



## Tourists' experiences of mega-event cities: Rio's olympic 'double bubbles'

Michael Duignan, Ilaria Pappalepore, Andrew Smith & Yvonne Ivanescu

To cite this article: Michael Duignan, Ilaria Pappalepore, Andrew Smith & Yvonne Ivanescu (2021): Tourists' experiences of mega-event cities: Rio's olympic 'double bubbles', Annals of Leisure Research, DOI: [10.1080/11745398.2021.1880945](https://doi.org/10.1080/11745398.2021.1880945)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/11745398.2021.1880945>



© 2021 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group



Published online: 08 Apr 2021.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 183



View related articles [↗](#)




View Crossmark data [↗](#)



Citing articles: 1 View citing articles [↗](#)

# Tourists' experiences of mega-event cities: Rio's olympic 'double bubbles'

Michael Duignan <sup>a</sup>, Ilaria Pappalepore<sup>b</sup>, Andrew Smith<sup>b</sup> and Yvonne Ivanescu<sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup>School of Hospitality and Tourism Management, University of Surrey, Guildford, UK; <sup>b</sup>University of Westminster, London, UK; <sup>c</sup>Université Libre de Bruxelles, Bruxelles, Belgium

## ABSTRACT

Rio 2016 sought to connect Olympic-tourists with the city's local-Cariocan community and culture. Yet the way mega-events are spatially and regulatorily organized, alongside the behavioural tendencies of Olympic-tourists, constrain such ambitions. Using Rio 2016 as a case-study, we offer in-depth, qualitative insights through the lens of 35 individual Olympic-tourists to examine how and why these factors determine behaviour, and thus experiences across host-environments. We detail how concerns over tourists' safety result in managers designing risk averse experiences, produced by overlaying hyper-securitized and regulatory enforcements inside existing tourist bubbles, creating what we refer to as a 'double bubble' – reducing the likelihood of visitors venturing 'off-the-beaten-track'. Whilst Olympic-bubbles protect tourists from outside threats, they restrict cultural engagement with the wider city, neighbourhoods and locals – side-lining other sides to Rio. We suggest managers adopt a dual-strategy of 'local infusion' in *and* 'tourist diffusion' beyond official zones to achieve intended goals.

## ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 18 March 2020  
Accepted 18 January 2021

## KEYWORDS

Olympic tourism; event tourism; tourist bubbles; New urban tourism; Rio 2016

## Introduction

Between 2009 and 2016, Rio de Janeiro planned for and delivered the 2016 Summer Olympic Games (hereafter referred to as Rio 2016). Increasing numbers of tourists helps to justify staging mega-sporting events (MSEs), as hosts seek to gain both short-term economic gains and longer-term outcomes such as image enhancement (Chalip 2017). Undeniably, this rationale was at the heart of pledges and promises made in Rio's 2016 Candidature Bid (2009). The Brazilian Tourism Board sought to stimulate an extra 350,000–500,000 visitors to the country during the live staging period (Brazil Government 2016). Organizers sought not only to increase tourist numbers to the country and city by staging the Olympic Games, they wanted Olympic-visitors to connect with the local host-community so they could experience Rio's cultural uniqueness and diversity. Furthermore, they promised a visitor experience integrating sports and cultural activities to experience the city's 'unique character and spirit' (...) by engaging in 'celebrations [that] will extend

**CONTACT** Michael Duignan  m.duignan@surrey.ac.uk

© 2021 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group  
This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>), which permits non-commercial re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited, and is not altered, transformed, or built upon in any way.

beyond venues to communities' (Rio Candidature Bid 2009, 37). Specific emphasis was placed on facilitating unique experiences *beyond* official 'Host Event Zones' (HEZs).

Whilst Rio had high hopes, their projections contrasted with a body of evidence suggesting that hosts tend to over-estimate such tourism benefits (Smith and Stevenson 2009). We argue that this reflects a failure of managers to understand the supply *and* demand side challenges associated with Olympic-tourism: particularly the way tourists explore and consume host places and communities (McGillivray, Duignan, and Mielke 2019).

By citing community engagement, interaction with local people and Carioca culture, Rio's Olympic-tourism ambitions can be linked to the rise of 'New Urban Tourism' (Novy 2018). This term has been used by several authors (e.g. Frisch et al. 2019) to represent instances where tourists seek more authentic and distinctive experiences by travelling beyond designated tourist bubbles (Judd 1999). By visiting peripheral neighbourhoods, visitors can experience everyday urban life and engage with local citizens, providing the uniqueness that is often missing from tourist-oriented zones. But encouraging Olympic-tourists to engage with areas outside tourist bubbles was an ambitious aim given Rio's reputation for organized crime and violence (Cade, Everett, and Duignan 2019). There are multiple Rios, and it is dangerous to summarize the complexity of such a complex city, but Rio is associated with social inequality and inner-city conflict. It is a polarized city, where decadent lifestyles coexist with destitution (Gaffney 2015), a so-called splintering urbanism (Graham and Marvin 2002) where tourist-zones and local-neighbourhoods are juxtaposed and clearly separated. This a challenging context in which to promote New Urban Tourism.

It is the responsibility of host-city officials to encourage visitation beyond honeypot sites of official, Olympic-consumption, particularly those responsible for tourism planning, management and development (Knott, Fyall, and Jones 2016). Yet, organizers often fail to deploy tactics that seek to: (i) deepen cultural and tourist engagement with host environments, (ii) lengthen stays, (iii) retain consumption locally (Mhanna, Blake, and Jones 2017). It is assumed that benefits associated with Olympic-visitors simply trickle down to local urban communities, which is often not accurate (Duignan, Pappalepore, and Everett 2019). Organizers often fail to encourage local connectivity and Olympic-tourist consumption is often directed toward global-corporate spaces as opposed to local areas (McGillivray and Frew 2015). With this in mind, Chalip (2004) stresses the importance of connecting visitors and event-related spending with local areas to secure positive economic benefits for the host-community. In this study we aim to uncover the factors that influenced the behaviour of Rio's Olympic-tourists, particularly those that affected their propensity to explore beyond official Olympic-venues and designated urban zones.

The research is guided by the following research questions:

- (1) What impact does Games planning have on tourists' exploration of, and engagement with, Olympic-cities?
- (2) Which factors facilitate and/or prevent deeper cultural engagement?
- (3) To what extent did tourists go 'off the beaten track' to explore and engage across the city of Rio during the 2016 Olympic Games?

Questions are addressed by drawing on qualitative data obtained by interviewing 35 tourists during the Rio Games. Our empirical analysis is preceded by a review of literature structured around three interrelated topics. First, the requirements and the implications of

creating temporary zones dedicated to housing Olympic-sports, culture, and commercial activity. Second, the multiple factors that determine sport tourist and event tourist behaviours as the basis to understand likely Olympic-tourist behaviours, particularly during live staging periods. Finally, we examine the potential for deeper cultural connectivity between visitors and the host-city by introducing and examining the notion of the 'tourist-bubble' and the rise of New Urban Tourism.

## Literature review

### *Forming Olympic bubbles*

A growing body of research has revealed and detailed the extent to which staging mega-events involves the sequestration, territorialisation and commodification of physical spaces. Host cities conceptualize existing urban areas as blank canvases that need to be cleaned ready for a quick, easy overlay of new territory. Examples of spaces affected include roads, streets, parks, and transportation networks across the host-city. These are used to house official sporting, cultural and commercial activity within Games' venues, Live Sites and Fan Parks (what we will now collectively refer to as 'Host Event Zones' (HEZs)). Even when free access is provided to these zones, entry and behaviour is strictly controlled, and public spaces are temporarily transformed into private ones. Official sites, particularly Live Sites, are designed in a way to contain tourists through sponsor activation, food and drink offers, cultural performances and exhibitions. Typically, tourists who wish to immerse themselves in Olympic-activity inhabit these types of spaces, reducing the propensity to engage with other parts of the city.

HEZs protect the safety of visitors but also the investments of corporate sponsors. Here, security imperatives are intertwined with commercial objectives as various initiatives justified for security reasons also act as ways to maximize commercial returns (Osborn and Smith 2015). Examples include ticketing policies, restrictions on what can be taken into venues and measures to prevent ambush marketing (James and Osborn 2016). New legal exceptions and regulatory systems are introduced affecting how tourists behave (e.g. McGillivray, Duignan, and Mielke 2019). Indeed, local-products tend not to feature inside ticketed areas which are dominated by goods provided by official sponsors, suppliers, and supporters. HEZs play host to global producers who seek to 'activate' brands through experiential marketing experiences (McGillivray and Frew 2015). These are complemented by direct-trading opportunities as official suppliers pick off a reliable, steady stream of event visitors (Giulianotti et al. 2015). Host-businesses are also precluded from leveraging Olympic symbols and logos to promote themselves to tourists. Those responsible for organising and securing such spaces apply off-the-shelf organisational practices demanded by the Host City Contract (HCC) and related legislation usually inscribed into national-law (James and Osborn 2016). As Pavoni (2011, 204) suggests, this creates a securitized and branded zone of controlled festivity; 'an Event in which no events i.e. unpredictable occurrences must occur.'

Whilst the unique qualities of a city are often used as selling point to win event bids or in media communications, arrangements made to stage these events tend to privilege globalized processes and producers, creating generic 'brandscapes' (Osborn and Smith 2016). The physical design of exclusive enclaves, strategic deployment of hard

Olympic-branding (e.g. enlarged Olympic rings providing 'selfie' hotspots) and the choreographed circulation of Olympic-tourists, direct tourists' gaze toward official sites of consumption and away from local, host-communities (McGillivray, Duignan, and Mielke 2019). Physical installations like barriers, marshals and signage are installed across the host-city to cajole tourists into certain areas – reducing propensity for local engagement (e.g. Giulianotti et al. 2015).

As Klausner (2012, 1040) notes, 'sport mega-events powerfully exemplify the splintering of the contemporary urban environment into a wide range of tightly controlled enclaves'. This is reinforced by Pavoni's (2013) account of Fan Walks, Fan Miles and Fan Parks associated with the FIFA World Cup, which together 'constitute a disembodied and fortified network of channelling urban flows' (2011, 203). As a result, Olympic-tourists are typically disciplined to move in particular ways across host-environments (Kirby, Duignan, and McGillivray 2018). This is compounded by a crowd mentality as people tend to follow the flows of pedestrians between transport networks and stadia (e.g. Mhanna, Blake, and Jones 2017).

Some tourist attractions, used as venues, are partially or fully closed down during live staging periods. This reduces the likelihood Olympic-tourists will dwell within a host-environment whilst simultaneously reducing the chance regular non-Olympic-tourists will visit local areas too (Duignan and Pappalepore, 2019). Changes made to transport arrangements also play an important role. Pappalepore and Duignan (2016) note that during the London 2012 Olympic Games, stations and entry points serving some urban communities were temporarily closed, restricting access to areas adjacent to the Olympic-Park and HEZs. Local businesses hoping to profit were excluded as a result. Revanchist measures are deployed to render non-Olympic-urban zones invisible, particularly less desirable neighbourhoods deemed unworthy of the tourist gaze. As Foley, McGillivray, and McPherson (2011) suggest, mega-events tend to exacerbate spatial segregation: 'instead of opening up the city and its civic spaces to a wider section of the population', these events 'colonise, mark space and define who belongs and who does not' (2011, 23). The designation and control of mega-event territory determines what spectators do and where they go, but also affects the freedoms of the wider citizenry. Even when more peripheral districts host mega-event venues, these areas tend to be sanitized and gentrified before events are staged, thus preventing engagement with local neighbourhoods. Paton, Mooney, and McKee (2012) account of Glasgow's Commonwealth Games suggests the overriding rationale was to normalize the city's East End, by transforming it into a space of consumption, rather than allowing visitors to experience a working class district.

### ***Factors influencing Olympic tourist engagement with host environments***

Travel-related decision making involves numerous factors that influence and determine individual and collective action, either when planning to visit or when physically exploring a destination (Weed and Bull 2009). This section illustrates some of the factors that influence the behaviour of Olympic-tourists, their engagement with the host-city, and their propensity to explore beyond HEZs.

Weed (2008, 22) notes that Olympic-tourism is 'behaviour motivated or generated by Olympic-related activities' yet usually includes some form of non-sport-related tourism

generated before, during, and after the Olympics (Kim and Chalip 2004). Rio, like other host-cities sought to intertwine sporting and non-sporting cultural components to provide a unique experience across the city – a so-called ‘extension’ beyond official venues. Here, host-cities wish to mobilize what Weed and Bull (2009) refer to as ‘active event sport tourists’.

Understanding the reasons Olympic-tourists decide to travel is particularly important in the era of digital communication when individuals can consume official sporting events without physically travelling. We note how event organizers should ask two pertinent questions: (1) ‘what’ exactly drives Olympic-tourists to travel from all corners of the world to a host-city, and (2) ‘how’ and ‘why’ do they explore and engage with the city (or not) when they arrive. Additionally, Weed and Bull (2009) ask: (i) what aspects of ‘activity’, ‘people’ and ‘place’ attract visitors to the event, and (ii) what is the relationship between the sporting event(s) itself and other aspects of the trip. Several studies have tried to address these questions (e.g. Duignan and Pappalepore 2021; Kaplanidou 2009), but more research is needed on the relationship between Olympic-tourism and host-destinations.

One underexplored area of research we highlight in this paper is how security arrangements are perceived by the visitors they are meant to reassure. In Rio, the security plans associated with the successful Olympic bid were touted as a major success, including the military occupation of favelas and other deprived neighbourhoods, and the use of a centralized, high-tech system of security devices to police public spaces (Rodrigues, Brancoli, and Kalil 2018). Everyone appraises and perceives risk differently: some people are attracted to risky situations that others would be repelled by as tourists appraise the severity and likelihood of being exposed to risk and evaluate their individual ability to cope with it (Qi, Gibson, and Zhang 2009).

Since the turn of the twenty-first century, especially post-9/11, there is a basic assumption that tourists are more motivated to travel to destinations deemed safe and secure (Kozak, Crotts, and Law 2007). Qi, Gibson, and Zhang (2009) research suggests that violence risk and socio-psychological risk are key factors influencing intentions to visit mega-event cities. Chalip (2004) and Neirotti and Hilliard (2006) both note how threats to health and safety are a central concern of visitors intending to visit destinations, places and particular attractions. Kim and Chalip (2004) note these factors were the primary concern of visitors intending to visit Korea during the 2002 Football World Cup. Neirotti and Hilliard (2006) reaffirmed these findings by studying attendees at the 2004 Olympic Games, noting that two-thirds of tourists interviewed reported safety and security considerations were fundamental in their decision to attend the Athens Games. Interestingly, Schroeder et al. (2013) observe that, during London 2012, U. S. tourists with previous experience of attending mega-events had higher, rather than lower, destination risk perceptions than those with no previous mega-event experience. This finding suggests that witnessing heavy security measures during mega-events contributes to higher risk perceptions rather than reassuring participants. Threats posed by global terrorism are compounded by internal host-city risks like threats of urban protests, crime and violence (Giulianotti and Klauser 2010). As Pavoni (2011) suggests, staging mega-events in the Global South, often means dealing with everyday security problems in ‘an extraordinary spatio-temporal context’, rather than prioritising ‘spectacular anti-terrorism measures’ (2011, 201).

Evidence suggests that Olympic-tourists typically travel to engage in collective social-sports spaces, activities and networks. They are often focused on the Games and tend not to prioritize cultural exploration, engagement and consumption (e.g. Mhanna, Blake, and Jones 2017). As globalisation intensifies, sport events play a central role in re-affirming (lost and/or diminishing) national identity (Marivoet 2006). A 'sports' identity – and assuming the identity of a 'fan' – thus appears to serve as a primary motivation to travel for Olympic-tourists. As a result, spaces outside these immediate fan networks may be less valued (Duignan, Down, and O'Brien 2020).

While research suggests that the movements of Olympic-visitors are often limited to familiar tourist-oriented zones and that they tend to connect with likeminded individuals, this behaviour is by no means unique to Olympic-tourists. Over half a century ago, Knebel (1960) introduced the concept of *touristische Eigenwelt*, touristic own or inner world, to describe this phenomenon. Cohen (1972), drawing on Knebel (1960), famously described the tension between cultural curiosity and need for safety experienced by international tourists:

“though novelty and strangeness are essential elements in the tourist experience, not even modern man is completely ready to immerse himself wholly in an alien environment. (...) Most tourists seem to need something familiar around them, something to remind them of home (...). They would like to experience the novelty of the microenvironment of a strange place from the security of a familiar microenvironment”. (Cohen 1972, 166)

Cohen uses the term 'environmental bubble' to identify the microenvironments where, in the host-destination, tourists can experience a diluted (often staged) version of the local culture while being surrounded by safe and culturally familiar reminders of home. Since Cohen's seminal paper, environmental bubbles – now more commonly referred to as tourist bubbles (Judd 1999; Jacobsen 2003), enclavic tourist spaces, or tourist enclaves (Freitag 1994; Ek and Tesfahuney 2019) – have been widely researched. These are conceptualized as either behavioural-psychological patterns and perceptions or, more often, as physical spaces constructed by tourism planning and/or the tourism industry (Jacobsen 2003). Boundary cues, such as the presence of fewer other tourists, signs in the local language or shops catering for local people, signal to tourists that they are approaching the extremities of the bubble, thus communicating territorial safety (Jacobsen 2003). Examples of constructed tourist bubbles include tourist resorts in the Global South (Klein 2007), cruise ships (Jacobsen 2003), and urban tourist precincts (Judd 1999). Building on Judd's work, Silk and Andrews (2011) discuss the ways Baltimore's tourist bubble was reinforced through sports initiatives: Anchored by two stadiums and promoted through the Volvo Round the World Yacht Race. Sport and entertainment were also key to the development of Memphis's tourist bubble, to which people were invited to 'come downtown and play' (Silk and Amis 2005). We argue in this paper that the geographic configurations constructed in the context of mega-events are a type of tourist-bubble with unique qualities warranting further investigation.

### ***New urban tourism and off-the-beaten track experiences of the Olympic city***

According to Ashworth and Page (2011), tourists tend to consume cities *selectively* (i.e. they only experience a small proportion of the place they are visiting) – and – *rapidly*



(i.e. most city visits consist of relatively short stays). This closely aligns with behaviours associated with Olympic-tourists as both traits discourage wider engagement with more peripheral parts of a host-city. These characteristics have implications for wider tourism planning, and further explain the development of tourist bubbles in contemporary Western cities. Cities have been pressured into building spectacular (touristic) spaces that will attract the attention of external audiences whilst providing a convenient and safe experience for visitors (Fainstein and Gladstone 1999). Typically, these spaces tend to be located in city centres, or in adjacent post-industrial sites that have been repurposed as leisure, culture and entertainment districts. Pavoni's (2011) observation of 'bubble to bubble' visitor movements in Johannesburg during the 2010 FIFA World Cup highlights that there are parallels between tourism zones and temporary HEZs – links that we explore in this paper.

In cities deemed to be unsafe, urban planners have sought to construct 'defensible spaces', compounds where policing, surveillance and architectural design work to keep undesirable citizens, visitors and untoward activity out (Fainstein and Gladstone 1999, 26). As Judd (1999, 37) notes, 'where urban decay or social problems cause tourists to regard a city as dangerous or inhospitable, city government in partnership with entrepreneurs constructs places where visitors can find suitable facilities and amenities in a safe and convenient environment'. Judd famously used the term 'tourist bubble' to describe this assemblage – a set of tactical and strategic ways touristic spaces are designed to protect tourists from the city and citizens they are visiting. Inevitably, this spatial arrangement only serves to exacerbate urban polarisation between host-populations and visitors. As Judd (1999, 53) suggests, class and racial divisions can be exacerbated 'if tourist reservations are constructed as artificial, segregated environments devoted to consumption and play while substantial areas of the city outside the tourist-bubble fester with physical decay, crime and poverty'.

Although sometimes derided as tourism compounds, tourists are not the only users of these spaces. 'Open' tourist bubbles are those with 'porous' borders allowing mobility and interaction between hosts and guests. Generally, the lack of porous borders in a tourist-bubble is a result of the level of inequality and uneven power relations between tourists and the host-community (Saarinen and Wall-Reinius 2019). For example, enclavic resorts in developing regions have tight, highly controlled borders and the movements of local people in and out of the bubble are limited or even prevented (Jacobsen 2003). In contrast, urban tourist bubbles in the Global North have porous borders and often serve – and are usually frequented by – privileged residents and office workers. They are exclusive sites of consumption where a visiting middle class mingles with a local-middle class (Lim and Bouchon 2017).

Clustering facilities not only provides added convenience for tourists, it also enables these spaces to be marketed, contained and secured (McGillivray, Duignan, and Mielke 2019). They are often designed by global architects, feature global brands, and epitomize a new breed of global, homogenous space that makes tourists feel more comfortable away from home (Gospodini 2004). Spatial, geographical, architectural and all-around cultural departure from the rest of the city means that even when local residents use these 'alien' spaces 'they become, in effect, tourists' (Fainstein and Gladstone 1999).

In recent years, driven by increased mobility and the collapse of modern distinctions (home/away; holiday/everyday; work/leisure), we have witnessed increasing interest in



visiting peripheral parts of cities outside of tourist bubbles. This is a direct consequence of tourists seeking more distinctive and authentic experiences. Tourists are increasingly going 'off-the-beaten-track' by visiting neighbourhoods typically not part of tourist routes prescribed by official itineraries. Ironically, 'elements of the urban experience previously deemed to be liabilities by politicians/developers' can be recast as attractive qualities, fuelled by a 'notion of diversity that often fetishises the gritty and the illicit as authentic' (Lloyd 2002, 518). As a result, 'former no-go areas have been turned into desirable destinations' (Huning and Novy 2006, 7). Whilst this trend is particularly apparent in global cities like New York, Berlin and London, the popularity of slum and favela tours shows it is also relevant to mega-cities in the Global South. In Rio, this trend has famously led to the rebranding of some favelas (such as Babilônia and Vidigal) as fashionable quarters, and the subsequent development of hospitality businesses such as night-clubs, cafes and accommodation, often facilitated by microbusiness training and (public and private) funding programs (Ribeiro and Santos Junior 2017).

Tourists now want to experience a city 'like a local': an antidote to purpose-built urban landscapes. Inspired by the work of Maitland and Newman (2014), scholars such as Dirksmeier and Helbrecht (2015) and Novy (2018) have dubbed this New Urban Tourism. This movement encourages tourist exploration, engagement and consumption beyond tourist bubbles into the heart of less visible spaces, places and attractions, a continued trend found in recent Olympic cities including Tokyo (Duignan 2021). In light of New Urban Tourism and to address the lack of research on Olympic-tourists' engagement with host-destinations, we explore to what extent tourists in Rio went 'off the beaten track' during the Olympic Games, and the role of Olympic-spatial planning in facilitating or hindering forms of New Urban Tourism.

## Methodology

To answer our three research questions, we drew on qualitative data obtained through in-depth qualitative interviews with tourists during the Rio 2016 Olympics (Table 1). In total, 35 face to face interviews were conducted in the Copacabana HEZ – a sample featuring a range of different nationalities, ages, motivations for travel to Rio and intentions to travel inside and outside HEZs. We chose Copacabana as it represents one of Rio's most popular tourist bubbles whilst being temporarily overlaid with significant Olympic regulations – a characterisation central to our 'double bubble' argument, as we empirically illustrate and justify later. Our questions addressed the following themes: experiences of the city, places visited, engagement with the local-population, and risk perceptions. Data generated were synthesized to form a 'Thematic Network Analysis' (Attride-Stirling 2001) which produced the primary and secondary empirical themes presented in the findings and discussions.

As identified earlier, there is a dearth of in-depth, qualitative research looking into tourist motivations and behaviours, especially in the context of mega-events. We adopted a social constructivist position using a qualitative and inductive approach within a single event case study (Yin 2013). This corresponds to Qi, Gibson, and Zhang (2009) call for a deeper excavation of tourist motivation and behaviour in the context of mega-events, focusing on 'how' and 'why' Olympic-tourists engage with the city when they arrive. By generating in-depth – qualitative data we sought to generate this deeper understanding.

**Table 1.** List of Phase 1 interviewees.

Tourists (T)	Nationality	Age	Gender	Length of stay in Rio
T1	Canada	No answer	M	No answer
T2	Ireland	27	F	1 week so far
T3	USA	No answer	F	6 days
T4	Ireland	No answer	F	1 week
T5	Canada	No answer	M	1 month
T6	Israel	31	M	3 weeks
T7	Australia	57	M	1 month
T8	USA	28	F	6 months
T9	USA	27	M	3 months
T10	USA	27	F	Few days
T11	USA	43	M	No answer
T12	UK	No answer	F	1 month
T13	UK	No answer	F	7 months
T14	Australia	No answer	F	4 weeks
T15	Australia	25	F	1 week
T16	Australia	25	F	1 week
T17	Australia	25	F	1 week
T18	Australia	25	M	1 week
T19	USA	No answer	F	6 days
T20	Israel	38	M	3 weeks
T21	Israel	33	M	2 weeks
T22	New Zealand	27	F	Few weeks
T23	Brazil	No answer	M	3 days
T24	UK	33	F	Few days
T25	UK	36	F	Few days
T26	Argentina	33	F	1 week
T27	UK	19	F	5 weeks
T28	Ecuador	27	F	No answer
T29	Poland	31	F	No answer
T30	Australia	No answer	M	6 weeks
T31	Germany	No answer	M	1 week
T32	Brazil	32	M	9 days
T33	UK	36	M	6 months
T34	USA	33	F	Few days
T35	USA	32	F	2.5 weeks

Secondary data included an analysis of strategic, policy documentation and archival analysis (e.g. candidature, official bid, and policy documentation). Integrating these secondary sources helped us to understand Rio's tourism strategy and policy which we related to how tourists experienced, explored and engaged off the beaten track during the event. Local sources also helped us to become familiar with the geographical context and event topologies under investigation and served, where possible, to bolster and triangulate our evidence base derived from primary data analysis. To strengthen our analysis, we adopted both 'investigator triangulation' (i.e. all four authors independently analysed primary data sets) and 'methodological triangulation' (i.e. our primary and secondary data sets were fused together to strengthen the evidence base).

## Findings and discussion

### *Defining and protecting interests in the bubble*

An imperative for the organizers of any Olympic Games is to provide safe spaces for a range of Olympic-related activities, including sport, commercial and media activities (Graham 2012). Within these temporary spaces, various (at times conflicting) interests

need to be protected, including those of the IOC, affiliated sponsors, suppliers, media, governments, athletes, supporters, tourists and locals. As a result, the construction of sporting and commercial spaces to stage the 2016 Olympic Games imposed a series of physical and regulatory changes on Rio – redefining parts of the city as Olympic-zones and replacing existing socio-economic activity with a new project orientated territory (see Ribeiro and Santos Junior 2017). We refer to these highly circumscribed (new) event zones as ‘Olympic bubbles’ due to their deliberate separation from the rest of the city. Contingent on the geography and topographies of the host-city, Olympic bubbles can manifest in numerous ways. In Beijing (host of the 2008 Olympic Games), bubbles were isolated in one central zone. However, in most Olympic-cities they sprawl across the city, often out into the periphery beyond central tourist attractions. Rio followed this trend by developing four core Olympic-zones: Maracanã and Copacabana in central locations, and Deodoro and Barra in more peripheral districts.

Each bubble differed in size, type of activity, with contextual and existing socio-economic activity. Barra, a previously undeveloped beachside area situated to the south west was developed to house the Olympic-village and the main Olympic-Park. Deodoro, a part-urban part-rural area situated in the far north west of the city was created to stage some of the less prominent events of the 2016 Games (hockey, fencing, canoeing, shooting, equestrian). Maracanã, situated within the heart of the city, integrated residential districts and inner-city sports venues. On the other hand, Copacabana – an existing ‘tourist bubble’ – represented an opportunity to capitalize on its international reputation too. Copacabana hosted the majority of the commercial facilities that are now an intrinsic part of the Olympic Games (i.e. main superstore, PyeongChang exhibition, global media suites, newly regenerated Live Site et cetera). Here, the installation of a (temporary) Olympic-bubble in an existing (more permanent) tourist bubble created what we refer to as a ‘double bubble’. This original conceptualisation recognizes the fact that temporary mega-event zones are layered on top of a pre-existing urban context: as Pavoni (2011, 204) suggests, they are assemblages that emerge ‘out of an urban space which is not blank but already traversed and shaped’ (2011, 204). Copacabana was already a tourism bubble before it became an Olympic HEZ, and this was one of the main reasons we selected this site as the focus for our research.

Secondary evidence and interviews with tourists suggest Rio’s Olympic-bubble(s) were constructed in several ways. At the most obvious level, these bubbles had ‘hard’ physical dimensions: fences and barriers which protected those within and excluded those unable to access outside. Hard perimeters – which extended beyond venues into urban areas – were less visible and more loosely secured in Rio compared to previous editions of the Games, but tourists still noted the ways that whole parts of the city were ‘cordoned off’ (T5). Tourists often mentioned the visible ‘fences’ and ‘perimeters’ that defined Olympic-zones with one using the more politically loaded term ‘barricades’ (T17). One tourist felt they couldn’t explore areas outside the Olympic-bubble because ‘the streets are locked off and dead so it’s pretty hard to have that connection with local communities’ (T18). The systems used to transport people around were also designed in a way that restricted tourist engagement with local areas. For example, one noted the way she was ‘plonked where the stadiums were and then you just got out.’ (T17). Tourists also referenced the ways they were herded around, which limited incidental engagement with areas outside the perimeter of Olympic-zones.

The hard construction of Olympic-bubbles – or even double bubbles in the case of Copacabana – was supported by regulations that restricted access to, and behaviour in, Olympic-areas (Rodrigues, Brancoli, and Kalil 2018). Previous events in Rio (2007 Pan American Games; 2014 FIFA World Cup) left a legal legacy, and these existing arrangements (i.e. Pele's Law, 1999) – alongside new laws required as part of signing the Host City Contract (HCC) – enabled an efficient mobilisation of legal and regulatory exceptions, or 'law exclusion zones' (Corrarino 2014). This also includes the 'Lei Geral da Copa' – a legal exception that interfered with all fields of legislation, including urban planning, policing, rights to the city, and social protection (e.g. Sánchez and Broudehoux 2013). Such measures, in the name of safety, civic pride and national image (Corrarino 2014), (legally) legitimize the swift and effective installation of security conditions to control movement and activity (i.e. to prevent non-official forms of ambush marketing and event exploitation). For example, Rio's Candidature Bid (2009) outlined Article 124 and Article 195 that either 'prohibits companies that are not official sponsors, providers or supporters of the Olympic Games from registering any item, brand or symbol which could easily be confused with official partners and symbols [124]' – or – 'makes it illegal to divert clients from another entity in a fraudulent manner, for example through an association, such as with the Olympic Games, without official authorization [195]'. And if any other forms of regulation are required to protect certain interests, the bid stated that 'all levels of Government have committed to enact additional legislative protection as required' (2009). Ultimately, this means that local aspects of cultural production including food, drink, culture and heritage is rendered invisible, inaccessible, or removed from Olympic-bubbles, privileging more spectacular global cultural producers.

Constructing and protecting spaces to maximize touristic benefits was a dominant theme across our tourist interviews. Even though areas surrounding venues appeared less heavily controlled than in previous host-cities (e.g. London 2012), access to these zones was still restricted. For example, one tourist noted: 'you couldn't get into the [venue] zone if you didn't have a ticket' (T17). Regulations were enforced by the visible presence of security personnel and associated technologies. In an era when people have become very used to heavy security, many saw these as 'standard procedures' but there were extra layers of securitisation that went beyond what people would normally expect, even in a city with a reputation for gang and gun violence. During Rio 2016 the presence of military police, the constant whirring of police helicopters and sirens, the installation of police turrets and the prevalence of military hardware (including tanks and gunships anchored off Copacabana beach) created a 'spectacle of security' (Boyle and Haggerty 2009), which served to legitimize the rise of 'military capitalism' (Amar 2018).

Zones were demarcated giving formal definition to the perimeters of Olympic-bubbles and to mark where Olympic-advertising, trade, venue regulatory effects were meant to be enforced. This zoning determined what activities could exist and co-exist and whose interests were prioritized. Aligned with other studies, like Pappalepore and Duignan (2016) and Giulianotti et al. (2015), we identify that such environments restricted physical tourist access to local communities, including local (cultural) producers within these communities, whilst simultaneously offering existing local cultural producers' minimal access to Olympic-zones. There seemed to be a number of reasons why tourists were denied access to a more local cultural offer: fear and risk perception; the role of security and physical barriers; and time-budgets.

### ***Factors affecting tourist exploration and engagement in Rio***

Stimulating, maintaining, and maximising tourism outcomes is central to the rationale for hosting the Olympics. Yet, the perceived threat to visitor safety in Rio dominated non-sporting media and headlines ahead of the 2016 Games. Our interviews with tourists corroborated this view, with media, from traditional-broadcast to YouTube videos emphasising ‘negative narratives [that] scared a lot of people away’ (T1). Numerous tourists simply illustrated that Rio was a risky place to visit, especially outside the secured areas: ‘Well I guess I was scared, yeah I was scared before coming to Rio because of all the thing about ohh you can get mugged’ (T3). Others reported wider fears amongst their fellow tourists: ‘people come in with a lot of fear’ (T6). The construction of highly controlled, safe spaces was therefore seen as vital. Yet, beyond these securitized Olympic-bubbles security efforts to make tourists feel safe were limited – potentially stunting their interest in exploring off the beaten track outside of Olympic-bubbles.

“Security was perfect for visitors in general, but only around the Olympic-areas. Throughout the rest of the city safety conditions remained at the known level [high public risk outside of HEZs]”. (T1)

In the academic literature the strict security arrangements associated with mega-events tend to be represented negatively (e.g. Graham 2012), but there are accounts such as Pavoni’s (2011) which resist the urge to repeat the ‘taken for granted’ narrative of mega-event over-securitisation. Several tourists interviewed in this study regarded Rio’s approach positively: ‘there was a lot of security, they were really strict about bottled water and taking the caps off and things like that, they went through your hand-bags. There is always a little bit of fear. Overall, I say it was good’ (T9). These positive appraisals included people who were clearly nervous, and who appreciated the extra-layers of security introduced during the Games. Comments included references to physical installations, ‘I personally felt a lot safer because there was a huge barricade, and you couldn’t get into the zone if you didn’t have a ticket so if someone wanted to do something then it would probably be difficult for them to get close’ (T17) and the presence of security staff: ‘seeing the military police everywhere gave me more of a feeling of safety’ (T3). These findings replicate visitors’ praise for over-policing recorded by Pavoni (2011) in Johannesburg during the 2010 World Cup, and corroborate Bauman’s (2003) argument that the fear of ‘invisible or almost unpredictable enemies’ (cited in Rodrigues, Brancoli, and Kalil 2018, 98) drives public demand for securitisation and surveillance. However, other tourists we interviewed were dismissive of visitors who appreciated the presence of barriers: ‘They feel like they are going to get mugged if they go beyond the fence’ (T1). Indeed, there were tourists who felt less safe because of the spectacle of security implemented for the Games. ‘The security in Rio is really visual. You see a lot of army people with guns. (...) I probably would feel safer not seeing people walking around with guns. I don’t know if some of these young kids with the armour actually know how to use those guns. So, it would actually make me feel safer if I didn’t see them’ (T7).

The varied perspectives noted above highlights the diverse range of Olympic-tourists present in Rio during the Games. Some seemed nervous of being in this host-city and these people appreciated the heightened security arrangements associated with staging the Olympic Games and regarded the creation of an Olympic-bubble as

something that made them feel safer. This reflects Pavoni's (2011) observation that in cities deemed to be dangerous, securitized mega-event zones function as 'safe spaces', providing relief from the 'everyday anxiety' in host cities that prevents tourists from relaxing (2011, 204). However, several expressed the view that security arrangements – particularly the visible presence of armed personnel – made them feel less safe-and-exacerbated the perceived threat of low public safety. The diverse range of attitudes highlights the dilemmas faced by host-cities tasked with staging the Games.

There are interesting contrasts between Rio 2016 and the previous edition of the summer Olympic Games held in 2012. In London, fear appeals and the power of persuasion were used to encourage local people to avoid the city's public transport system and stay away from the city centre (e.g. Pappalepore and Duignan 2016). Posters, adverts and announcements on bus services were deployed to deter unnecessary journeys. The aim was to avoid congestion – helping the logistical challenge of staging the Games. In Rio, the intention seemed to be more aligned to security objectives. Preventing large numbers of local people accessing Olympic-bubbles reduced the threat of protests and crime but it restricted the capacity of Olympic-tourists to interact with local people and local culture too.

The Olympic-bubble offered convenience and comfort, as well as safety and security. Often, urban tourism experiences are characterized by stringent time-budgets (Pearce 1988) and Olympic-visitors often only visit the host city for a short period. For example, one commented: 'I tend to think that if you want to get to know a city you are better off not going during the Olympics (...) a lot of time dedicated traveling to an event and then a lot of time traveling back to home. It takes a big chunk out of your time' (T7). Or:

"Your focus is on the games and the events if you are a sports fan. A lot of people went home right after the Olympics (...) since I was only there for a week, it was rushed (...) People who come just for the games, I don't think they get a real feel for the city. They are not in the city, they are just in the venues". (T4)

This meant visitors didn't feel able to explore beyond Olympic-zones; a problem exacerbated by the amount of time it took to move between different venues. Whilst there is evidence that Olympic-tourists were carefully choreographed and orchestrated by organizers and city officials, it is also important to point out that Rio's bubbles were not entirely 'closed'. They had porous borders: locals and tourists alike were, if they wished, able to leave them and some of our interviewees indeed took the opportunity to do so. However, many tourists didn't leave Olympic-spaces because of numerous factors identified: safety concerns, the lack of time to do so – or – because they were more interested in socialising with other Olympic-tourists:

"We were there for 6 or 7 nights, we had tickets for events on Thursday, Friday and Saturday, which left us sightseeing Tuesday and Wednesday. We were out every night, our focus was really on the Olympics and then to go out and socialise with different tourists during the night time". (T2)

There were tourists who had no real wish to move beyond the Olympic-bubbles – not necessarily because they were scared of what they might encounter but because they had come to Rio for the Games; and, therefore, were more interested in trying to meet Olympians and spending time with fellow fans, than immersing themselves in Brazilian culture. The spatial organisation of the Olympic-bubble catered for such needs by providing

congregation points on the beachside for specific national groups. As noted by Marivoet (2006), the meaning and value derived from attending mega sports events is often about the re-affirmation of national identity and self-belonging more than discovering the host destination and soaking in the local vibes. Connecting with fellow nationals and supporting one's national team together within sport venues and fan zones may therefore be more important than exploring the city. For some of our interviewees attending the Olympics meant feeling part of a cosmopolitan elite experiencing a global village:

"Celebrate nationalism, celebrate globalism. All these things happen. Even in the media village where I don't see Rio I am interacting with the Japanese, the Dutch, with the guys from Turkey and Africa. So there is social mixing that happens" (T1)

The social identity created in this case is one of cosmopolitanism (Hannerz 1990) rather than a nationally focused one, and experiences are shared with likeminded Olympic-fans. This finding supports the notion that Olympic-bubbles – where fans and athletes from around the globe co-exist side by side – are more valued by Olympic-tourists than 'authentic' local-spaces. This theme is explored in more depth in the next section.

### ***A new Olympic tourist?***

Kellner (2013) notes that we have seen an 'entertainmentisation' of economic, society, politics, and fundamentals of everyday life – creating a so-called 'culture of the spectacle'. The Olympics is arguably the most advanced form of global culture, uniting communities, towns, cities, nations and supranational entities together in a single space, and time. It is therefore important to understand whether, in a project fundamentally underpinned by the need to promote globalized culture, is there space for more diverse ambitions, particularly in light of recent theories surrounding the rise of New Urban Tourism.

Whilst some of the tourists interviewed appeared to match the Olympic-tourist stereotype – only interested in the Olympic-events and unlikely to explore the city beyond the double bubble – others appreciated the chance to consume Rio at a time (and in spaces) where they were afforded extra protection. One of the interviewees, for example, singled the Olympics as a special and unique time to experience local-culture:

"[I enjoyed ...] Gastronomy, culture, music, art, people, language (...) Visit favelas, go on locally-supported tours of communities outside of the tourist trap zones, eat as much amazing food as possible (...) getting an idea of the style of life led by the daily and average Brazilian – especially during such a contested time as the Olympics". (T5)

This finding reflects research conducted in Beijing, which found that during and after the 2008 Games tourists visited a greater number of attractions (and areas) in comparison with the months leading up to the Games. New attractions included Olympic-venues, but also other less central or newly developed tourist areas which were not Olympic-sites but were promoted by the government as part of their Olympic-driven tourism policy (Leung et al. 2012). Many other tourists seemed frustrated that the Olympic-bubbles provided very unrepresentative experiences of Rio. These visitors described how normally they would enjoy exploring the city 'off-the-beaten track' and mingling with the locals more, but this was made difficult this time by the very nature of the Games:



“... there was no going off to find indigenous communities or anything like that. (...) we wanted to taste the local cuisine in every country we go to but in Rio we just didn't have the chance to so it was ... we were gone early in the morning and out all day so it was just mostly fast food, something quick just to fill ourselves really” (T2)

Some tourists interviewed, however, pointed to the fact that attending the Games in Rio gave them a desire to return and explore the city in more depth another time, ‘I feel like I didn't get to see the real Rio, I think I have to come back. I think the way that Rio was during the Games is not how it is usually’ (T22). This (unfulfilled) ambition to experience the ‘real Rio’ shows that even new urban tourists (Dirksmeier and Helbrecht 2015; Novy 2018) struggle to explore the Olympic city beyond the bubbles. New urban tourists would normally search for opportunities to mingle with locals and experience everyday places for a chance to live the city ‘as if’ a local and a more authentic experience. The Olympic bubbles were therefore seen one of several ways limiting access to the ‘real Rio’ and connectivity with local Cariocas.

Several tourists explicitly linked the idea of ‘bubbles’ to the absence of local and Olympic-tourist interactions: ‘Going back and forth from these bubbles, you don't really meet any locals’ (T12). One tourist extended the bubble metaphor to communicate the overly protected, cosseted way that Olympic zones operated: ‘This bubble wrapping also prevents the authentic interactions between people’ (T1). A few interviewees used new internet and mobile platforms such as Airbnb, Couchsurfing and Tinder to escape these bubbles and connect with local-people:

“I did couchsurfing for that exact reason to meet the locals and things like that. And one of the best things is Tinder. It is actually the best ways to meet locals around a certain area and they generally come and pick you up and show you around, I've done it many times and, in many countries, and it works”. (T22)

For many people we spoke to, the poor integration between Olympic-zones and the rest of Rio was regarded as detrimental to the visitor experience: ‘Probably the thing I liked the least during the Olympics was how parts of the city were designated and cordoned off to foreign visitors, especially areas surrounding Olympic-sites and houses’ (T5). This segregation and separation also meant that Olympic-areas were largely devoid of the celebratory atmosphere that organizers had promised when they bid for and planned the 2016 Games. One tourist lamented the lack of culture in the Olympic-zones and said they ‘expected a little more celebration and a little more party’ (T17). Another felt that the physical isolation of the events from the rest of the city and the restricted access afforded to local-vendors produced an atmosphere that was sterile and diluted, something which they felt was not in the interests of either the host or the tourists. In a similar vein, several tourists said they were disappointed by the lack of Brazilian and Cariocan food in the Olympic-zones: ‘the food, is like very stock standard. I mean it would have been cool to see local-foods’ (T18).

Whilst the configuration of Rio during the 2016 Games encouraged tourists to stay within Olympic-bubbles, these zones were also designed to keep local-people out; not merely by limiting access to certain areas to ticket holders but by limiting the capacity of Cariocas to move between their neighbourhoods and Olympic-zones. These barriers possibly reflect the significant social and economic inequalities existing in Rio and, consequently, the uneven power relations between Olympic-tourists and the host-

community. For example, normal bus services into central areas were suspended for the duration of the Games. The freedom of Cariocas to travel around their city was affected in other ways too: for example, tourists noted that 'on the Line 4 and then the BRT, you have to show your ticket and a Rio transit card to the event to be able to take the transport' (T14). This led to the feeling that the Olympics were foisted on the local-population and they didn't even get the benefit of being able to access parts of their city – reducing the propensity of social mixing between tourists and locals. Indeed, the management of public transport during the 2016 Games exacerbated this separation.

Rio's Olympic tourists generally acknowledged they were inhabiting a bubble. Whilst these bubbles restricted access to Cariocas, they were often appreciated by visitors who liked the interactions between people from different parts of the world. As noted earlier, for these people, the Olympics was a celebration of globalism rather than a Brazilian celebration – contrary to the initial aims of Rio's Olympic project. The literature on sport mega-events suggests the desire to belong to and interact with a cosmopolitan fan community supported by relevant urban platforms, may represent a more attractive experience for Olympic-tourists than exploring local areas and mingling with local residents. This 'coming together' of different nationalities is exactly how the IOC wants the Olympic Games to be regarded. A more critical view is that these are typical of the spaces for transitional elites that are emerging in various cities in the Global South. These are not egalitarian spaces but ones where people from certain parts of the world are more welcome than others. As one tourist told us: 'I think that I look American, and that affords me a privilege' (T11).

A significant proportion of Olympic tourists are indifferent to the types of deeper local cultural interactions originally promised by Olympic organizers and happy to inhabit segregated spaces that are detached from less privileged areas. Even if some tourists want deeper experiences of host city cultures, various structural factors constrain these. Clark, Kearns, and Cleland (2016) argue that the Olympics' 'mega' status automatically favours elements of host culture that are overtly spectacular and 'macro' in nature as local cultures are overshadowed by the grandiose, all-consuming, and pseudo-religious nature of mega-events (Chalip 2017). It is important to acknowledge that global culture is often customized and adapted to its local setting (Robertson 1994), which is reflected in the way each Olympic edition seeks to promote the host nation alongside the Olympic brand. However, in the context of mega-events, more localized adaptations are constrained in a number of complex ways, many of which are discussed in this paper.

## Conclusions

This paper responds to limited qualitative research looking at Olympic-tourist behaviour by identifying how and why Olympic-tourists engage with the host-city. We do this by offering an in-depth, qualitative examination of tourist behaviour through the lens of individual Olympic-tourists. Our analysis also contributes to the conceptualisation of the 'tourist bubble' (following Cohen 1972; Judd 1999; and Jacobsen 2003) by examining Olympic-bubbles as both behavioural and psychological entities, that are constructed through a combination of regulatory, planning and commercial dynamics. One of the key questions addressed by the present study is what impacts Olympic Games planning and management have on tourists' exploration of, and engagement with, Olympic-cities.

Games managers, aware of the fears and risks to visitor safety in Olympic-cities, design safe and secure tourists' experiences. Perceptions of fear and risk also play a major role in tourists' ability and propensity to venture 'off the beaten track', particularly in cities deemed dangerous like Rio. Experiences are designed to influence the way tourists access and interact with the city, herding tourists toward – and containing them within – Olympic-HEZs. To do this, managers install a variety of mechanisms, creating new-temporary boundary cues signalling to Olympic-tourists they are either within – or at the extremities of – the bubble.

First, transportations networks are designed in a way to efficiently move tourists from 'safe space' (e.g. a hotel, shopping centre, tourist bubble) to the next 'safe space' (e.g. the HEZ). In other words, rail and bus routes are temporarily reconfigured serving as a protective barrier to ensure safe passage to what are often global, corporate spaces of consumption. We refer to this as a sort-of 'bubble wrapping' of tourist experiences that directly, and intentionally, serves to reduce visitor interaction with 'unofficial' city spaces and local-host cultures.

Second, within the HEZ themselves, a 'Last Mile' is erected to corral tourists between transport drop off points, past airport style security and into venue zones only to be accessed by spectators with a ticket. Whilst the degree of corralling varies depending on time and place, they are designed in a way – similarly to transportation networks – to bubble wrap the tourist experience. As noted, hyper securitisation, temporary Olympic regulations and legal exceptions keep the 'right' (global) cultures in, and the 'wrong' (local) cultures out. This affects the opportunities Olympic tourists have to fully engage with local cultures. As Broudehoux and Sánchez (2015) note, Rio's market-friendly mega-event policies were 'elitist, segregationist and exclusive' (2015, 113). Via brand activation, live screening sports events and officially sanctioned cultural displays in existing tourist hotspots, HEZs are highly circumscribed and controlled spaces 'aimed at capturing the desires unleashed by the advent of the mega-event' (Pavoni 2011, 203). In other words, they represent a total institution – tourists need not venture beyond the boundary. We argue that by overlaying said conditions over existing tourism bubbles leads to the formation of a 'double bubble'. These ways of orchestrating HEZs, compounded by demand side factors, lead to a narrow tourist offer that ignores wider, deeper, multidimensional and plural cultural concepts and local-stakeholders residing in less-visible parts of the city.

The relative riskiness and unattractiveness of 'unofficial' host-city neighbourhoods, when juxtaposed against the double bubble, encourages tourists to stay away – sidelining other sides to Rio and preventing deeper cultural engagement. HEZs typify the restrictive ways tourists can engage with locals and the wider city – even though they may be far from home, what they encounter is often familiar and generic. As McGillivray, Duignan, and Mielke (2019) note, evidence suggests HEZs are also designed to keep local people out, whether that be through transforming beach-side public space to privatized ticketed arenas or by suspending bus and train routes to HEZs from some favela neighbourhoods. Compounding other factors, this leads to further segregation between tourists and locals—contravening initial promises in the bid to connect tourists, locals, and local-communities. Instead, tourist experiences *and* most HEZs themselves were largely devoid of a well-planned locally integrated authentic Cariocan offer.

Our work highlights the existence of double bubbles in Olympic host cities where Olympic compounds are implemented in areas that are often already established

tourist bubbles, segregated from everyday neighbourhood spaces. If and how Olympic-tourists engage with host cities beyond these double bubbles is a key issue warranting further research. The problems noted in this paper could also be addressed by looking at what happens inside these bubbles. We suggest these spaces could be better infused with host cultures to co-exist alongside global cultures, acting as a platform for showcasing regional products, local food and drink, cultural displays including art, music and theatre generated by a cross-section of the host population. The 'local infusion' of these spaces should, ideally, involve the use and management of public areas within the bubble by local cultural, creative and charitable organisations, alongside global sponsors and cultures. For example, food producers, performing artists and dance schools, agents which may encourage forms of creative tourism and the experience of existential authenticity (Ning 1999). Strategically and creatively incorporating local cultures into the cultural programming of HEZs would represent a progressive step forward in the inclusivity of the host population. However, careful work at the specific host-city level is required to identify who, what and how particular local cultures are deemed a priority as we recognize the danger that local infusion strategies merely represent tokenistic involvement. 'Visitor diffusion', on the other hand, could be encouraged by providing information about safe off-the-beaten-track exploration, maps (in paper or digital form) of cultural attractions and cultural itineraries outside of the tourist bubbles, as well as the provision of organized tours for less adventurous tourists. In an era of New Urban Tourism, this has become a central strategy in plans for future editions of the Olympic Games (McKinsey 2016) and we suggest collaboration between scholars, policy makers and event managers to consider how those managing large-scale events can both plan and deliver the integration of host cultures into the Olympic-tourist experience (Duignan 2021).

### Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

### Notes on contributors

**Michael Duignan** is Head of Department and Reader in Events at the School of Hospitality and Tourism Management, University of Surrey, UK. His work examines human and community rights issues in the planning and staging of large-scale sporting events and related visitor economy and tourism development. Mike's work is centred around three pillars: 1) urban development and regeneration, 2) visitor economy and tourist experiences, and 3) human trafficking and exploitation. Visit [www.MichaelDuignan.uk](http://www.MichaelDuignan.uk) for a detailed overview of Mike's biography and work to date.

**Ilaria Pappalepore** is a Senior Lecturer in Events and Tourism in the School of Architecture and Cities, University of Westminster, London. Her research interests include urban tourism; cultural events; creative industries; and urban regeneration.

**Dr Andrew Smith** is a Reader in Tourism and Events at the University of Westminster, UK. His research focuses on tourism in urban areas and the role of events in urban policy. He has written two notable books on events and is currently researching the ways festivals and events affect the inclusivity of urban public spaces.

**Yvonne Ivanescu** is a PhD student at the Université libre de Bruxelles, specializing in community-based tourism projects in Brazil.

## ORCID

Michael Duignan  <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-1539-2310>

## References

- Amar, P. 2018. "Military Capitalism." *NACLA Report on the Americas* 50 (1): 82–89.
- Ashworth, G., and S. Page. 2011. "Urban Tourism Research: Recent Progress and Current Paradoxes." *Tourism Management* 32: 1–15.
- Attride-Stirling, J. 2001. "Thematic Networks: An Analytical Tool for Qualitative Research." *Qualitative Research* 1: 385–485.
- Bauman, Z. 2003. *Wasted Lives: Modernity and its Outcasts*. Washington: Polity.
- Boyle, P., and K. Haggerty. 2009. "Spectacular Security: Mega-Events and the Security Complex." *International Political Sociology* 3: 257–274.
- Brazil Government. 2016. "Rio 2016 Olympic and Paralympic Games are a milestone for Brazilian tourism, says Embratur president". Accessed June 3, 2019. <http://www.brasil2016.gov.br/en/news/rio-2016-olympic-and-paralympic-games-are-a-milestone-for-brazilian-tourism-says-embratur-president>.
- Broudehoux, A. M., and F. Sánchez. 2015. "The Politics of Mega-Event Planning in Rio de Janeiro: Contesting the Olympic City of Exception." In *Mega-event Cities: Urban Legacies of Global Sport Events*, edited by V. Viehoff, and G. Poynter, 109–123. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Cade, N., S. Everett, and M. B. Duignan. 2019. "Leveraging Digital and Physical Spaces to 'de-Risk' and Access Rio's Favela Communities." *Tourism Geographies* 23 (1–2): 249–274. doi:10.1080/14616688.2019.1571099.
- Chalip, L. 2004. "Beyond Impact: A General Model for Host-Community Event Leverage." In *Sport Tourism: Interrelationships, Impacts and Issues*, edited by B. Ritchie, and D. Adair, 228. Clevedon: Channel View Publications.
- Chalip, L. 2017. "Trading Legacy for Leverage." In *Legacies and Mega-Events: Fact or Fairy Tales?*, edited by I. Britton, J. Boccardo, T. Byers, and K. Swart, 25–43. London: Routledge.
- Clark, J., A. Kearns, and C. Cleland. 2016. "Spatial Scale, Time and Process in Mega-Events: The Complexity of Host-Community Perspectives on Neighbourhood Change." *Cities* 53: 87–97.
- Cohen, E. 1972. "Toward a Sociology of International Tourism." *Social Research* 39: 164–182.
- Corraro, M. 2014. "Law Exclusion Zones: Mega-Events as Sites of Procedural and Substantive Human Rights Violations." *Yale Human Rights and Development Law Journal* 17: 180–204.
- Dirksmeier, P., and I. Helbrecht. 2015. "Resident Perceptions of New Urban Tourism: a Neglected Geography of Prejudice." *Geography Compass* 9 (5): 276–285.
- Duignan, M. B. 2021. "Leveraging Tokyo 2020 to Re-Image Japan and the Olympic City, Post-Fukushima." *Journal of Destination Marketing and Management*. awaiting DOI.
- Duignan, M. B., S. Down, and D. O'Brien. 2020. "Entrepreneurial Leveraging in Liminal Olympic Transit Zones." *Annals of Tourism Research* 80: 1–19.
- Duignan, M. B., and I. Pappalepore. 2019. "Visitor (im)mobility, Leisure Consumption and Mega Event Impact: The Territorialisation of Greenwich and Small Business Exclusion at the London 2012 Olympics." *Leisure Studies* 38 (2): 160–174. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02614367.2019.1572212>
- Duignan, M.B., and I. Pappalepore. 2021. "Strategic New Urban Tourism Planning and the Tokyo 2020 Olympics." *Tourism Geographies*.
- Duignan, M. B., I. Pappalepore, and S. Everett. 2019. "The 'Summer of Discontent': Exclusion and Communal Resistance at the London 2012 Olympics." *Tourism Management* 70: 355–367.
- Ek, R., and M. Tesfahuney. 2019. "Topologies of Tourism Enclaves." *Tourism Geographies* 21 (5): 864–880.
- Fainstein, S., and D. Gladstone. 1999. "Evaluating Urban Tourism." In *The Tourist City*, edited by D. Judd, and S. Fainstein, 21–34. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Foley, M., D. McGillivray, and G. McPherson. 2011. *Event Policy: From Theory to Strategy*. London: Routledge.
- Freitag, T. G. 1994. "Enclave Tourism Development: For Whom the Benefits Roll?" *Annals of Tourism Research* 21 (3): 538–554.

- Frisch, T., C. Sommer, L. Stoltenberg, and N. Stors. 2019. *Tourism and Everyday Life in the Contemporary City*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Gaffney, C. 2015. "Gentrifications in pre-Olympic Rio de Janeiro." *Urban Geography* 37 (8): 1132–1153.
- Giulianotti, R., G. Armstrong, G. Hales, and D. Hobbs. 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.
- Giulianotti, R., and F. Klauser. 2010. "Security Governance and Sport Mega-Events: Toward an Interdisciplinary Research Agenda." *Journal of Sport and Social Issues* 34: 49–61.
- Gospodini, A. 2004. "Urban Morphology and Place Identity in European Cities: Built Heritage and Innovative Design." *Journal of Urban Design* 9 (2): 225–248.
- Graham, S. 2012. "Olympics 2012 Security: Welcome to Lockdown London." *City* 16 (4): 446–451.
- Graham, S., and S. Marvin. 2002. *Splintering Urbanism: Networked Infrastructures, Technological Mobilities and the Urban Condition*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Hannerz, U. 1990. "'Cosmopolitans and Locals in a World Culture.'" *Theory, Culture and Society* 7: 237–251.
- Huning, S., and Novy, J. 2006. "Tourism as an Engine of Neighborhood Regeneration? Some Remarks Towards a Better Understanding of Urban Tourism Beyond the 'Beaten Path'." Center for Metropolitan Studies, 1-19.
- James, M., and G. Osborn. 2016. "The Olympics, Transnational law and Legal Transplants: the International Olympic Committee, Ambush Marketing and Ticket Touting." *Legal Studies* 36 (1): 93–110.
- Jacobsen, J. K. S. 2003. "The Tourist-Bubble and the Europeanisation of Holiday Travel." *Journal of Tourism and Cultural Change* 1 (1): 71–87.
- Judd, D. 1999. "Constructing the Tourist-Bubble." In *The Tourist City*, edited by D. Judd, and S. Fainstein, 54–70. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Kaplanidou, K. 2009. "Relationships among Behavioral Intentions, Cognitive Event and Destination Images among Different Geographic Regions of Olympic Games Spectators." *Journal of Sport and Tourism* 14 (4): 249–272.
- Kirby, S. I., M. B. Duignan, and D. McGillivray. 2018. "Mega-sport Events, Micro and Small Business Leveraging." *Event Management* 22 (6): 917–931.
- Klein, N. 2007. *The Shock Doctrine: The Rise of Disaster Capitalism*. New York, NY: Metropolitan Books.
- Klauser, F. R. 2012. "Interpretative Flexibility of the Event-City: Security, Branding and Urban Entrepreneurialism at the European Football Championships 2008." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 36 (5): 1039–1052.
- Knebel, H. 1960. *Soziologische Strukturwandlungen im Modernen Tourismus*. Stuttgart: F.Enke Verl.
- Kellner, D. 2013. *Media Spectacle and Insurrection, 2011: From the Arab Uprisings to Occupy Everywhere*. New York: Bloomsbury.
- Kim, N., and L. Chalip. 2004. "Why Travel to the FIFA World Cup? Effects of Motives, Background, Interest, and Constraints." *Tourism Management* 25: 695–707.
- Knott, B., A. Fyall, and I. Jones. 2016. "The Nation Branding Opportunities Provided by a Sport Mega-Event: South Africa and the 2010 FIFA World Cup." *Journal of Destination Marketing and Management* 4: 46–56.
- Kozak, M., J. C. Crofts, and R. Law. 2007. "The Impact of the Perception of Risk on International Travellers." *International Journal of Tourism Research* 9 (4): 233–242.
- Leung, X. Y., F. Wang, B. Wu, B. Bai, K. A. Stahura, and Z. Xie. 2012. "A Social Network Analysis of Overseas Tourist Movement Patterns in Beijing: The Impact of the Olympic Games." *International Journal of Tourism Research* 14 (5): 469–484.
- Lim, S., and Bouchon, F. 2017. "Blending in for a Life Less Ordinary? Off the Beaten Track Tourism Experiences in the Global City." *Geoforum* 86: 13–15.
- Lloyd, R. 2002. "Neo-Bohemia: Art and Neighborhood Redevelopment in Chicago." *Journal of Urban Affairs* 24 (5): 517–532.
- Maitland, R., and P. Newman. 2014. *World Tourism Cities: Developing Tourism off the Beaten Track*. Abingdon: Routledge.



- Marivoet, S. 2006. "UEFA Euro 2004™ Portugal: The Social Construction of a Sports Mega-Event and Spectacle." *The Sociological Review* 54: 127–143.
- McGillivray, D., M. B. Duignan, and E. Mielke. 2019. "Mega Sport Events and Spatial Management: Zoning Space Across Rio's 2016 Olympic City." *Annals of Leisure Research* 23 (3): 280–303.
- McGillivray, D., and M. Frew. 2015. "From fan Parks to Live Sites – MSEs and the Territorialisation of Urban Space." *Urban Studies* 52: 2649–2663.
- McKinsey. 2016. "The future of Japan's tourism: Path for sustainable growth towards 2020." Accessed February 5, 2019. <https://www.mckinsey.com/~media/mckinsey/industries/travel%20transport%20and%20logistics/our%20insights/can%20inbound%20tourism%20fuel%20japans%20economic%20growth/the%20future%20of%20japans%20tourism%20full%20report.ashx>.
- Mhanna, R., A. Blake, and I. Jones. 2017. "Challenges Facing Immediate Tourism Leveraging: Evidence from the London 2012 Olympic Games." *Managing Sport and Leisure* 22 (2): 147–165.
- Neirotti, L., and T. Hilliard. 2006. "Impact of Olympic Spectator Safety Perception and Security Concerns on Travel Decisions." *Tourism Review International* 10: 269–284.
- Ning, W. 1999. "Rethinking Authenticity in Tourism Experience." *Annals of Tourism Research*, 26 (2): 349–370.
- Novy, J. 2018. "'Destination' Berlin Revisited. from (new) Tourism Towards a Pentagon of Mobility and Place Consumption." *Tourism Geographies* 20 (3): 418–442.
- Osborn, G., and A. Smith. 2015. "Olympic Brandscapes." In *The London Olympics and Urban Development*, edited by G. Poynter, V. Viehoff, and Y. Li, 139–154. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Osborn, G., and A. Smith. 2016. "Olympic Brandscapes. London 2012 and the Seeping Commercialisation of Public Space." In *The London Olympics and Urban Development*, edited by G. Poynter et al., 139–153. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Pappalepore, I., and M. B. Duignan. 2016. "The London 2012 Cultural Programme: a Consideration of Olympic Impacts and Legacies for Small Creative Organisations in East London." *Tourism Management* 54: 344–355.
- Paton, K., G. Mooney, and K. McKee. 2012. "Class, Citizenship and Regeneration: Glasgow and the Commonwealth Games 2014." *Antipode* 44 (4): 1470–1489.
- Pavoni, A. 2011. "Tuning the City: Johannesburg and the 2010 World Cup." *Urbe. Revista Brasileira de Gestão Urbana* 3 (2): 191–209.
- Pearce, D. G. 1988. "Tourist Time-Budget." *Annals of Tourism Research* 15 (1): 106–121.
- Qi, C., H. Gibson, and J. Zhang. 2009. "Perceptions of Risk and Travel Intentions: The Case of China and the Beijing Olympic Games." *Journal of Sport and Tourism* 14 (1): 43–67.
- Rio Candidature Bid. 2009. Accessed July 6, 2016. Previously available at: [www.Rio2016.org/transparency](http://www.Rio2016.org/transparency). Now removed and not available online.
- Ribeiro, L. C. D. Q., and O. A. D. Santos Junior. 2017. "Neoliberalization and Mega-Events: The Transition of Rio de Janeiro's Hybrid Urban Order." *Journal of Urban Affairs* 39 (7): 909–923.
- Rodrigues, T., F. Brancoli, and M. Kalil. 2018. "Brazil, Pacification and Major Events: Forging an "Ambience of Security" in Rio. in Rio." *Revista de Estudios en Seguridad Internacional* 4 (1): 71–86.
- Robertson, R. 1994. "Globalisation or Glocalisation?" *Journal of International Communication* 1 (1): 33–52.
- Sánchez, F., and A. Broudehoux. 2013. "Mega-events and Urban Regeneration in Rio de Janeiro: Planning in a State of Emergency." *International Journal of Urban Sustainable Development* 5 (2): 132–153.
- Saarinen, J., and S. Wall-Reinius. 2019. "Enclaves in Tourism: Producing and Governing Exclusive Spaces for Tourism." *Tourism Geographies* 21 (5): 739–748.
- Schroeder, A., L. Pennington-Gray, K. Kaplanidou, and F. Zhan. 2013. "Destination Risk Perceptions among US Residents for London as the Host-City of the 2012 Summer Olympic Games." *Tourism Management* 38: 107–119.
- Silk, M., and J. Amis. 2005. "Sport Tourism, Cityscapes, and Cultural Politics." *Sport in Society* 8 (2): 280–301.
- Silk, M. L., and D. L. Andrews. 2011. "(Re)Presenting Baltimore: Place, Policy, Politics, and Cultural Pedagogy." *Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies* 33 (5): 433–464.



Smith, A., and N. Stevenson. 2009. "A Review of Tourism Policy for the 2012 Olympics." *Cultural Trends* 18: 97–102.

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

Weed, M., and C. Bull. 2009. *Sports Tourism: Participants, Policy and Providers*. Oxford: Elsevier.

Yin, R. 2013. *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*. London: Sage.