

RIO 2016: SPORT POLICIES?

Author:

Leandro Mazzei

email:

lemazzei78@yahoo.com.br

Co-authors:

BASTOS, FLÁVIA da CUNHA
BÖHME, MARIA TEREZA DA SILVA
MEIRA, TATIANA

University:

UNIVERSIDADE DE SÃO PAULO

Faculty:

ESCOLA DE ESPORTE E EDUCAÇÃO
FÍSICA/GEPETIJ/GEPAE

Abstract

The international sport success can be considered a valuable tool. Many countries seek this success in order to achieve a number of other goals in their internal and external policies (GREEN & HOULIHAN, 2005). This view is more evident by the current competition between nations and cities for host international sporting events. Several countries spend years and years planning sport policies, mainly to host the Olympic Games, with the perspective of improvements in internal infrastructure and external image of the country. The Olympic events reached professional proportions and amounts of financial investment ever imaginable before (RUBIO, 2005; PAYNE, 2006). Therefore, when a city is chosen to host the Olympic Games, the country should develop consistent policies for this event and, if possible, gain a prominent worldwide position in term of number of medals. Exception of the USA, who always had good ratings in the medal table, countries like Korea (4th place in 1988), Spain (6th place in 1992), Australia (4th place in 2000) Greece (15th place in 2004) and China (1st place in 2008), conquered a number of Olympic medals so far never achieved in the professional era of the Games. Some nations have developed a consistent sport policy before hosting the edition and kept a considerable development after the Games. Others, developed a fragile sports policies, immediate, no building a legacy and with big debts and problems in the sport development and public infrastructure. A strong system of sport policy can reflect in great success in international competitions. Two examples are the United Kingdom and Canada. The UK systematized the sports structure in 1997, following the failure in Atlanta in 1996. In Sydney 2000 and Athens 2004 moved from 36th to 10th place, in Beijing 2008 reaching the 4th. Canada, through a national plan implemented in long term, prepared the country to receive the Winter Olympics in Vancouver in 2010, which lead the conquest of first place in such games (DE BOSSCHER et al, 2008;

IOC, 2010). The aim of this paper is to analyze the Sport Policies in Brazil, given that the country will host the 2016 Olympic Games, in the city of Rio de Janeiro. The study was based on the methodological model of De Bosscher et al. (2008). Documental content analysis was carried out to identify specific aspects and actions relating to the nine pillars and their critical factors for international success in sport. The documents used were laws, policies and institutional documents of National Olympic Committee (NOC) and National Governing Bodies (NGB) of Olympic sports. The main results show that in the last years the Brazilian government has passed lottery funds (through specific legislation – Law 10264/2001) to the National Olympic Committee, which has divided among 30 Olympic sports (con) federations. Some elite athletes has financial support of the Sports Ministry (Law 10891/2004) and some projects for sport development are sustained for the renouncing of the federal government for tax collection (Law 11438/2006) (Pillar 1). Since 2002, Brazil has hosted many international events with the goal of hosting the Games of 2016 (Pillar 8). Another initiative was the establishment of the Olympic Public Authority (OPA) in 2010, responsible for coordinating the participation of the three level of public policies (Union, State and City of Rio de Janeiro) in the management of the Games, but not yet in operation (Pillar 2). Other projects are only perspectives, for example, the Federal Government decided to expand the goals of national programs which combine sport, leisure and education (Pillar 3) and the building of specific places for training facilities (Pillar 6). Meanwhile, programs aimed to detection, selection and promotion of young sports talents (Discovery of Sporting Talent program) and scientific research and innovation in Sport (CENESP network) in practice, are not in operation (Pillar 4 and 9 respectively). Governmental programs relating to athletic career and post career support, and coach education and provisions practically do not exist (Pillar 5 and 7). These results shows that little have been done in relation to elite sport policies. One possibility for the analysis is that the country had few programs for olimpic sports and only after the victory of Rio to host the Games waited more than a year, until the general governmental election in 2010, to implement programs for sport in the country. In conclusion, this fact directly influenced in the retard of decisions that will be taken for management Rio 2016 and that also probably will reflect in the level of the performance of athletes and Sport Policies of this country.

References:

De Bosscher, V.; Shibli, J. B.; Van Bottenburg, M.; De Knop, P. (2008). The global Sporting Arms Race. An international comparative study on sports policy factors leading to international sporting success. Aachen: Meyer & Meyer.

Green, M., & Houlihan, B. (2005). Elite sport development: Policy learning and political priorities. London: Routledge.

International Olympic Committee (IOC) (2010). Available in: <<http://www.olympic.org>>. Access: 20 jan. 2010.

Payne, M. (2006). A Virada Olímpica. Rio de Janeiro: COI, Casa das Palavras.

Rubio, K. (2005). Da Europa Para América: A Trajetória do Movimento Olímpico Brasileiro. Geo Crítica Scripta Nova, Revista Electrónica De Geografía Y Ciencias Sociales Universidad De Barcelona, v. IX, nº 200.