

Games-Makerization:

Creation of the Purple and Red Army

A conceptual review of literature examining traditional and contemporary management theory relating to the recruitment, training and development of staff within modern leisure service industries

Author:

Senior Lecturer in Event Management

Lynsey Melhuish

Southampton Solent University, East Park Terrace, Southampton,
SO14 0YN, lynsey.melhuish@solent.ac.uk

Games Makerization – Creation of the Purple and Red Army

Abstract

‘People’ are key to the successful delivery of modern leisure services and it is essential that leisure managers acknowledge and respond to the differing management approaches which continually evolve, and which significantly influences, organisational effectiveness. With

Rio 2016 just around the corner, comes a perfect time to reflect on the ‘human resource phenomena’ of the London 2012 Games Makers, and in examining this ‘unexpected triumph’ in recruiting, training and deploying 70,000 volunteers. This conceptual review analyses research relevant to the London 2012 Games Makers, exploring how traditional management approaches (scientific, classical and bureaucratic principles), are arguably still underpinning successful leisure services today. Concepts such as ‘McDonaldization’ and ‘Disneyfication’ are applied to the management of the Games Makers, dispelling the myth that ‘old school’ management has no place in contemporary leisure industries. Instead, it suggests today’s leisure managers consider prioritising ‘process’ ahead of ‘people’ in the right circumstances, to achieve effective results.

Key words: Management theory, human resource management, organisational behaviour/culture, commodification, and commercialisation of leisure services, London 2012 Olympic Games Makers

Introduction

It is proposed that the London 2012 Games Makers were the critical resources of the Games' and an example of a contemporary leisure 'commodity'. Hailed as "*one of the unexpected triumphs*" (Dejevsky 2013, p1) of the Games, with a scale of "*unprecedented positive public acclaim*" (Girginov 2014, p58) the Games Makers are reflective of a modern, dynamic and fast paced multi-dimensional leisure industry. However, the suggestion that 'old school' nineteenth century scientific/classical management models utilised through the likes of Dagenham's Ford Factory assembly line (Heitmann 2009 and Bryman 1999) were utilised in the success of the Games Makers, could be vehemently argued by the original human relations/neo human relations contingent, born from the likes of Mayo 1932 (Mullins 2010), Maslow (1943), McGregor (1960) etc. However, as has been examined more than once in the latter stages of the 20th century and through to today, the use of traditional management approaches within more service related industries, as opposed to manufacturing/production, is not a new concept and this review examines some of these concepts in relation to the Games Makers. The "*Management Approaches Framework*" illustrated through Mullins (2010, p43) has been used as it draws on works surrounding classical/ scientific and human relations theory though recognising that these theories are by no means exhaustive, and reflects Koontz's early recognition of the 'management jungle' (1980) associated with differing management perspectives and the evolution of more contemporary systems and contingency based approaches.

Background

Ritzer's McDonaldization of Society concept (1993) and subsequent papers, inspired by these principles, are integral to this critical analysis of management approaches used in the Games Maker Volunteer Programme. The relevance of McDonaldization is twofold, firstly because

the dimensions which define McDonaldization reflect directly the traditional management characteristics examined. Secondly, McDonalds had a significant part to play in the recruitment and training of the Game Makers, stretching the relationship between commercial company and the London Organising Committee of the Olympic Games (LOCOG) to a whole new level. “*London 2012 was the first Games to subcontract its volunteer programme to a commercial organisation*” (Girginov 2014, P54). Therefore understanding the management and organisational culture of McDonalds, is paramount in understanding the approach adopted in managing the Games Makers and can be used in comparison to a range of other reputable leisure service brands from hospitality to events, outdoor adventure to tourism. For the purposes of this conceptual review, Girginov’s London 2012 publications (2013, 2014) are significantly relied upon to provide evidence of the Games Maker experiences.

A Conceptual Review of Leisure Management Philosophies

The following section provides a critical analysis of the evolution and application of leisure management philosophies and associated theory, conceptualised in relation to their influence on the recruitment, training and deployment of the London 2012 Games Makers.

Influence of the ‘Happiest Place on Earth’

The ‘Smile Factory’ is a good place to start when considering traditional management philosophies and its impact in leisure service industries. Stemming from initial experiences in the 1960’s, Van Maanen (1999) revealed within Disneyland, a hidden organisational culture that on the surface portrayed smiling faces, and a people orientated approach; “*The Happiest Place on Earth*” (1999, P11), but instead reported to uncover a much darker some might argue sinister culture of structure, control and power, with supervisors described as employing “*surreptitious techniques*” (1999, P18) in monitoring staff “*supervisors in Tomorrowland are,*

for example, famous for their penchant of hiding in the bushes” (1999, P18)....suggesting ‘big brother’ is very much watching you. Furthermore Van Maanen goes on to accuse Disneyland of a near ‘brainwashing’ process for staff on the official definition of ‘*Disneyland culture*’ (1999, p. 16), from being taught the appropriate (and only acceptable language).....”*park not amusement center.....guests not customers*” (1999, p. 16).....through to the screening / grooming of staff appearance along with the importance of image and status and fuelling a deep rooted internal class system. This is reinforced by Martin (2004) who describes the tensions and conflicts within its organisational culture that were clearly evident due to ‘status’ at Disney and reflected the ‘differentiation perspective’ where cultures and sub cultures overlap. This might suggest a far more ‘mechanistic culture’ (Burns and Stalker 1961), within the management of a workforce underpinned by traditional management approaches ie authoritative leadership, control, rules, regulations etc. This could also be seen to reflect two of Handy’s culture classifications; ‘role’ or ‘task’ being the fundamental priority (1993 cited in Mullins 2010).

Van Maanen clearly had a ‘vested interest’ regarding the Smile Factory, and potentially a more bias perspective having been ‘frog marched’ from Disneyland himself for what he still describes as a “Mickey-Mouse offence” (1999, 23) and how his dismissal process “*still irks*” (1999, 23), a bitter pill to swallow...but revenge is sweet? However, Van Maanen (1999) is not the only one who has suggested this ‘mechanistic’ management regime both in relation to Disney and within other leisure service related organisations, and it is by exploring these organisations that we see patterns emerging between that of the past – the original Ford factory assembly line (Witzel 2012) and that of more contemporary leisure services including the London 2012 Games Maker Volunteer Programme.

Power of the Golden Arches and the Birth of the 'Ization'

Researchers before (and since) Van Maanen's Smile Factory, have suggested similar perspectives in the use of traditional 'mechanistic' approaches to managing a 'leisure' workforce. However, they have tended to broaden studies to analyse patterns between management approaches and rising commercial 'corporate' cultures and the industrialisation of service societies (O' Neil cited in Ritzer 2013). It would appear that The Smile Factory was inspired by Ritzer (1993) and the 'infamous' McDondaldization of Society, a paradigm which was introduced to reflect how the principles of the fast –food restaurant/hospitality industry was growing to dominate sectors of American society and beyond (Ritzer 2013). Furthermore huge global brands like McDonalds have long since been involved in prestigious mega-sporting events one such example reflects this from Jary (cited in Smart 1999) who refers to the Atlanta Opening ceremony, describing “*a flame burning brightly.....in an enlarged McFries box*” (p116).

McDonaldization has four dimensions (Ritzer 1993), presented as a way of best reflecting the culture and management of the organisation; efficiency, calculability, predictability and control. The delivery of these dimensions could also be used with Johnson, Scholes and Whittington's cultural web of an organisation (2005), where power/organisational structures / control systems/ rituals, routines, stories and symbols reflect how the organisation operates and signifies the type of culture within. These characteristics reflect the more traditional management approaches synonymous with scientific and classical management and the philosophies of 'one best way' argued by Taylor, Ford etc (Bender and Poggi cited in Smart 1999: p24). This further links to the works of Weber (Witzel 2012) and his theory of rationality and bureaucratization (Weinstein and Weinstein cited in Smart 1999). Ritzer (1993, 2013) therefore argues that McDonalization can be seen as an amplification and extension of Weber's

theory of rationalization, based on the need for rules, regulations, structure. However, with these principles come inevitable negativity, the irrationality of rationality and the threat of the 'Iron cage' ie bureaucratic control (Takaki cited in Ritzer 2013; p31).

Whilst there are significant benefits to control and structure, it also raises the concern of de-humanizing the work environment (Bender and Poggi cited in Smart 1999), issues of red tape and quantity prioritising quality (Ritzer 2013). However within the fast food industry, arguably a 'conveyor belt industry', not dissimilar to the Ford factory environment, adopting Taylor's one best way (Kanigel 2005) embraces the four dimensions. This ensures that the outcome (and the speed at which it is reached) remains the focus, and which became the principles of Fordism (Benyon and Nichols 2006). Post Fordism (Ritzer 2013, O' Neill cited in Smart 1999) then went on to see a decline in mass products and instead more customer specialised, shorter and more flexible production. However Ritzer would argue that whilst elements of post-Fordism emerged in the modern world, elements of old style Fordism persist and show no signs of disappearing....."in fact McDonaldization, a phenomenon that clearly has many things in common with Fordism is growing at an astounding pace in contemporary society....." (2013, p49). Ritzer refers to other examples of streamlining to justify such a statement, for example 'Docs in a box' - health care (2013, p62) and this is further recognised by other earlier works such as Smart 1999 who predicted correctly the future direction of service industries; "rationalising the organisation of production and consumption has increasingly become the model.....for delivering a wide range of other commodities and services including public services like education, health and welfare" (Smart 1999; 1). Therefore fuelling further, the strength of traditional management methods in more modern service related industries.

Humans as robots

A significant part of Ritzer's study relates to the workforce and the control of '*humans as robots*' (2013, p36). McDonalds and similar organisations such as Disney, appear to have embraced the characteristics of scientific management and particularly in controlling people (Kincheloe 2012), recognising that failing to, could have dire consequences; "*the great sources of uncertainty, unpredictability and inefficiency in any rationalising system is people – either those who work within it or those served by it*" (2013, p102), hence efforts to increase control are seen as paramount. This reflects Cameron and Quinn's 'hierarchical' quadrant as seen in the Competing Values Framework (2011) where the focus is on control and stability of the workforce. However, in relation to Games Makers this could be seen to go beyond the internal influence due to the prestigious nature of the Games and the need for public success, further suggesting the need for focus within the 'market' quadrant (Cameron and Quinn 2011). With 70,000 volunteers recruited into the roles (Girginov 2013) it not only demonstrated the reliance on volunteers for mega sporting events (Nichols, cited in Girginov 2013) "*.... key ingredients that ensure the success of the event*" (Deery and Jago 2005 p385) but more specifically the reliance and 'risk' of the sheer size and scale of the 'people factor' involved with making the Games a success. This highlights the subsequent difficulty in co-ordinating and controlling such a vast workforce in such a complex environment and reinforces further the benefits of a rationalised system which enables such a high number of volunteers to be efficiently and effectively controlled.

Ritzer describes how McDonalds employees, have scripted interactions with customers (2013) comparable with the fictitious film the Truman Show (an example of the iron cage?) where all dialogue which was meant to be everyday life was underpinned by predictability and control. However he recognised the flaws with such a concept; as both employers and customers

sometimes resist scripts (and other routines) – therefore those that give and receive service would suggest that it is never entirely predictable “*people do not yet live in an iron cage..... nonetheless.... the potential for freedom / flexibility is limited*” (2013, p. 93). This concurs with the culture described by Van Maanen in the Smile Factory (1999), with staff working to specific scripts and where possible, all interaction with the public is kept minimal....the ‘have a nice day’ Americanism.

When exploring the training and presentation of the Games Makers there is a similarity which emerges, and although there is no evidence that Games Makers were ‘scripted’ in any of their roles, training would suggest that there was a strong push for consistency in communication in whatever role they were undertaking. According to Games Maker diaries, part of the orientation training pack included the introduction of key learning objectives, including ALL Games Makers to be able to state five facts about the history of the Olympic/Paralympic Games. Furthermore the mantra from the first orientation session was described as.....”*I am to be Inspirational, Distinctive Open, Alert, Consistent and part of the Team*” (Kenyon 2012). Whilst this may not match the extreme levels of human control described within the Disney and McDonald cultures, the levels of consistency suggested in Games Maker training, and what was delivered at the event, cannot be ignored and does reflect an undercurrent of corporate ‘American’ commercialisation. This is clearly evident from the *‘cheerleading Games Makers with their unaffected enthusiasm and their huge foam hands’* (Dejevsky 2013)to *”dishing out smiles as readily as information”* (Hirst 2012). As one journalist described.....”*ebullient, noisy, interactive – rather than reserved.....In a way it is so –un British*” (Heald 2012); surely evidence enough that an “ization” has occurred.

'Ization' has become a popular concept with Bryman (1999) taking Ritzer's concept further by proposing the term 'Disneyization' (1999) through his observations and analysis of Disney culture had been brewing long before and alongside numerous other socio-cultural studies. Studies revealed social order controlled by an all-powerful organisation and a fusion of principles, defining a distinctive Disney culture (Rojek 1993, Wasko 1996 cited in Bryman 1999). This again reflects Burns and Stalker's mechanistic process (1961), characteristic in Handy's role culture where the organisation is heavily structured with logic, rationality and a bureaucratic approach (Mullins 2010). This can be complimented by Cameron and Quinn's internal hierarchical influence (2011), where the focus is on rigid structure, control, co-ordination and efficiency. This further aligns with Martin's suggestion of an 'integration' cultural perspective due to characteristics of "*consistency, organizational-wide consensus and clarity*" (2004, p.4) born from values/missions/rules articulated by senior authority. Whilst the London Games Makers were a 'temporary' arrangement the recognition of key objectives during their orientation suggests that LOCOG were looking to McDonalds to instil a similar culture.

Control, power and underpinning cultures

Bryman's (1999) introduction of "disneyfication" demonstrates the influence of organisational control and power but in quite a negative and critical tone. Created by Walt Disney's biographers, 'disneyfication' describes the shameful process of losing originality of any works, visions, individuality; "*destroyed by Disney once passed through the machine*" (Schickel 1986, cited in Bryman 1999 p26). Disneyfication appears to be a distorted version of an original concept (Bryman 1999). Reference to 'a machine' provides further comparable links to a more traditional manufacturing/product driven industry synonymous with Ford and further recognising the industrialisation of service societies (Bender and Poggi cited in Smart 1999).

Again, whilst Games Makers were not the victims of such cold and callous mechanistic systems, there are still some similarities to the 'assembly production line'. Bryman (1999) recognised four trends in Disney, arguably comparable again with the McDonalds culture. These trends can be seen to reflect different elements of Johnson, Scholes and Whittington's Cultural Web (2005), and distinguishes Schein's three levels of culture from the more visible 'artefacts' of an organisation (both physical and social) and overt recognised behaviours (reflecting 'theming' and 'merchandising'), through to the 'espoused values' that filter into the organisation to justify actions and behaviours, and which manifest into deeper rooted 'underlying assumptions', ie unconscious behaviours, beliefs etc established over time and repetition (Schein 2004) and reflecting Bryman's trends of de-differentiation of consumption and emotional labour (1999).

Hall's iceberg analogy (1976) also reflects these different levels of organisational culture. The external, visible elements; waving Mickey Mouse / smiling staff / the 'happiest place on earth' message, hiding a much bigger and arguably more powerful set of characteristics hidden below the surface (ie more the underlying assumptions / values) and as reflected earlier in Van Maanan's account of The Smile Factory (1999). In relation to Games Makers, Bryman's (1999) underpinning trends, albeit more subtle, are present; from the consistency of image and uniform through to the repetitive quality of presentation, knowledge/ information and instruction given by the Games Makers. However, none of these suggest deep rooted cultural characteristics and instead appear more visible ie artefacts/espoused values (Schein 2004), most likely due to the temporary nature of the Games Makers process and therefore the lack of time for more powerful unconscious cultural behaviours to manifest. Visible artefacts were far more apparent in the Games Maker culture and one in particular had an unprecedented influence on their

image and reputation, and arguably the most distinguishing feature of the Games Maker is the power of the uniform...

Creation of the 'Red and Purple Army'

The uniform was seen to have a significant impact on the role and ultimately the success of the Games Maker. *"The distinctive purple and red Games Maker uniforms gave them a very strong sense of identity and pride...it made them recognisable and accessible whether they were on or off duty"* (Girginov 2013). The uniform became synonymous with the London 2012 Games; in a much shorter space of time it established symbolic status comparable to that of a London red bus or a Beefeater – albeit on a more temporary basis. The Games Maker became a 'brand' of its own but it was not only the consistency of the uniform (and enthusiasm and pride of volunteers wearing it) – but more the process with which it was distributed.

The Uniform Distribution and Accreditation Centre (UDAC) were responsible for processing 400,000 staff and volunteers, wearing identical outfits (Minard BBC 2012) and demonstrated an 'assembly line' approach: *"the efficiency of the Uniform Distribution Centre on processing 280 uniforms and 800 accreditations per hour was widely acknowledged"* (Girginov 2013: p56). The distribution was clearly mechanistic and functional in approach, ensuring the most efficient and effective way for all Games Makers to be suitably attired. To support this process driven approach LOCOG portrayed the stance of a powerful/controlling force, refusing to coordinate training and uniform collection on a more regional/local basis to ease accessibility. Instead they stood firm that the 70,000 Games Makers and related staff would come to the centre for collection. This not only demonstrates an autocratic culture but suggests a clear rational and logical, mechanistic process- very much task driven as opposed to being responsive to the human factor 'if the mountain won't come to Muhammad.....'. This provided

even more evidence to suggest that the Games Maker approach was underpinned by strong traditional management techniques, matching that of its makers.

De-McDonaldization – where do the Games Makers fit?

Whilst the Games Maker programme provides evidence to suggest McDonalozation is alive and well, Ritzer (2013) did not stop here and in his conclusions more recently, considers the ‘de-McDonaldization of Society’ suggesting a more modern replacement, and one that might better fit the ‘Games Maker’ culture, that of “*Starbuckization*”, (2013, p171). This is a move away from the mediocre quality of McDonalds and instead to higher quality products. This reflects Pine and Gilmore’s recognition of the evolving ‘experience economy’, moving away from tangible products and instead to the impact and memories associated with the consumer experience (1998). For London 2012 it was arguably the quality of the Games Maker in terms of customer service and subsequent public acclaim, that counted, therefore could there be comparison with the more modern ‘people’ focused approach, which puts the ‘customer first’, even if what they are purchasing is intangible? “*Starbucks most important innovation has been to soften McDonald’s hard-edged approach and image*” (2013, p172). Ritzer describes the contrasting appearance and ambience of their environment (the cultural ‘artefacts’ (Schein 2004); less of the stiff and unwelcoming plastic chairs and tables – replaced with relaxing armchairs and décor to match. Oldenburg (cited in Ritzer 2013, p172) described the homey notion of a third place “*we’re in the business of human connection and humanity, creating communities*”, customer focused and friendly, reinforcing the ‘experience economy’ (Pine and Gilmore 1998).

This surely reflects more closely the legacy of the London 2012 Games - ‘the people’s Games’ (Gibson 2012) and the aspiration of a “*lasting legacy*” (LOCOG 2009). The culture of the

Starbucks organisation is described a little differently to McDonalds, a “*kind, gentle and caring corporation*” (Ritzer 2013, p. 173), possibly more public theatre or better public relations, and questioning whether the culture is myth or reality. Regardless, Starbucks has caught the imagination of modern commodity focused services where experience is key (Pine and Gilmore 1998) and appears to maximise the benefits of McDonaldization whilst carefully marketing a more ‘people’ based approach (both the workforce and consumers) which appears to reflect the success of the Games Makers. It is apparent that Starbucks still has the underpinning consistency and uniformity which reflects the basic principles of McDonaldization. However this is portrayed in a more positive, humane way, perhaps alluding to a more balanced management approach ie could they be demonstrating a more systems approach (Mullins 2010) as opposed to traditional management models? It could be argued that all of these large commercial, commodity driven organisations are still reliant on more traditional management approaches in the pursuit of continued global commercial superiority, or as Jarvie (1996 cited in Loynes 1998) describes when referring to leisure services, the pursuit of ‘recreational capitalism’. Loynes’ (1998) ‘adventure in a bun’ analogy which explored the commodification of ‘McAdventure’ (Bryman 1999) demonstrates the breadth of this commercialisation of leisure experiences (Beames and Varley 2013) who raised concerns regarding the ‘authenticity of adventure’ experiences. This reinforces further the power of commercialisation on the widest of leisure service industries.

Games Makers....X or Y?

McGregor’s X & Y principle (1960) is significant when exploring the recruitment and training of Games Makers and raises questions as to where their role (and motivations) best fit. X is seen as the traditional view of the workforce where control, structure and power are essential to keep all ‘in check’ (Mullins 2010) whereas the growth of the human relations theorists

started to recognise the Y employee.... the power of human relations and how the ‘people’ factor can play a significant part on influencing and changing both the culture of the organisation AND the outcome of the product (or service) (Mayo 1932 cited in Mullins 2010 and Brannigan and Zwerman 2001). This provides an interesting multi-dimensional perspective when considering the Games Makers as they could be seen both as the ‘commodity’ being produced but also part of the ‘nuts and bolts’, integral to the success of the Games, and further reflecting the difficulties in balancing ‘people and process’

The power of motivation (McGregor, Mayo, Herzberg, Mullins 2010, Buchanan and Huczynski 2010) in relation to Games Makers, becomes significant here. Numerous studies on event volunteer motivation has been undertaken (Dickson, Benson, Blackman, Terwell 2010, Wakelin 2013, Holmes and Smith 2009) and recognises a variety of factors depending on the event, it’s size and scale, the demographic of the volunteer etc. These varying factors compound the problem when dealing with a ‘Y’ focused workforce with so many mixed backgrounds, experiences, motivations; including both personal and professional aspirations, and which highlights the complexity of managing volunteers (Love, Sherman and Olding 2009, Kristiansen, Skille, and Vida Hanstad 2014 and Fairley, Lee, Green, Lyang Kim 2013).

Brannigan and Zwerman (2001) make clear that we should still be learning from our history today in order to reach industrial harmony. They state the importance in recognising and responding to the difficult fit between human nature, production and process (2001). Holmes and Smith (2009) recognise the importance of this balance in managing event volunteers like the Games Makers; *“A well designed and organised program will mean that the volunteer’s efforts will be managed in the most effective way and should bring positive outcomes for the volunteer, the organisation and other beneficiaries (2009, p69).* Nichols (cited in Girginov

2014) reinforces the complexity of differing motivations of volunteers and the implications for management in selecting the best method but argues that despite everything else, there is a preferred approach: *“The complexity of the event and the need to ensure effective organisation of one of the highest profile events in the world means that management is likely to adopt a ‘rational systems perspective’ in which the goal of effectively running the Games is paramount* (Nichols p216 cited in Girginov 2014).

Holme and Smith (2009) appear to suggest a more traditional management approach as they signify the importance of a highly formalised and structured organisation for large events with clear policies and procedures and where necessary the inclusion of contracts and agreements to ensure volunteer commitment. Deery and Jago (2005) agree with this perspective recognising that sports tourism events like the London 2012 Olympics do not have the characteristics of more generic organisations, ie they are not stable workforces built on established relationships, therefore structure and control is essential. They make reference to *“pulsating organisations”* (Hanlon and Jago cited in Deery and Jago 2005 p383) suggesting events, like other leisure/tourism related industries are dynamic, fast paced and changing. Rogers (2014) also refers to pulsating organisations and the importance of responding to specific conditions in relation to the short term nature of events, which may involve contracts/subcontracting. However he makes reference to the importance of structure and order through procedure, further supported by Theodoraki 2007, and reflecting Deery and Jago’s ‘flexible-firm model (2005)’, but also recognising the need to be flexible, and requiring a particular way of recruiting, training and rewarding volunteers.

How to train your Games Maker

Recruitment, training and a commitment to development was paramount for the Games Makers. Eade (2010) states there is a “*need for a programme of continued professional development to create a true profession for those working within it*” (cited in Rogers 2014 p125). He goes on to refer to the drive for professionalism within events, and “*most notably, London’s hosting of the Olympic and Paralympic Games 2012*” (p125). It is here that the factory conveyor belt approach really shines, and highlights how the use of McDonalds as a partner enabled “*productivity enhancement.....creating efficiencies in the supply chain*” (Rogers 2014 p21). The research goes on to describe how such a partnership enables a “*transfer of knowledge....and....experiences*” (p21) ie embracing the McDonalidization approach and Ritzer’s (1993) four dimensions on the process. LOCOG had a clear objective which draws in the second dimension; calculability. Emphasising the quantitative aspects of a production line, 70,000 Games Makers had to be recruited and trained, and as part of this process this had to be narrowed down efficiently from 240,000 (Girginov 2013), no simple task.

The recruitment and selection process of the Games Makers therefore can be seen to rely heavily on these first two McDonaldization dimensions of efficiency and calculability. McDonalds and LOCOG brought in four hundred “Event Trailblazers” as part of this process used to cut through the short listing process (Girginov 2013) and descriptions of the process magnify further the conveyor belt journey that the Games Maker applicants were part of. For example, the interview process itself emulates a production line; a two hour process including passport check, photos, ID, viewing of promotional literature and culminating with six standard value questions (Girginov 2013). Games Makers described how “*interviewers kept rigidly to the standard questions and transcribed word for word the responses*” (Girginov 2014, P55).

Volunteers found the interview process very efficient, although some were disappointed that skills/experiences did not always match the roles given, again reflecting the 'task' based approach and appearing to ignore the wants of the people. Girginov (2014) describes how interviewers reminded the applicants how lucky they were, given the volume of applicants. Responses such as *"you've said all the buzz words you should get in"* and *"it's not on the list for me to ask"* (2014, p54) reflects this mechanistic approach and furthermore suggests that the process and behaviour of the Trailblazers emulated rather 'robotic' characteristics. Further criticism of communications being 'obtuse / full of jargon and largely via electronic means and with no scope for negotiation', provides further evidence to indicate the process replicated the 'coldness' of the factory conveyor belt. Interestingly any Games Maker applicant wishing to discuss personal circumstances eg accommodation / travel / potential to work with their partner / expenses claims and so on, were continually rebutted and those that did not conform were rejected (Girgino 2014). With 240,000 applicants and fighting for positions at 3:1, demand far exceeded supply which reflected a similar environment to that of Disney and the sense of it being a *"once in a life time opportunity"* and with LOCOG described as seemingly *"unconcerned about volunteers withdrawing"* (p54) with a 'meet our goal or not at all' mentality (Girginov 2014). Recruitment and selection clearly reflected the McDonaldization culture and the use of more classical, scientific management processes, and this also rolled on to training and deployment.

Training was based on Games Makers complying with certain objectives, which reflects the McDonaldization culture *"workers in McDonaldized systems also behave in predictable ways. They follow corporate rules, as well as the dictates of managers. In many cases what they do and even what they say is highly predictable"* (Ritzer 2013 p15). This reinforced the 'control' element also and is reflected in LOCOG's overall vision of the Games Maker Volunteer

Programme, using McDonalds, to provide structure, design and clear allocation of resources and tasks (Schuzle et al 2011 cited in Nichol 2013 p217) most efficiently and effectively. Girginov (2013) goes on to describe it as a “*programme management*” approach, defining roles required and slotting volunteers into them, in contrast to “*membership management*” in which volunteers are allocated roles to match their aspirations (Cuskelly et al 2006 cited in Nichols 2013 p217). This reinforces the ‘task not team’ philosophy associated more with autocratic, classical management cultures. LOCOG demonstrated power and decision making, with the volunteers only choice being whether to opt in or out. However, much like Disney, 70,000 Games Makers (and 20,000 reserves) very much chose to ‘opt in’ to this controlled culture, acknowledging that it really was a once in a life time opportunity (BBC 2012).

With such a mechanistic approach, leadership/ supervision of Games Makers focused very much on the “telling” quadrant of the Situational model where ‘task’ is high priority and the need for interpersonal behaviours low (Hersey, Blanchard and Johnson 2012). This is evident through the role of the ‘Trailblazers’ who had a scripted, rigid, interview process (Girginov 2014). According to Hersey and Blanchard’s model, it assumes that the Games Maker was not competent / mature in the role and therefore needed control and direction, but it could be argued that this is less about the trust in the individual abilities of the Games Makers’ and more about the volume of volunteers that were involved in the process. This also reflects the philosophy of the situational theory that the Games Makers are adjusted to fit LOCOG’s need and not the other way around.

The training conveyor belt for the Games Makers can be seen to reflect the traditional production line ie Ford cars, the Big Mac or one of the many Starbucks speciality coffees. The Games Maker as the metaphoric ‘Latte’ went from stage to stage along the production line,

with ‘information’ (the Games Maker workbook and CD), ‘rules’, ‘regulations’ etc (Girginov 2014), replacing the coffee shot, sugar, cream and marshmallows, but unlike the Starbucks coffee, it was clear that these ingredients were ‘non negotiable’. Despite this mechanistic approach each of the three compulsory training events were embraced positively and on the whole, volunteers spoke highly of the process, describing it as *“more inspirational and motivational than training.....designed to make volunteers appreciate the scale and uniqueness of the Games Maker opportunity & the importance of adhering to Olympic values”* (Girginov 2014).

Games Makers described the buzz of the atmosphere and excitement shared amongst everyone and magnified when celebrities such as Jonathon Edwards and Eddie Izzard were brought in to inspire the troops (Girginov 2014); could this be seen as comparable to a visit from Walt Disney to the theme park or Ronald McDonald popping in to a restaurant? Regardless of any cynicism, it would be difficult to argue that the recruitment, selection and training process, led by McDonalds, had not been successful. Well over a million hours of Games Maker training had been co-ordinated (Degun 2012a cited in Girginov 2014), covering everything from the philosophy, history of the games, through to layout, security, safety and specific skill training depended on the role. Clearly the Games Makers at this point were engaged, the whole training process securing their commitment and loyalty, regardless of the lack of expenses / accommodation / flexibility. Instead Games Makers were rewarded with ‘status’ ie being part of the once in a life time, London 2012 legacy, along with the more material benefits of a City and Guilds Level 1 NVQ and the infamous pride of wearing and owning the distinctive purple and red Games Maker uniformthe influence of such an outfit apparent through one eager Games Make requesting *“to get buried in their uniform when the time comes”* (Heald 2012), testimony indeed to the power of the role.

Deployment of the 'Purple and Red Army'

With the role of the metaphoric conveyor belt complete in mass producing 70,000 keen and eager Games Makers, it was time for 'deployment' in their allocated teams, function areas and venues. Girginov (2014) reinforces further that the management of the Games Makers was very much a process driven approach. This is evident through the clarity of meticulously scheduled rotas / tasks ration and shifts which brought with it some dissatisfaction by Games Makers who described how "*it looked like it had been churned out by a computer with no reference to a human being*" (2014 p56). Reaffirming the underpinning scientific/classical management culture, with LOCOG choosing to focus very much on the 'task' and to limit any influence from the 'people' perspective. Interestingly, due to Games Maker demand LOCOG did eventually respond to the 'people factor' and changed shifts where possible to suit individual circumstances. Girginov (2014) reflects on this U-turn, suggesting "*that as the Games became closer LOCOG realised that a more flexible and pragmatic approach was needed if they wanted to retain volunteers and not use their contingency reserve pool at such a late stage*" (2014 p57); demonstrating that 'people power' had not entirely been omitted from the process.

Regardless of some teething problems the success of the Games Makers from recruitment to deployment cannot be underestimated, "*once at the Games any negative feelings were short lived and volunteer experiences were overwhelmingly positive*" (Girginov 2014 p57). He goes on to describe the '*tsunami of positivity*' and this is reinforced by every angle of media that covered the event. From what some journalists described as an initially pervasive cynicism, turned around at a triumphant opening ceremony and the unveiling of the "*purple army*" (Dejevsky 2013), and two weeks of "*pink foam handed high-fives for the children.....cheerily megaphoned messages to queues at venues.....and high-chair jollity outside tube stations*" (Hirst 2012); finally culminating in the "*loudest cheer and longest ovation at the closing*

ceremony” (Girginov 2014 p58). The consistency and standardisation of the Games Maker from the factory conveyor belt had been balanced with the ability of each volunteer to bring their own ingredients and blend of personality, creativity and individuality.

Concluding thoughts and complexities of the ‘management jungle’

So drawing this all together, what does this exploration of cars to fast-food, theme parks to deluxe coffees tell us and more importantly – tell leisure managers? There is overwhelming evidence to conclude that the success of the Games Makers was largely influenced by the underpinning management approaches embraced by McDonalds and reflecting the ‘ization’ culture (Ritzer 1993, 2003, Brymann 1999, Kincheloe 2002). Comparisons have been made with the traditional management approaches associated with scientific and classical management and demonstrated through the manufacturing success of Ford, through to more contemporary organisations such as Disney, McDonalds and Starbucks which re-affirms the existence of leisure service commercialisation (O’Neill cited in Ritzer 2013, Bender and Poggie cited in Smart 1999). The Games Maker Volunteer Programme, managed by McDonalds can be seen to emulate these traditional management approaches and whilst there is recognition of ‘some’ human relations influence, this is limited in comparison to the intense mechanistic culture that has become apparent in underpinning the whole process.

It would be dangerous however, to take a step back and concur with Taylorism (Mullins 2010, Buchanan and Huczynski 2010, Heitmann 2009) that there is ‘one best way’. More it should be used to recognise the impact and influence of the varying management approaches, from traditional to contemporary, including the progression of human relations theory and through to the development of systems and contingency approaches today (Mullins 2010). Theodoraki (2007) appears to support this notion when examining Olympic events, suggesting that

“consistency, coherence, and fit – harmony – are critical factors in organization design but they come at a price” (2007, p22). She goes on to suggest that an organisation *“cannot be all things to all people”* (2007, p. 23), instead she suggests it should do what it does well. Therefore if it succeeds in being an efficient bureaucratic machine, then that should be its focus and not try to be highly adaptive where the situation does not allow it. Theodoraki (2007) argues that the type of structure / management approach is not as important as ensuring that the outcome/strategy (ie the ‘making of the Games Maker) is suitable for the environment of the organisation. This may suggest more of a ‘systems’ approach which encourages a balance of people and process or even contingency management which shifts and adapts to the situation and environment as required (Mullins 2010).

Jones (2000) recognised the difficulty when trying to shift to a more human relations approach, or the ‘people factor’. His investigation demonstrated deep rooted cultures on the shop floor and therefore, whilst the Games Maker Volunteer Programme was in essence a NEW initiative and not an established organisation already with a deep rooted culture, the fact that the programme was being co-ordinated by McDonalds, would suggest that their ‘ization’ culture would inevitably seep through combining Handy’s task culture of logic and rationality with Deal and Kennedy’s ‘work hard/play hard’ philosophy (Mullins 2010). Whilst it is evident from McDonalds HR practices today, that it is not reliant solely on scientific/classical philosophies and that it *does* respond to the people factor and human relations (McDonalds 2014), Ritzer’s McDonaldization concept, combined with its demonstration in practice through the Games Makers, still recognises that traditional mechanistic methods can play a significant part in organisational management today. Bobic and Davis (2003) shares similar opinion when referring to McGregor’s X & Y theory in the 21st century. Whilst they recognise that the Y theory has been widely adopted as the preferred model, X still persists in practice. Furthermore

they reflect on examples, where adoption of Y philosophies has been seen to fail in reforming a workplace and/or workers attitudes. Whilst Y has been seen as inherently better allowing creativity, Bobic and Davis (2003) suggest that not all people are or want to be creative. Instead they suggest that whilst improving the work environment still requires one to pay attention to the Human Side of Enterprise (McGregor 1960), they would argue that managers and employees should capitalise on strengths to ensure effective management.

This would seem to reflect the McDonaldization paradigm (Ritzer 2013) which worked so effectively for the 70,000 Games Makers who were successfully 'mass produced' in a global commercial culture. Koontz (1980) suggested that the management jungle continually flourishes and gets denser, as each school of management with its own semantics, fights a fierce pride to protect concepts and techniques. This makes it difficult for the practicing manager (or management committee such as LOCOG) to see 'the woods for the trees' and causing risk for the organisation, regarding the establishment of authority, responsibility, policy. However that is exactly what leisure managers need to do, take a step back, consider the stakeholders (management, staff, customers , sponsors etc), consider the objectives (and agendas) of the organisation / event / project and related internal and external factors, and approach the 'wood' with caution in terms of the best way to tackle it.

Koontz (1980) reinforced the need for the management jungle to be disentangled....but arguably that is exactly what LOCOG did, recognising the benefits of the McDonaldization culture and seeing that their management philosophy, entrenched in 'old school' classical techniques could and would be effective to manage the Games Maker Volunteer Programme. Their vision surely echoed this: *"Work with our partners will create a new volunteering spirit, an improved volunteer network with more opportunities and better training for those who want*

to give their most important commodity – time (LOCOG 2009) though for the Games Makers it could be argued that the commodity given, was far more than just time.....perhaps the ‘human soul’ encapsulates it better, in their purple and red packaging as they progressed down the conveyor belt.....but if this leaves leisure managers with an uncomfortable feeling – consider this, if you asked any Games Maker would they do it again, what do you think the answer would be?

REFERENCE LIST

- ABOUT MCDONALDS., (2010) *Mission and Values*. [online] [viewed 31st July 2014] available at: http://www.aboutmcdonalds.com/mcd/our_company/mission_and_values.html
- ABOUT MCDONALDS., (2010) *Training and Development*. [online] [viewed 31st July 2014] available at: http://www.aboutmcdonalds.com/mcd/corporate_careers/training_and_development.html
- ADDLEY, E., (2012). London 2012's Games Makers fired up to perform 800 vital roles. *The Guardian*. [online] [viewed 31st July 2014] available at: <http://www.theguardian.com/sport/2012/jul/17/london-2012-games-makers-800-roles>
- BBC NEWS., (2011). London 2012: Olympic Games Maker volunteer offers begin. *BBC News*. [online] [viewed 31st July 2014] available at: <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-15003201>
- BEAMES, S., and VARLEY, P., (1999). Eat, play, shop: The Disneyization of adventure. In S. TAYLOR, P. VARLEY and T. JONHSTON eds. *Adventure Tourism: Meanings, experience and learning*. Oxon: Routledge, Chapter 6: pp.77-84
- BENDER, C., and POGGI, G., (1999). Golden arches and Iron Cages: McDonaldization and the Poverty of Cultural Pessimism at the END of the Twentieth Century. In B. SMART eds. *Resisting McDonaldization*. London: Sage Publications, pp.22-40
- BEYNON, H., and NICHOLS, T., (2006). *Fordism of Ford and Modern Management*. Cheltenham: Elgar Publishing
- BLACKSHAW, T., (2013). *Routledge Handbook of Leisure Studies*. Oxon: Routledge

- BOBIC, M. P., and DAVIS, W. E., (2003). A kind word for theory x: or why so many new-fangled management techniques quickly fail. *Journal of Public Administration Research & Theory*
- BRANNIGAN, A., and ZWERMAN, W., (2001). The Real Hawthorn Effect. *Society*. Vol 38, Issue 2, pp.55-60
- BRYMAN, A., (1999). The Disneyization of society. *The Editorial Board of the Sociological Review*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 25-47
- BRYMAN, A., (2004). *The Disneyization of society* [online]. London: Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publishers Available from: MyiLibrary ebooks
- BUCHANAN, D, A., and HUCZYNSKI, A, A., (2010). *Organisational Behaviour*. London: Prentice Hall
- BURNS, T., and G, M., (1961). *The Management of Innovation*. London: Tavistock Publications
- CAMERON, K. S., and QUINN, R, E., (2011). *Diagnosing and Changing Organizational Culture: based on the competing values framework*. 3rd edition. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass
- DCMS., 2013. *Report 5: Post-Games Evaluation*. London: Department for Culture, Media and Sport
- DEERY, M., and JAGO, L., (2005). *The Management of Sport Tourism (Sport in Society: Cultures, Commerce, Media and Politics.*, Victoria University Australia: Centre for Hospitality and Tourism Research
- DEJEVSKY, M., (2013). Olympic Legacy: Has the Spirit of the Smiling Games Makers' army endured. *The Independent*. [online] [viewed 31st July 2014] available at: <http://www.independent.co.uk/sport/olympics/olympics-legacy-has-the-spirit-of-the-smiling-games-makers-army-endured-8711683.html>

- DICKSON, T. J., and BENSON, A. M., (2012). *London 2012 Games Makers: Towards Re-defining Legacy*. London: DCMS
- DICKSON, T.J., and BENSON, A.M., and BLACKMAN, D.A., and TERWELL, F.A., (2013). It's All About the Games 2010 Vancouver Olympic and Paralympic Winter Games Volunteers. *Event Management Volume 17*. USA: Cognizant Communication Corp.
- FAIRLEY, S., and LEE, Y., and GREEN, C., and LYANG KIM, M., 2013. Considering Cultural Influences in Volunteer Satisfaction & Commitment. *Event Management Volume 17*. USA: Cognizant Communication Corp.
- FEIDLER, F. E., (1964). *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*. Volume 1, p149-190. Philadelphia: Elsevier
- GIBSON, O., (2012). London 2012 Olympics opening ceremony to reflect 'people's Games – *The Guardian*. 27th January 2012.
- GIRGINOV, V., (2013). *The London 2012 Olympics: Volume One: Making the Games*. Oxon: Routledge
- GIRGINOV, V., (2014). *The London 2012 Olympics: Volume Two: Celebrating the Games*. Oxon: Routledge
- HALL, E. T., (1976). *Beyond Culture*. New York: Anchor Books
- HEALD, C., (2012). London Olympics: How Volunteers Made the Games. *BBC News*. [online] [viewed 31st July 2014] available at: <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-19201329>
- HEALD, C., (2012). London 2012: Social Media Restrictions for Games Makers. *BBC News*. [online] [viewed 31st July 2014] available at: <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-16426840>
- HEALD, C., and MCCLATCHEY, C., (2010). Did the Dagenham Women's Equal Pay Fight Make a Difference? *BBC News*. [online] [viewed 31st July 2014] available at: <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/magazine-11420445>

- HEITMANN, J., (2009). *The Automobile and American Life*. North Caroline: McFarland and Company Inc.
- HERSEY, P., BLANCHARD, K, H., JOHNSON, D, E., (2012). *Management of Organizational Behavior*. 10th Edition. New Jersey: Prentice Hall
- HIRST, M., (2012). London 2012 Paralympics: What Next for the Games Makers? *BBC News*. [online] [viewed 31st July 2014] available at: <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-19512993>
- HOLMES, K., and Smith, K., (2009). *Managing Volunteers in Tourism. Attracting Destination and Events*. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann
- JARY, D., (1999). The McDonaldization of Sport and Leisure. In B. SMART eds. *Resisting McDonaldization*. London: Sage Publications, pp.116-134
- JOHNSON, G., SCHOLE, K., and WHITTINGTON, R., (2005). *Exploring Corporate Strategy*, 7th edition. Harlow: Financial Times Prentice Hall
- JONES, O., (2000). *Scientific Management, culture and control: A first hand account of Taylorism in practice –Human Relations*. London: Sage Publications
- KANIGEL, R., (2005). *The One Best Way: Frederick Winslow Taylor and the Enigma of Efficiency*. Cambridge MA: MIT Press
- KENYON, C., (2012). *Games Maker Orientation* [online] [viewed on 5th August 2014] available from: <http://www.cssc.co.uk/VIPLounge/VNews/ChrisKenyonGamesMakerOrientation.aspx>
- KINCHELOE, J, L., (2002). *The Sign of the Burger: McDonalds and the Culture of Power*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press
- KRISTIENSEN, E.A., and SKILLE, D., and VIDA HANSTAD. (2014). From Community Based Identities to Individual Benefits for Volunteers. A Comparison of Three Sporting Events, Scandinavian ports Studies Forum 2014

KOONTZ, H., (1980). The Management Theory Jungle Revisited. *Academy of Management Review*, Vol 5, No. 2. Pp.175-187

LOCOG, (2009). *Get Involved: The Volunteer Programme – London 2012*. In the official site of the London 2012 Olympics and Paralympics

LOYNES, C., (1998). *Adventure in a Bun*. *Journal of Experiential Education*; 21:1, pp35-39

LOVE, G.W., and SHERMAN, K., and OLDING., (2012). Will they stay or will they go. Study of Volunteer Retention at Film/Music Festivals in the South west US. *Event Management Volume 16*. USA: Cognizant Communication Corp.

MCDONALDS CORPORATION., (2011). *People: That's what makes London 2012, that's what makes McDonalds*. [online] [viewed 31st July 2014] available at: <http://www2.mcdonalds.co.uk/people/games-maker/games-maker.shtml>

MCDONALDS., (2012). *McDonald's sprints ahead with landmark campaign to celebrate the part we will all play in making the Games*. [online] [viewed 31st July 2014] available at: http://www.mcdonalds.co.uk/ukhome/Aboutus/Newsroom/news_pages/We_all_make_the_Games.html

MCDONALDS., (2012). *McDonald's to offer national qualification to London 2012 Games Makers looking for work*. [online] [viewed 31st July 2014] available at: http://www.mcdonalds.co.uk/ukhome/Aboutus/Newsroom/news_pages/gamesmaker_qualification.html

MCDONALDS., (2012). *London 2012 Games Makers boost confidence, skills and employability with national qualification – Announcement welcomed by Lord Coe*. [online] [viewed 31st July 2014] available at: http://www.mcdonalds.co.uk/ukhome/Aboutus/Newsroom/news_pages/gamesmaker_qualification2.html

- MCGREGOR, D., (1960). *The Human Side of Enterprise*. Columbus OH: McGraw Hill Higher Education
- MARTIN, J., (2004). *Organizational Culture*. Research Paper 1847. Stanford Graduate School of Business
- MASLOW, A. H., (1943). A Theory of Human Motivation. *Psychological Review- The American Psychological Association*. Vol 50, pp 370-96
- MINARD, J., (2012). London 2012: Games Makers Attend Wembley Training Event. *BBC News*. [online] [viewed 31st July 2014] available at: <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-16874424>
- MINARD, J., (2012). London 2012: Games Makers get in gear for the Olympics. *BBC News*. [online] [viewed 31st July 2014] available at: <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-18020445>
- MULLINS, L. J., (2010). *Management & Organisational Behaviour*. Essex: Prentice Hall
- NICHOLS, G., (2013). Volunteering for the Games? In V. GIRGINOV, eds. *Handbook of the London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games. Volume 1: Making the Games*. Oxon: Routledge, pp.215-224
- NICKSON, D., (2013). *Human Resource Management for the Hospitality and Tourism Industries*. London: Routledge
- O' NEILL, J., (1999). Have You Had Your Theory Today? In B. SMART eds. *Resisting McDonaldization*. London: Sage Publications, pp.41-56
- OLYMPIC.ORG. (2012). Volunteers: Helping to make the Games happen. *Official website of the Olympic movement*. [online] [viewed 31st July 2014] available at: <http://www.olympic.org/news/volunteers-helping-to-make-the-games-happen/168630>
- ONASANWO, R., (2012). London 2012: The Happies Olympic Worker? *The Guardian*. [online] [viewed 31st July 2014] available at: <http://www.theguardian.com/profile/rachel-onosanwo>

- PRESS ASSOCIATION., (2010). London Olympics taps McDonald's to train volunteers. *The Guardian*. [online] [viewed 31st July 2014] available at: <http://www.theguardian.com/uk/2010/jul/09/london-olympics-2012-mcdonalds-volunteers>
- RITZER, G., (2013). *The McDonaldization of Society 20th Anniversary Edition*. London: Sage Publications
- RITZER, G., (1993). *The McDonaldization of Society*. London: Sage Publications
- ROBERTSON, H., (2010). Become a London 2012 Games Maker. *Department for Culture, Media and Sport*. [online] [viewed 31st October 2014] available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/become-a-london-2012-games-maker>
- ROGERS, T., (2014). *Events Are Great- Britain: A Report on the size and value of Britain's events industry, its characteristics, trends, opportunities and key issues*. West Midlands: Tony Rogers Conference and Event Services
- SCHEIN, E. H., (2004). *Organizational Culture and Leadership*. 3rd edition. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass
- SMART, B., (1999). *Resisting McDonaldization*. London: Sage Publications
- STEVENS, M., (2010). McDonalds to help recruit Olympic volunteers. *CIPD*. [online] [viewed 31st July 2014] available at: <http://www.cipd.co.uk/pm/peoplemanagement/b/weblog/archive/2013/01/29/mcdonalds-to-help-recruit-olympic-volunteers-2010-07.aspx>
- TAYLOR, P., (2013). Human Resources Management. In T. BLACKSHAW eds. *Routledge Handbook of Leisure Studies*. Oxon: Routledge
- THEODORAKI, E., (2007). *Olympic Event Organization*. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann
- TOMLIN, J., (2012). Can the Olympic experience help change the face of volunteering? *The Guardian*. [online] [viewed 31st July 2014] available at:

<http://www.theguardian.com/voluntary-sector-network/2012/jul/19/olympics-change-face-volunteering>

VAN MAANEN, J., (1999). The Smile Factory: Work at Disneyland. *Southwestern College Publishing*, 11-24

WAKELIN, D., (2013). What Motivates Students to Volunteer at Event. *Event Management Volume 17*. USA: Cognizant Communication Corp.

WEBER, M., (1947). *The Theory of Economic and Social Organization*. New York: The Free Press

WEINSTEIN, D., and WEINSTIEN, M. A., (1999). McDonaldization Enframed. In B. SMART eds. *Resisting McDonaldization*. London: Sage Publications, pp.57-69

WITZEL, M., (2012). *A History of Management*. London: Routledge

WOODS, D., (2012). McDonald's kicks off Olympic volunteer training initiative. *HRMagazine*. [online] [viewed 31st July 2014] available at: <http://www.hrmagazine.co.uk/hro/news/1020817/mcdonalds-kicks-olympic-volunteer-training-initiative>