

An Empirical Analysis On Disparate Impacts of the London 2012 Olympics

Team 20 ||| Jenny Chen | David Fan | Kevin Sun | Sarah Ye

Background

Motivation

Studies have been done extensively on the economic impact of **London Olympics** overall—there lacks literature targeting the more intangible aspects of its **various boroughs**

Focus

London Olympics targeted specifically the so-called **"growth boroughs"**. We seek primarily to examine and investigate whether or not this strategy has been successful or have yielded unintended short and long term consequences

Data


GDP per capita, ethnic distribution, leisure-related data, etc. in **time-series** (~2000-2018) and **per-region (UK boroughs + international cities)** format

Obtaining Net Effect of Olympics

Constructing Control Group

Local Trends


Obtain Non-London UK borough data (GDP per capita in pounds shown to the right)



International Trends

Use **KNN** to obtain the most similar international city to London to put alongside UK boroughs

PCA Representation




Estimating True Average Treatment Effect (ATE) of Olympics

Model: Lasso-based Modified Synthetic Control

Using members of the Control Group, construct a synthetic control counterfactual for the GDP per capita of London boroughs, and obtain net ATE for periods post Olympics in order to establish causality.

Graphics Below Shows the marginal difference between the actual GDP per capita of UK boroughs with the predicted GDP per capita




Net Present Value (NPV) of panel ATE:

Using the Annuity formula and the corresponding interest rate, calculate the NPV of all net ATE in the future


Insights and Recommendations

Deep Dive Comparison

2012 GDP per capita margin [Short Term]



GDP NPV per capita margin (2012-2015) [Long Term]



Note: Host cities are bolded

We can clearly see that the Host city only obtained short term gain from the comparison. **Thus, we pose that the impact of Olympics is likely more a multiplier to the currently already well-off and fast developing cities in London (centered in West London)** that can take advantage of the intangible impacts of Olympics (e.g. increasing awareness and better infrastructure)

Recommendation: invest in changes that will simultaneously make future tourism safer and make local residency more desirable and accessible. With those the host borough will be able to sustain impacts from Olympics and reap the most benefits from hosting the Games

Back Attribution to Borough Characteristic


Machine Learning based Attribution

Using the final NPV value obtained as our dependent variable, we employed standard machine learning algorithms, including a **Decision Tree**, in an attempt to understand what explains the **difference of ATE across boroughs**. Economic and Leisure indexes were constructed using PCA on relevant characteristic of the borough

Key Preliminary Insights:

1. Certain protected classes such as Asians does not seem to receive equal degrees of benefit from the Olympics

Decision Tree Using Aggregated ATE



We also further examined the potential **non-stationarity** that exists along how the various characteristics affected both the immediate and long term development of these areas. Here, we used **time-based Linear Regression**

Key Preliminary Insights:

1. Cities with lower economic indexes and higher leisure indexes benefited in the short term, however the trend reversed later on
2. GDP/capita growth in general show a positive trend over the years

Time based Variable Importance

