

The Olympic Games as a catalyst for infrastructure development.



Nyenrode Sports Leadership Program 2016-2017

Group Assignment

Frank Gimbrere, Ernst Ligthart, Lucas Judge, Merijn Zeeman, Pieter Bas Bruggink

25th August, 2017.

Contents

Acknowledgements	3
1 Introduction	4
2 The relationship between the Olympic Games and infrastructure development	6
2.1 Infrastructure and long term economic success	6
2.2 Can hosting the Olympic Games help speed up infrastructure development?	7
3 Leadership in complex environments	10
3.1 Leadership theory	10
3.2 Characteristics and habits of successful leaders	12
3.3 Leadership of the London Olympic Games	15
4 Conclusion	17
5 Recommendations	20
Bibliography	23

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank all of the people who made our research possible. From the Royal Dutch Football Association (KNVB), where Gijs de Jong, Michael van Praag and Bart van Soest provided us with valuable information about the hosting of EURO 200 to Priscilla Janssens from Pieter van den Hoogenband's Topsport Community, who we spoke to about the social power of world-class athletes and the momentum that the Olympic Games could bring to the Netherlands as a community. Thanks also to Henk Markerink from the Dutch Ministry of Health, Well-being and Sports who provided a significant boost to our leadership research. Thanks also to Noor Huitema and Cécile van Oppen from Copper 8, who taught us about the potential of sustainable construction and infrastructure and to the Mayor of Almere, who gave us valuable information about the direct and indirect effects of the organisation of Floriade. We would also like to express our gratitude to all of the guest speakers during the Sports Leadership program, in particular Chris Woerts, who spoke specifically about different leadership styles which also stimulated discussion within our group for this assignment.

1 Introduction

One of the largest threats to a potential Dutch bid for the 2028 Olympic Games (OG) is the popular belief that the OG are an expensive stand-alone event with a low or negative return on investment. This is unfortunate given the potential long-term benefits that can come from organizing not only the OG, but any major sporting event.

The biggest challenge facing those in support of a Dutch bid for the 2028 OG will be their ability to position the hosting of the OG as an integral part of a much broader vision for the future (sustainable and socio-economic) development of the Netherlands, a plan that should be aimed at strengthening the position of the Netherlands as one of the most innovative and competitive countries in Europe while also securing the long-term welfare of Dutch citizens in the process.

In this paper, we would like to argue that hosting any major sporting event (including the OG) can positively contribute to strengthening the (economic) position of any country, but in particular that of the Netherlands. A major opportunity presents itself in the form of spatial development, specifically regional and national infrastructure. Infrastructure within a region facilitates movement which stimulates interaction between people and assists with the efficient transfer of both goods and services. This sense of inclusion creates opportunity for innovation and trade, not only nationally and regionally but also internationally. The Dutch government wants to stimulate this type of development, setting aside 40 billion euros between now and 2040 to realising this goal. To speed up the process of spatial and infrastructure development, we believe that the Dutch government should endorse the OG, using it as a catalyst to realise development targets ahead of schedule. In chapter 2 we will explain why bringing such development forward is a good idea.

Given the complex discussions that take place on the pros and cons of hosting major sporting events it is necessary to discuss not only why infrastructure projects and spatial development goals should be brought forward but also what kind of leadership is required

to ensure that a balanced discussion is held on the subject. What does it take to successfully organize large-scale, multi-stakeholder, public investments for example? Why do some leaders succeed and others fail in complex environments? And, more specifically, what are the characteristics and habits of successful leaders? Answers to these and other questions are provided in chapter 3. In Chapter 4 we will combine the knowledge and insights gained in Chapters 2 and 3 by presenting our conclusions and recommendations.

2 The relationship between the Olympic Games and infrastructure development

In 2012, the Dutch Ministry of Infrastructure and the Environment (*Ministerie van Infrastructuur en Milieu*) stated the following vision: “The Netherlands competitive, accessible, liveable and safe.” The government has since set about pursuing an approach that gives the necessary attention to regional customization, by investing heavily in spatial development and infrastructure and by prioritizing the user. The Dutch government does this by working together with other governments, and with a European and global view. But what will Holland look like in 2040?” (Ministerie van Infrastructuur en Milieu, 2012). The report argues that the OG should lead to lasting long-term benefits for the whole of the Netherlands. This means that investments for the OG must contribute to the competitive power of the Netherlands as a whole and that the investments that need to be made are done as much as possible with "no regret". Integration of the OG into the specific vision of the Dutch Ministry for Infrastructure and the Environment would make this possible.

2.1 Infrastructure and long term economic success

To begin with, let's discuss the impact and importance of infrastructural innovation and development on economic growth. “Spatially, the urban regions in the Netherlands are characterized by an open structure, (relatively) small scale and (internationally) low densities in interaction with high-quality and accessible rural and cultural-historical areas. This structure is, on the one hand, a constraint in competition with metropolitan regions like London and Paris (because they give less agglomeration benefits), but also makes the Netherlands attractive to invest in. In order to make more use of the agglomeration benefits of this spatial structure, urban areas should be internally and (inter)nationally connected” (Ministerie van Infrastructuur en Milieu, 2012).

There are numerous examples of potential sustainable economic success through infrastructure renewal. One of them is the growth of the national airport “Schiphol”. If

“Schiphol” wants to continue competing with other international airports it will need to continue growing (Ministerie van Infrastructuur en Milieu, 2012). Another example is the need for strong urban regions with a good quality of life, optimal accessibility and good (logistical) connections with Europe and the world if the Netherlands wants to continue being able to provide an attractive business climate for international companies, a necessary ingredient for economic development (Ministerie van Infrastructuur en Milieu, 2012).

The ministry concludes that if The Netherlands wants to be a worldwide competitive, accessible, liveable and safe country by 2040, it should have:

- A high-quality business environment for companies and knowledge workers through a good spatial economic structure;
- By 2040, optimal international accessibility of urban areas, including the main ports of Rotterdam, Schiphol, Brainport South-East Netherlands, the greenports and the valleys being fast and reliably connected to Europe and the rest of the world;
- By 2040, users have access to optimal chain mobility with a proper connection of the different mobility networks through multimodal nodes (for persons and goods) and through proper coordination of infrastructure and spatial development.

2.2 Can hosting the Olympic Games help speed up infrastructure development?

If we believe that infrastructure and spatial development will improve the international economic position of the Netherlands, then the next question to be asked is how can this process be accelerated? Considering that a strong competitive position contributes to economic growth, it would be conceivable that improving the competitive position of the Netherlands soon rather than later would be beneficial. An accelerating factor or catalyst would therefore be very welcome.

Heurkens describes in his 2008 article ‘Olympische Spelen 2028: Katalysator voor ruimtelijke investeringen en bestuurlijke vernieuwing’ that ‘The Randstad’ can become a strong

THE OLYMPIC GAMES AS A CATALYST FOR INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT

metropolitan region by balancing the three core tasks for international competitiveness: integral accessibility; sustainable quality, vitality and safety of city and country and economic development of cities, economic centers and clusters. Heurkens describes the OG as a possible lever that can help the Netherlands address some of the challenges of the 'Randstad'.

Henk Markerink, the general director of the Amsterdam Arena said, during his presentation visit to the Sports Leadership program in December 2016, that he sees the organization of the OG as a catalyst for the infrastructural innovations that will be need to happen anyway. According to him, the question is not whether the Netherlands wants to organize the OG, but how the OG can contribute to sustainable economic development in the Netherlands.

Van Hoorn et al (2006) give in their article 'Dutch Delta Games, pleidooi voor de Olympische Spelen in de Randstad' a very strong argument for the OG as required catalyst. "The Dutch Spatial Planning Bureau describes the potential leverage effect of the Spatial Development Games for the Randstad. Due to the fact that many parties are involved with the Games and abide by the plans, much more momentum arises than in the regular slow planning processes."

Heurkens (2008) describes the accelerating effect of the OG for spatial renewals.

"Several cities got through the Olympic Games a spatial boost. With the 1992 Games, Barcelona completed the infrastructure around the city, tackled the airport and initiated the urban transformation of disadvantaged areas. In 2000 Sydney adopted the Summer Games to give the city a "green" boost. A complete airport has been built in Athens, a highway was built with private money, tens of kilometers of tramline was been constructed and the seabed rubbish zones have been transformed into an urban waterfront. Beijing hopes to reduce the heavy smog in the metropolis with the construction of new metro lines, as well as the largest airport in the world. In London, an industrial suburban area in 2012 will be replaced by a multifunctional residential area, and major investments have been made to increase East London's accessibility with a new rail link and public transport stations."

Van Hoorn et al. (2006) are very clear about the effect of the Olympic Games:

“A common goal like the Olympic Games, in fact, offers a unique opportunity to break through administrative and financial barriers to large-scale, complex and necessary spatial investment.”

The Dutch government is aware that infrastructure development and innovation is a must for economic growth and lasting prosperity in the Netherlands. If the Netherlands wants to compete in an environment of increasing regional and international competition, the Netherlands needs to remain accessible, modern and liveable. The accelerated implementation of infrastructural innovation and development will benefit Dutch economic growth and competitiveness. In summary, we can start better today than tomorrow and a catalyst, like hosting a major sporting event such as the OG, should be embraced as it could help speed up and the inevitable.

3 Leadership in complex environments

As mentioned in the introduction the biggest challenge facing those in support of a Dutch bid for the 2028 OG will be their ability to position the hosting of the OG as an integral part of a much broader vision for the future (sustainable and socio-economic) development of the Netherlands. Navigating the complex Dutch political and social landscape, with its multitude of stakeholders and wide-ranging interests, in an attempt to explain the vision behind bringing the OG to the Netherlands will demand a unique and modern form of leadership. In this section we briefly outline current leadership theory and discuss the characteristics and traits required of leaders tasked with leading organisations within complex working environments.

3.1 Leadership theory

The concept of leadership is constantly evolving. Leadership models of the last century have mostly been a product of top-down, bureaucratic paradigms that were effective during the industrial age, when the economy was primarily based on physical production (Uhl-Bien, Marion & McKelvey, 2007). These paradigms and traditional, hierarchical views of leadership are increasingly being found to be less well-suited to a more knowledge and service-oriented economy as is increasingly the case in the 21st century (Lichtenstein et al, 2006; Bililies, 2015). Traditional leadership models view leadership solely through the perspective of an overly-simplistic linear process while the knowledge era is characterized by an extremely complex operating environment caused by the collective forces of globalization, technology, deregulation and democratization (Hyypiä, 2013). Traditional leadership models are also based on the assumption that leaders possess or have access to all of the relevant knowledge and capabilities that will enable them to decide on future directions without external advice. This assumption is under increasing pressure with the demands being placed on leaders of the 21st century meaning that the time has come to broaden the traditional approach to leadership and decision making to form a new perspective based on complexity science (Snowden & Boone, 2007).

With a growing emphasis on decentralized organization and co-evolutionary ecologies of firms, institutions, and markets, there is a growing recognition that traditional top-down theories of leadership are at best overly simplistic. Leadership theory is therefore in the midst of a transition to new perspectives that account for the complex adaptive needs of organizations and the requirements this places upon leaders of the 21st century. “Leadership (as opposed to leaders) should now be seen as a complex dynamic process that emerges in the interactive “spaces between” people and ideas with leading-edge theorists and the leaders they inform now questioning the assumption that the essence of leadership rests within the character or the characteristic behaviors of effective supervisors” (Lichtenstein et al, 2006). Uhl-bien, Marion and McKelvey (2007) propose that “leadership should not only be seen as position and/or authority but also as an emergent, interactive dynamic and complex interplay from which a collective cause for action and change emerges”. When heterogeneous agents interact in networks in this way new patterns of behavior or new modes of operating emerge (Uhl-bien, Marion & McKelvey, 2007). In her 2014 paper, Geer-Frazier agrees suggesting that today’s leaders must change from the old hierarchical systems to dynamic systems, where leaders change the structure, culture, and the strategy, to meet the dynamic environments they are in. This new approach is based on enabling people using more of a relational approach to leadership, with shared or dispersed control taking place at all levels and being reliant on social exchanges and networks of power.

Today, organizations come across situations where traditional methods no longer bring the preferred results. Total order and high probability is no longer certain. To lead an organization today, a leader must therefore carefully align the culture, structure, and strategies to the environments that it the organization works within (Geer-Frazier; 2014). As Snowden & Boone (2014) write, given this increasing degree of complexity leaders will more often be called upon to act against their instincts. They will need to know when to share power and when to wield it alone, when to look to the wisdom of the group and when to take their own counsel. A deep understanding of context, the ability to embrace complexity and paradox, and a willingness to flexibly change leadership style will be required for leaders

who want to make things happen in a time of increasing uncertainty.

According to Boal & Schultz (2007) organizations are increasingly being described as complex adaptive systems (CAS). In this view, the behavior and structure of an organization emerges out of the interaction of a collection of organizational agents. This systemic approach suggests that there is no role for strategic leadership because the system self-organizes. They argue that strategic leaders play a crucial role in moving organizations to the “edge of chaos” and aid in organizational learning and adaptation by influencing the way in which structure organizational agents interact. Through dialogue and storytelling, strategic leaders shape the evolution of agent interactions and help construct the shared meaning that provides the rationale through which the past, the present, and the future of the organization are combined.

3.2 Characteristics and habits of successful leaders

With the evolving nature of leadership theory, particularly in relation to the increasingly complex environment that organisations and leaders operate in, it has become evident that leaders who succeed in complex environments, the environment in which large-scale public investment decisions (eg: spatial development and infrastructure projects) need to be made, is the leader who is able to adapt to quickly changing circumstances and who knows how to create a feeling of collective cause for action or change in a time of increasing uncertainty. Furthermore, traditional views of leadership are less and less useful given the complexities of our modern world (Lichtenstein, Benjamin B. 2006).

With this in mind it is important to consider what specific leadership characteristics and traits can lead to success in such complex environments. Does success come down to circumstance and luck, or does one need certain talents and are there particular skills that can be acquired to enlarge the chances for success? Why is it that some people can bring large projects to life, and others cannot?

Bearing in the goal introduced in the introduction, i.e. creating a movement that makes major sporting events, including the OG part of sustainable infrastructural development, it is fair to say that the characteristics of strategic leadership, as opposed to operational leadership will require some attention. Mintzberg (1994) argues that strategizing requires the use of imagination and creativity. Decisions made at the strategic level require the ability to deal with new challenges and threats. Leaders at the strategic level have to develop insight and wisdom, the ability to think outside the box and must be able to connect and synthesize ideas (Goldman et al., 2015). Gavetti (2011) points out that strategic leaders must have the ability to see cognitively distant opportunities. These are opportunities that are not obvious to others. Identifying such opportunities involves the ability to explore and see the unfamiliar. Gavetti argues that besides understanding the economics of competition, strategizing is also about the psychology of cognition. [...] Strategic leaders have to deal with challenges and discontinuities that emerge from time to time (Goldman, 2012). Quite often, signs of the change or problem are not very clear and require a lot of sense making by strategic leaders (Stigter and Cooper, 2015, p. 21; Appiah-Adu and Aming, 2016, p. 30). They have to consider competitors' actions, changes in consumer preferences, market trend and technological advancements" (Zumalia Norzailan, Rozhan B. Othman and Hiroyuki Ishizaki, (2016).

Connecting these leadership characteristics to organising and hosting the OG makes a lot of sense is a connection easily made. Firstly, interest needs to be created with different stakeholders for integration of the Games into large public infrastructural developments. Once this is looked at and considered a serious option, momentum is necessary to move from plan to realization and organization. This can only be done by people who are able to oversee an entire playing field, who can manage and influence stakeholders and relationships in general, and who can inspire people to join and get things done together. With regard to the latter characteristic, we found out that a leader who helps people with reaching common goals, instead of a leader who uses people in order to reach his or her own goals, is generally the more successful one. In the article *Character and Servant Leadership: Ten Characteristics of Effective, Caring Leaders*, Larry C. Spears argues that the

modern day successful leader would follow the model of servant leadership. He explains what is meant by servant leadership and then identifies ten main characteristics of the servant leader.

“We are experiencing a rapid shift in many businesses and not-for-profit organizations—away from the more traditional autocratic and hierarchical models of leadership and toward servant leadership as a way of being in relationship with others. Servant leadership seeks to involve others in decision making, is strongly based in ethical and caring behavior, and enhances the growth of workers while improving the caring and quality of organizational life. The words *servant* and *leader* are usually thought of as being opposites. In deliberately bringing those words together in a meaningful way, Robert Greenleaf gave birth to the paradoxical term servant leadership. In the years since then, many of today’s most creative thinkers are writing and speaking about servant leadership as an emerging leadership paradigm for the 21st century. [...] After some years of carefully considering Greenleaf’s original writings, I have identified a set of ten characteristics of the servant leader that I view as being of critical importance—central to the development of servant-leaders. These ten characteristics include: Listening, Empathy, Healing, Awareness, Persuasion, Conceptualization, Foresight, Stewardship, Commitment to the Growth of People, Building Community. [...] Servant leadership characteristics often occur naturally within many individuals; and, like many natural tendencies, they can be enhanced through learning and practice. Servant leadership offers great hope for the future in creating better, more caring, institutions” (Spears, 2010).

What we finally did was to check the leadership theory and our outcome in practise. We consulted three specialists to ask them what they, from their personal knowledge and experience, thought that the best leader or leadership style would be to achieve our goal. First of all Henk Markerink, second Michael van Praag, third Chris Woerts. They agreed with our outcome; Servant Leadership. They however added some characteristics: a. builder of relationships, b. connector, c. ‘type Karel Vuursteen’. Diplomatic. The name of our King Willem Alexander was suggested also because of his International a-factor (‘gunfactor’). Bas

Kodden (Nyenrode SLP June 20th 2017) was also convinced; a true leader brings brotherhood (a), energy (b) and ownership (c).

3.3 Leadership of the London Olympic Games

We would like to have a look at the London Olympics Games, generally acknowledged as a very successfully organized project. An article on the reasons for this success published online in *The Sport Digest* gives us interesting insights. It was written by Michael Pirrie, who was an Executive Advisor to Seb Coe, Chairman of the London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games Organizing Committee.

“The scale of success achieved at the London 2012 Games has become clearer and more vivid over the past year, providing a new blueprint for the planning and delivery of major events worldwide. There has been much discussion about how London organizers were able to achieve such universally, highly regarded Games events and experiences, and why the Games worked so well. [...] The successful delivery of Games events centered on effective Games-wide operations. This was result of intensive planning and preparations by teams that were well prepared, enabled and empowered by a leadership team whose confidence in the delivery of the Games came from strategies and plans that were carefully developed, tested and reviewed. London also benefited enormously from a generation of learnings from previous Olympic Games through the IOC’s transfer of knowledge programs. While this involved many thousands of pieces of detailed planning, the success of the London 2012 Games can be distilled into the three following areas: Vision, Engagement, and Leadership and Integrated planning and delivery.”

For now, let’s have a closer look at the distinctive leadership of the London Games. In this same article, the leadership of Sebastian Coe is said to have played a crucial role. “The role and influence of the Chairman of the London Olympic and Paralympic Games Committee, the double Olympic gold medalist and former politician Sebastian Coe [...] was pivotal to the success of these Games and cannot be overestimated. While Coe brought in talented people

THE OLYMPIC GAMES AS A CATALYST FOR INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT

to help manage the logistical challenges of staging the world's biggest event, he had an instinctive understanding of the most complex functions and operations and was involved in making and helping to guide and direct all key decisions from the Bid onwards. Coe made staff look and feel good about their work, and involved in playing an important part in London's grand Olympic mission, and his inclusive style, witty humor and generosity of spirit along with the high regard in which he is held in international sport was essential to keeping the London 2012 wide and extremely diverse stakeholder teams united and focused on what mattered most – Coe was as close as possible to being indispensable to the success of the London Olympic and Paralympic Games such was his profound importance to the endeavor”.

It is clear to us now that Sebastian Coe is the type of leader (or has displayed the type of leadership) that we have been talking about in this chapter. He is a servant leader, he has strong strategic capabilities, and he has been able to deal with changing circumstances and managed to adapt to the demands and the possibilities of the current times. In order to succeed with our approach of the Olympic Games in The Netherlands, we are convinced that the project will need such leadership.

4 Conclusion

In 2017, the issue of whether the Netherlands should host the OG, is approached very differently to, say, 50 years ago. For a start, the approach will be more critical with the economic value of hosting the games a dominant issue. For example, how much will it cost? What are the costs and the benefits and for whom? The notion that that the OG are “an expensive stand-alone event with a low or negative return on investment”, will be the default argument of those not in favour of the idea. To this end, it will important to combine any bid with the ideals of the IOC and the emotion of the OG on the one hand with the economic reality of hosting such a large event on the other.

Knowing that the Netherlands has a complex political and social landscape and an articulate and critical population, how can the argument of inflated costs be countered? An important management problem for us as supporters of the Dutch OG is how to position the hosting of the OG as an integral part of a much broader vision for the future development of the Netherlands.

We have therefore investigated whether the OG could be a catalyst for large-scale infrastructure progress. Could the OG accelerate this process? After investigating a range of research questions, we believe it could. The Netherlands must continue to develop, redevelop and innovate if it is to continue to participate in the competitive field of economic regions. It must progress in order to prevent economic activity trickling away to other countries or regions. The Netherlands currently occupies a respectable position in economic rankings, but to maintain that position we must continue to develop as an economic region. Prosperity, employment and accessibility are absolute requirements for a climate that companies want to invest in.

Innovation in the Netherlands doesn't stand still. The powers that be make plans, multi-year plans for structurally sustainable innovation. But that takes time. Especially in the Netherlands. Decision-making is slow, democratic and incremental. The fact that the

THE OLYMPIC GAMES AS A CATALYST FOR INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT

Netherlands must continue to develop is not disputed. We have reached the conclusion that the speed and momentum of that development would be positively influenced by bringing the OG to the Netherlands. We believe that infrastructure developments contribute to the Netherlands' competitive position. We have also become convinced that the OG could accelerate this process. The OG bring bridges, better roads, connections between cities, safer cities, and a higher quality of life through improvements to traffic and greater accessibility. The Olympic Games would bring these developments forward. We investigated the examples of London and Barcelona. Yes, the Olympic Games cost money, but the vast majority of those costs would be spent by the regions anyway over the next few decades, albeit earmarked for a different purpose.

In order to realise our dream of bringing the OG to the Netherlands, we need to provide the community with insight into those costs and into the significant benefits for the Netherlands if we should succeed in bringing the OG to the Netherlands. It gives us an enhanced competitive position and a strong reply to the myth that bringing the OG to the Netherlands would be to throw good money after bad. But is that the end of the story? No.

To a large extent, it is about leadership and communication. Leadership is an essential element, necessary to convey such a message. But more importantly, leadership is necessary to bring an event of this massive size to the Netherlands. Our second research question was about the type of leadership that would be required. Our conclusion was "servant leadership". Connecting elements and the requirement for an "A-factor" were added, based on the practice of leadership experts. And a small task force – no large groups.

Yes, it is possible to bring a large-scale event to the Netherlands, and yes, it would require careful preparation. Focus on infrastructure projects that would have to happen anyway, focus on the necessity of costs, place it in the broader context of competitive advantage and have it led by a genuine servant leader. We're in favour of it. We're committed to it.

All things considered, we became convinced that on the ground, between a democratic

THE OLYMPIC GAMES AS A CATALYST FOR INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT

model, an anarchic model and a dictatorial model, it's not the model that really matters, it's the leadership. These days, servant leadership is what is needed. A leader "who helps people with reaching common goals". A leader with courage and an irreproachable reputation, who is impartial and also has a background in sport. As well as a support base, a media strategist and momentum, such a leader would need the best substantive arguments. One key argument which focuses in particular on public opinion is the financial aspect. The economic value. Economic capital. So, yes – we are of the opinion that a strong servant leader can use the need for spending on infrastructure developments to influence people. Both in terms of timing and at a substantive level. Infrastructure developments could therefore help bring the OG to the Netherlands. More importantly, the OG could be a catalyst for the necessary infrastructure developments.

And furthermore, we could positively influence public debate with these arguments. The popular belief that the OG are an expensive stand-alone event with a low or negative return on investment just cannot be upheld. Organising the OG in the Netherlands offers a huge potential long-term benefit for our country and its inhabitants.

We accept that, and we're convinced by it. Bring the Olympic Games to the Netherlands. With help from a strongly unifying servant leader. It will make the Netherlands more competitive. How? By contributing to infrastructure development, creating not only economic but also cultural and social capital.

5 Recommendations

Recently, there has been a discussion about the organization of the OG by the Netherlands in the Netherlands. It was interesting to see that, in the background, many people think about a possible organization of the OG by the Netherlands, but one is reluctant to go public.

It was striking that there was a discussion immediately about the costs of organizing the OG. It was suggested by many that the costs are far too high for a small country like the Netherlands and that we do not want the taxpayer to pay for this. It was also striking that our Dutch IOC member Camiel Eurlings spoke about the cost discussion. In an interview, he noted that he found that the cost of the organization should be lower and that the Games would prefer to yield money. If that were the case, then the Netherlands could best organize the Games.

What does this Dutch reflex teach us? Now, when hearing the term 'Olympic Games', the Netherlands is thinking of the costs. It's not about the investments that need to be made, but about the costs involved. Nowhere in the discussion was the link made between necessary investments in infrastructure and the organization of the OG. The need for infrastructural innovations is evidently increasing in the news. It is becoming more and more evident that the boundaries of Dutch infrastructure as it stands are in sight. Public opinion seems to support drastic measures to keep Amsterdam and the rest of the Randstad accessible. It seems that the Dutch are once again becoming open to a (optimistic) vision for the future. Instead of emphasizing what's not right in the Netherlands, we are thinking about what we need to do to ensure the future safety and security of the Netherlands.

Right in the middle of the discussion is a great opportunity to influence public opinion regarding the organization of the OG. In light of recent economic growth, there is an opportunity to inform the population about the need for infrastructural innovations. Why are these innovations necessary? Why do these innovations bring us prosperity and economic growth? And of course, how can OG accelerate and facilitate these innovations?

THE OLYMPIC GAMES AS A CATALYST FOR INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT

Right now, the power of the OG can be exposed as a catalyst. If we now organize the OG we will move Schiphol instead of over 40 years. If we now organize the OG, we will make Amsterdam more accessible, rather than over 40 years.

Important in the discussion about the organization of the OG is to recognize the reflexes of the Netherlands, and then consciously put something else in place. Inform and teach the Dutch how to achieve economic growth. Teach the Dutch people about the importance of progress and the importance of the Netherlands as an economic force. The challenge is ultimately to allow the Dutch public to make the link between infrastructure and spatial development and the OG as a catalyst for themselves.

In order to convey the message of progress for the entire Dutch population, it would be good to use a leader as both a role model and messenger. This leader is preferably not an old top athlete. After all, this is not just about sport but about the progress for the Dutch population in general. Sport can help! Sport can speed it up and strengthen it! We think we should look for a person who symbolizes the emergence of the interests of the Dutch population. After all, the essence of the message is that the cost of the organization's organization is not cost but investment. Investments that serve prosperity and prosperity for the Dutch population. This person can bring the people in a credible way the message and enthusiasm. The person who is outstanding for the interests of the Dutch people is of course our King Willem Alexander.

To assist with delivering the message to the Dutch public we suggest the following recommendations:

1. Present a detailed communication strategy for necessary infrastructure development in the Netherlands
2. Ensure that this “necessary progress” has broad-based support
3. Be “strategic” with the timing of both communicating on and taking action
4. Incorporate the hosting of major sports, including the OG, into this larger ‘development’ plan for the Netherlands and make use of the unifying values of sport

in terms of social and cultural capital

5. Select a servant leader (eg: King Willem-Alexander) to present the plan for the future of the Netherlands, including why and how hosting major sporting events fits into this plan
6. Ensure that the is not involved in the implementation of the plan but serves as a spokesperson.

Bibliography

1. Billies, Ted. "How to be a great leader in a complex world". Article published on World Economic Forum website, dated 19th January 2015.
<https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2015/01/great-leader-in-complex-world/>
2. Kimberly B. Boal and Patrick L. Schultz. 2007. Leadership and Complexity, Storytelling, time, and evolution: The role of strategic leadership in complex adaptive systems, *The Leadership Quarterly*, 18(4):411-428
3. Geer-Frazier, Brenda. Complexity leadership generates innovation, learning, and adaptation of the organization *Emergence: Complexity & Organization*. 2014, Vol. 16 Issue 3, p105-116. 12p.
4. Heurkens, E.W.T.M. 2005. Multi-actoren beslissingsmodel voor ruimtelijke ontwikkelingsprojecten van de Olympische Spelen van 2028 in Nederland. *Laboratorium Integrale Gebiedsontwikkeling, Faculteit der Bouwkunde, TU Delft*.
5. Heurkens, E.W.T.M. 2006. Decision-Making on Olympic Urban Development - A multi-actor decision support tool.
6. Heurkens, E.W.T.M. 2008. Olympische Spelen 2028: Katalysator voor ruimtelijke investeringen en bestuurlijke vernieuwing.
7. Hoorn, A. van, Hornis, W. en Van der Wagt, M. 2006. Dutch Delta Games, pleidooi voor de Olympische Spelen in de Randstad. In: *Ruimte in debat/2006 03*, Den Haag: Ruimtelijk Planbureau. pp. 2-8.
8. Mirva Hyypiä. (2013) Roles of Leadership in complex environments - Enhancing Knowledge Flows in Organisational Constellations through Practice-Based Innovation Processes. Thesis for the degree of Doctor of Science (Technology), Lappeenranta University of Technology, Finland.
9. Lichtenstein, Benyamin B.; Uhl-Bien, Mary; Marion, Russ; Seers, Anson; Orton, James Douglas; and Schreiber, Craig. (2006). "Complexity leadership theory: An interactive perspective on leading in complex adaptive systems". Management Department Faculty Publications. Paper 8.
10. Ministerie van Infrastructuur en Milieu, *Structuurvisie Infrastructuur en Ruimte*. 2012

11. Markerink, H. 21-12-2016. Presentatie Nyenrode Sports Leadership Program.
12. Zumalia Norzailan, Rozhan B. Othman and Hiroyuki Ishizaki. (2016). "Strategic leadership competencies: what is it and how to develop it?", *Industrial and Commercial Training*, Vol. 48 Iss 8 pp. 394 – 399
13. David J. Snowden and Mary E. Boone, A Leader's framework for decision making, *Harvard Business Review* (2007), online article accessed 21 April 2017.
14. Spears, L.C., (2010), "Character and Servant Leadership: Ten Characteristics of Effective, Caring Leaders", *The Journal of Virtues & Leadership*, Vol. 1 Iss. 1, 2010, 25-30.
15. Structuurvisie Randstad 2040 in het kort, 01-09-2008 , ministerie VROM
16. Uhl-Bien, Mary; Marion, Russ; and McKelvey, Bill, "Complexity Leadership Theory: Shifting leadership from the industrial age to the knowledge era" (2007). Leadership Institute Faculty Publications. Paper 18.
17. Woerts, C. 19-06-2017. Presentatie Nyenrode Sports Leadership Program.