b) NOCs, National Olympic Committees and (c) IFs, International [sports] Federations.

In order to bear the high costs of the upcoming Summer, Winter and Youth Olympic Games, 50 percent of the generated TOP revenues and broadcasting fees are distributed to the OCOGs. In addition to that, the NOCs profited from TOP by $139 million (2008-12 cycle) as they can optimize the athletes’ conditions and the development of their Olympic teams (IOC, 2012). Due to the mass of sponsors which are based in North America and the huge broadcasting fees paid by the U.S. network NBC, the USOC benefits substantially; they received 20 percent of the TOP revenues and 75 percent of the NBC payment within a four-year period until 2020. Due to a recently negotiated deal between the IOC and the USOC, the USOC will retain its current revenue, but will profit less from a further increase in broadcasting deals. In addition to that, the NOC ‘will also contribute to the administrative costs for the Games’ (Whiteside, 2012). Moreover, the 35 IFs benefit from the money of Olympic Marketing with an amount of $454 million (IOC, 2012a). The recent debate about a possible exit of wrestling from the Olympic Programme and the struggle for existence of the FILA (International Federation of Associated Wrestling styles) underline the high interests of the IFs to be part of the Olympic programme and to benefit from the enormous marketing revenues (FILA, 2013). The differing allocation for each organization is summarized in figure 4.
This overview of income illustrates the principle activities of the IOC to support the Olympic Games and strengthen the development of sports within the entire Olympic Movement. Thus the worldwide promotion of Olympism is central to the IOC’s marketing objectives. In light of this, the IOC allocates portions of marketing revenues to the Olympic Solidarity programme which is affiliated to the NOCs. Olympic Solidarity is an example of an approach to pursue the Olympic Ideals. Their financial power enables the IOC to develop worldwide and continental programmes in order to support activities of the NOCs and to help emerging countries to send representatives to compete at the Olympics, for example, athletes from Australiasia, athletes from the hundreds of islands around the Philippines. The Factsheet of Olympic Solidarity (IOC, 2013) shows that the 2013-2016 programmes promise financial, technical and administrative assistance to the NOCs. Furthermore, it is one of the targets of Olympic Solidarity to promote Olympic values including Olympic education, culture and legacy (IOC, 2012c). According to Kenyon and Palmer (2008: 39), Olympic Solidarity can be defined as a part of the heritage of Coubertin’s vision of an international sporting event for the youth.

The expediential and rapid growth of the budget for Olympic Solidarity is revealing. As listed in table 5 below, the budget increased from $74.1 million in the cycle from 1993-1996, to $438 million during 2013-2016 (a rise of 592 percent). This huge financial cushion enables the programme to support the NOCs in a more effective way. However, the relative portion of the broadcasting fees to Olympic Solidarity decreased from 9.4 percent in 2001 to 8.0 percent in 2012. Considering the fact of increasing broadcasting revenues on the one hand and decreasing contributions on the other hand, the financial development of this programme may need to be monitored more carefully over the following Olympic periods.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distribution</th>
<th>Source of income</th>
<th>Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOCs</td>
<td>TOP</td>
<td>139 (2005-2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFs</td>
<td>Total marketing revenue</td>
<td>454 (2005-2008)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Plus 50 percent of the TOP revenues, subdivided into the amount of OCOGs

Figure 4: Revenue in the Olympic Movement $ million, own illustration, Data: IOC (2012a)
Despite the potential risks of increased mediatization, there may be opportunities for the IOC to use their influence to promote Olympic values beyond the Olympic Games themselves, for example, using the media to promote the Olympic Idea (Lenk 2004:9). From this the Olympic Movement benefits from the positive effects of the media beyond the monetary support of the broadcasting companies (Preuß, 2011:54). The function of the media enables sports organizations to ‘convert local events into worldwide ones’ (Pená and del Rio, 2011:133). In light of intensified media coverage, both the Olympic Broadcasting Service (OSB) as the Host Broadcaster of the Olympic Games and the Rights Holding Broadcaster now play important roles to implement a successful marketing media strategy.

From over 5,600 hours of coverage throughout more than 200 countries and a potential global audience of 4.8 billion (IOC, 2012b), the London 2012 Games were yet another example for the huge media potential of the Olympic Games. More than that, broadcasting companies were encouraged to produce ‘cross platform campaigns and content’ (Gantz, 2011:10). In this context, both the traditional media and new digital media forms have to be linked to the global platform of the Olympic Games to increase their vast media attention. Timmo Lumme, managing director of the IOC Television and Marketing Services, points out that ‘London 2012 heralded a new era in Olympic broadcasting’, (IOC, 2013:42) which can be demonstrated by the innovative digital media strategy of the BBC. In addition to traditional media forms; television and radio, every sporting event was broadcasted via one of 24 interactive digital platforms with over 106 million requests by the end of the Games (IOC, 2013:45).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Broadcasting revenues</td>
<td>1251</td>
<td>1845</td>
<td>2232</td>
<td>2570</td>
<td>3914</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution to Olympic Solidarity</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percental development</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>64,5%</td>
<td>71,8%</td>
<td>16,5%</td>
<td>27,5%</td>
<td>40,8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relation between incomes and expenditure for Olympic Solidarity</td>
<td>4,4%</td>
<td>6,40%</td>
<td>9,4%</td>
<td>9,1%</td>
<td>8,0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 5:** Development of the budget for Olympic Solidarity in $ million; own illustration; Data: IOC (2012a)
The use of new media forms within the Olympic Movement is an only recently established field of research. Due to the increasing importance of the internet or mobile communication, new possibilities are offered to reach a younger audience. Concerning the rise of social media activities within and across societies, it is a challenge for the Olympic Movement to implement those social developments and cross-communications into the sports-media-complex without losing control of its self-generated content. Miah and Jones (2012:284) emphasise the increase of so-called *citizen journalists* at the Olympics and summarize that ‘never before has an individual had such a capacity to destabilise the information hierarchy than is afforded by the Internet’. Consequently, the use of social media activities by global networks, athletes, spectators, citizen journalists and the local Organizing Committee itself has become a key part in the communication process of Olympic Games in addition to the corporate communication objectives of the IOC.

Due to the increase of social media activities during the Games, the London Olympics in 2012 are labelled as the ‘first truly social media Games’ (Miah in BBC, 2012). Consequently, there is constant tension between a wider-opening in terms of social media activities and the preservation of former media control by the IOC. Despite to the challenge of greater loss of control within the communication process, the IOC has reacted to this phenomenon by expanding its communication strategy. The XIII Olympic Congress in Copenhagen in 2009 was a first step to an adaption to modern forms of communications and proactive social media activities by the IOC. Considering the theme ‘digital revolution’, the keynote-speaker Martin Sorell presented the potential of digital media to develop social interactions for the distribution and promotion of Olympic values’ (IOC, 2009:186). Consequently, the IOC implemented several social networks into its marketing strategy and recruited an IOC Social Media Director for the first time. Nowadays, there are 4.8 million Facebook-Followers of the Olympic Games (January 2014) demonstrating the huge potential of these media instruments. Furthermore, the media strategy of the Youth Olympic Games aims especially at new media forms to reach a younger audience. Thus, these diverse media platforms offer new ways for the entire Olympic Movement to publicise sporting events and promote the educational *Olympic Idea*. In this manner, social media operations offer an opportunity for the IOC to distribute the Olympic brand and its values, such as fair play or the will to achieve high performances to a younger audience within their ‘familiar fields of communications’ (IOC, 2010:30-31). This recent move may be in keeping with the Olympic heritage of Coubertin’s visions and the preservation of the Olympic values.

Nevertheless, due to the IOCs dependence on broadcasting fees and its media range, television remains the most important medium for *advertising* Olympic Games. Therefore, television broadcasting is the ‘main route for disseminating
positive values about sports and its imagery’ (Pená and del Rio, 2011:133). Due to the long-term relationships between the IOC and the companies responsible for digital media, the corporate broadcasters ‘guarantee coverage of cultural aspects as well as high-quality standards’ of sporting performance (Preuß, 2011:54). Thus, a well-considered media strategy seems essential to tap the full potential of the broader communications spectrum which may help to reduce the negative impacts of over commercialisation but promote Olympic Values to an interested youth.

Conclusion

The former marketing director of the IOC Michael Payne (quoted in Pená and del Rio, 2011:138) emphasizes that there is an immense ‘challenge of generating revenue […], while protecting the integrity of the brand, equity and image […].’ His comments point to a vital task for the IOC in future decades. In fact, it is an immense challenge to balance increasing interest from external stakeholders and temptations of their money to the traditional value system of the Olympic Movement, which may generate little money. However, this paper has attempted to demonstrate that there may be opportunities to use the various strengths of the media and the economy within the complex field of the Olympic Games in order to benefit the entire Olympic environment.

Without a doubt, the marketing revenues are needed in order to host the Olympic Games and to generate a profit for the Olympic Movement to support their existence. However, a fair and efficient distribution of these revenues seems to be an ethical premise in order to fulfil the elevated responsibility of the IOC as the ‘governance of world sport’ (Chappelet and Kübler-Mabbott, 2008:15). The IOC’s financial power affords opportunities to support the world of sports in general and to promote the Olympic Values in particular. For example, the revenue distribution to the Olympic Solidarity programme is an opportunity to create an equitable solution for the participation of diversified athletes at the Olympics. Nevertheless, the effectiveness of programmes like this have to be closely monitored as Pound (2008:12) has emphasised, ‘political considerations […] make it almost impossible to provide a useful assessment of results and considerations of more interesting alternatives’. Despite its laudable approach to promote a positive message, a lack of transparent measures makes it almost impossible to judge the effectiveness of this programme. Thus, further research is needed to evaluate the efficiency of Olympic Solidarity Programme and to create valuable improvement proposals.

The media occupies immense power within the Olympic family (Austermann, 2012:43) and over commercialisation and profit margin can suffocate the concept of Olympic Ideals. However, there may be opportunities for the IOC to capitalise upon new digital media platforms to convey its message to a huge audience. According to
Billings (2008:7) ‘the Olympics are the only television behemoth that can make all other mass media slow to a near halt for weeks on end’. Furthermore, the symbioses between the broadcasting networks, the IOC and the OCOGs could be expanded for the purpose of promoting Olympic Ideals beyond the Olympic Games. The rise of social media activities offers an opportunity for the IOC to reach the target group more frequently and with more detail between the Game’s summer and winter cycles and on a long term basis. However, to hold its audience the IOC may have to think of innovative ways to demonstrate the uniqueness of the Olympic Games whilst promoting its educational values.
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