

[DOI: 10.20472/IAC.2018.037.019](https://doi.org/10.20472/IAC.2018.037.019)

NOPPAMASH SUVACHART

Khon Kaen University, Thailand

HOST POPULATION PERCEPTIONS OF SPORTING EVENTS

Abstract:

The purpose of this research was to investigate perceptions of people who live around The Rajamangala National Stadium regarding sporting events impact on the community. The Rajamangala National Stadium is the national stadium of Thailand and the home stadium for the Thailand national football team. It is part of the HuaMak Sports Complex, locate in HuaMak Subdistrict, BangKapi, Bangkok. Host population perceptions were measured through a two-page self-completed questionnaire written in Thai, administered to a sample of 400 residents of the district of Bangkapi (population 67,931 members) in Bangkok, Thailand. Resident questionnaires were distributed within 2 months, August - October 2017. The questionnaire comprised 27 questions. The first part aimed to identify awareness of event being staged. The second part contained 2 Open ended questions designed to find out how sporting event effect community, positive and negative impacts, with 8 items measure of residents' perceptions of impact. These items related to personal quality of life, quality of life of community, sense of community and community pride. The final part included questions relate to involvement characteristics of respondents; attend sporting events in year 2017 or previous years, level of interest in event, type of involvement in event by respondent or household member, distance from house, and socio-demographic data. Once collected, all data were entered into SPSS version 15.0 for further analysis. Descriptive statistics were used to describe the subjects and the perceived impacts of sporting events. Because of qualitative approach, the findings were described the central position of a frequency distribution for a group of data by mode. Mode is the number that occurs most often in a set of numbers. The results presented by descriptive with percentage in the form of tables, and text. We found both positive and negative impacts of sporting events performance on the community. The findings were identified as seven main positive impacts and six main negative impacts. These impacts related to economic, social and environmental of the community. The directions for future sporting events research on environmental studies: impact and evaluation studies including sustainability and greening of sporting events such as reducing garbage. More research on consequences of sporting events effect local culture community.

Keywords:

Sporting event, Business, Social responsibility, Economic, Environmental

JEL Classification: M16

Introduction

There is growing realization that present material consumption and waste generation levels are persevering a various impact on the environment, a situation that scientists dread might explain term for people's ultimate survival. Scientists discuss that the ecological footprint of people through resource harvesting and waste generation far exceeds the carrying capacity of the world (Wackernagel and Rees, 1996). Increasing populations and a consistent escalate in the use of fossil fuels have effected in substantial rise in greenhouse gases that are responsible for global warming. A general consensus is thus emerging that conventional approaches to economic development are likely to diminish the ability of current and future generations to meet their social, economic, and environmental needs. One of the reasons why so little has been done to stop climate change is that everyone makes an exception for themselves. We can all agree, for example, there are too many cars on the roads, while insisting that we cannot possibly leave ours at home. The same problem applies to businesses: the people who run them might agree that collective action urgently needs to be taken, but unfortunately their sector is just too important and its requirements too demanding. This seems to be the prevailing ethos at the moment in sport. Some sports are simply incompatible with any likely solution to the problem. The most obvious example is motor racing. There is a direct relationship between and engine's performance and the amount of greenhouse gases it produces: the faster the car, the quicker it cooks the planet. At the moment, there is no foreseeable means by which a racing car's emissions can be brought down by 90 per cent within the necessary time frame. Biodiesel currently causes more harm to people and the environment than good, as it pushes up food prices and encourages the felling of tropical forests. One day – perhaps in 20 or 30 years – racing cars might run on hydrogen or electricity. Unfortunately, that's too late: the major cuts have to be made right now. We may think that football is spontaneously harmless cause major environmental effects, but it is major crowd pullers. As a result, mainstreaming sustainability issues into their sporting events has become a major issue of environmental concern. Because of sporting event is set in the physical environment and is bound to have effects on it and be affected by it. The roots of global environmental issues are to be found in local environmental conditions and in this context the interaction of the sporting communities with the environment within which its activities are performed needs to be analyzed. There is a two-way relationship between sporting event and environment. Consequently, it can be assumed that sporting events will generate different type of impacts, and probably not only those effects related to the theme or type of event. For example, a business event may generate not only economic impacts, but also social and cultural impacts.

The impact of environment on sporting event is more palpable and direct which influences the scheduling of certain sporting events according to the suitability of the climate and the physical environment of the particular place. Global Warming has an unmistakable potential of having a long-term negative impact on sports in general and winter sports in particular. However, the focus of this research is on the social, economic, and environmental aspect. Based on the importance and problems

mentioned above. The research project aimed to investigate perceptions of people who live around The Rajamangala National Stadium regarding sporting events impact on the community. The Rajamangala National Stadium is the national stadium of Thailand and the home stadium for the Thailand national football team. It is part of the HuaMak Sports Complex, located in HuaMak Subdistrict, BangKapi, Bangkok. This research questions as following.

1. Are there impacts of sporting events performance on the community?
2. What type of impact, it may be positive or negative impacts?
3. What type of impact, it may be relate to economic, social or environmental of the community?

Literature Review

Events and the environment began to receive some interest from researchers, such as Sherwood (2007). Sherwood interested in sustainable development agenda. The sustainable development is underpinned by the recognition that there are limits to the capacity of the earth to cope with unimpeded economic growth. Businesses, due to their power and reach, are seen as major users of natural, human and financial capital resources. Granted a societal license to operate, businesses are under increasing pressure from a diverse range of internal and external stakeholders, who expect a higher level of accountability and transparency in regard to economic, social and environmental performance measurement. In response, businesses have incorporated practices such as eco-efficiency and corporate social responsibility, and an increasing number are now moving towards a more holistic evaluation of their triple bottom line (TBL) performance. In contrast, the special events industry has continued to rely on traditional economic measures of performance. There has been tremendous growth in the number of special events being staged in tourism destinations. Events have been used strategically to bring 'new' money into regions, promote economic development and to showcase destinations to potential visitors. As a result of these economic imperatives, the evaluation of events has predominantly been undertaken from a narrow economic perspective. This approach, however, fails to account for the impact of the event on the host community as well as the impact on the natural environment such as water and energy use and waste generation. Since the 1980's, event researchers have called for a broad-based evaluation model that incorporates economic, social and environmental measures. Recently, a number of these researchers have suggested that a TBL approach has merit as a potential framework. What has been lacking, however, is a set of standardized measures that would underpin a broad-based evaluation model. Therefore, the aim of this research is to develop a set of standardized TBL indicators, which would enable a parsimonious TBL evaluation model to be established. A seven-step indicator development process was used to underpin this research, based on a number of collaborative projects that developed indicators to measure sustainable Abstract A TBL Evaluation of the Impact of Special Events v development. Within this framework, there were a number of research stages. Initially, a comprehensive analysis of 224 academic event evaluation publications and 85 actual event impact assessments was undertaken. The aim was to understand what impacts have been used in event

evaluations from academic and practical perspectives. From these 309 sources, a list of the 20 key impacts was derived. The second stage of the research was a three-round, modified Web-based Delphi survey of event experts. The aim was to use the opinions of the event experts to develop a pool of indicators to measure the key impacts. A total of 24 indicators was proposed by the experts to measure the impacts. A conceptual model was developed, which detailed the event drivers, the event inputs, the event outcomes, and the TBL indicators. The model also included a TBL evaluation, which included overall measures for the economic, social and environmental impacts. A number of possible models were discussed, which enable a number of TBL indicators to be integrated to allow an overall event 'score' to be achieved. After a subset of the indicators was selected, the third stage of the study involved the conduct of two special event case studies. The objective of this stage was to operationalise the indicators in order to test their appropriateness for inclusion in a TBL evaluation model. The case studies used intercept surveys of event attendees, competitors and exhibitors to gather economic data, mail-out surveys of local residents to gauge the social impacts and the collection of a range of environmental data from event venues and attendees. Whilst the economic and social data were readily captured via the surveys, not all environmental data were available, mainly due to the regional setting of one of the events, where there was limited capacity for capturing data. Following this, the fourth major stage of the research involved consultations with a small number of project stakeholders in order to obtain feedback on the indicators used and the results of one of the case studies. In general, the stakeholders were supportive of both the direction of the research and the use of the TBL indicators to evaluate the impact of events.

A TBL evaluation will broaden the evaluation criteria for events and bring the events industry in line with the wider business community. There is a growing recognition in the tourism literature that, particularly with transportation, the tourism industry is a major contributor to greenhouse gas emissions. Therefore, inclusion of environmental measures will provide a clearer picture of the environmental footprint of an event. Moreover, inclusion of the measures of the impact of events on the quality of life of the host community may provide information that assists event organizers to retain the license to stage an event, which is granted by the event stakeholders. A further benefit of a TBL evaluation is that it will enable a comparison to be made of a range of different events, which will aid tourism organizations and event stakeholders in the decision-making process about which events merit support. As a result, it will be possible to manage events in a more sustainable manner. Whilst this study contributed to the development of a TBL evaluation, further research is required to integrate the indicators into a framework that can provide an overall 'score' for an event, which can then be compared with other events.

Harris and Huyskens (2002) published paper that manipulate with the environmental impacts of events. They focused on negative impacts of events and attempted to introduce some balance into this area by addressing the roles events can potentially play in progressing broader community goals associated with environmentally sustainable development. Specifically, this paper began by examining the relationship

between events and ecological sustainability, highlighting the key role of the Olympic Movement in this regard. Then moved on to identify key forces that were acting to lead events down this path. Following on from this discussion the issue of how public events had responded to the challenge of ecological sustainability were be addressed. This paper concluded by arguing that events had little choice but to increasingly move towards the adoption of more environmentally gentle practices, and that a number were already leading the way in this regard.

Concomitantly, there have been a growing number of studies investigating the impact of events on the physical attributes of a host destination and in particular, the greening of events (Getz, 2009) and associated issues pertaining to the adoption of environmentally friendly practices, and the management processes necessary to accomplish reduction of waste and of the event's overall ecological footprint. The increasing dominance of this view encouraged the development of the triple bottom line approach to event evaluation (Fredline et al., 2001; Sherwood, 2007) and, it is within this context that research focusing on event sustainability has gained traction (Hede, 2007).

Guizzardi, Andrea; Mariani, Marcello; Prayag, Girish, (2017) examined residents' perceptions of environmental impacts and certification for the Milan World Expo 2015 as well as their overall attitude toward the mega-event. They found that residents perceived the the Expo will have minimal negative and positive environmental impacts. A minority of residents were aware of the environmental certification of the event. The less agreeable residents were with the perceived negative environmental impacts of the event, the more agreeable they were that a certification of event sustainability should limit the damage to the natural environment. Residents' perceptions of the certification were positively related to their overall attitude toward the event.

Philip Xie and Andy Sinwald (2016) investigated the perceived impact of special events hosted by Parks and Recreation Departments' event organizers along the shore of Lake Erie in the state of Ohio, USA. They used qualitative data collected from an in-depth interview process. The purpose of their research focus the major impacts and how to the organizers measure and event's success. They found that the special events creating a positive experience and encouraging community involvement, bringing the community together, producing economic benefits for local businesses, and creating socializing and educational opportunities for visitors were the foremost impacts anticipated by interviewed event organizers. Specifically, the special events providing a positive experience, and creating community cohesion. There were a few limitations; the study presented a relatively small sample, their findings might relate to the institutions located along Lake Erie where parks and recreation had long been viewed as an integral part of community life. Their research represented a first attempt to complement the quantitative data in the former research with a qualitative study. Through in-depth interviews, Higham (1999), Fredline (2005), Preuss and Solberg (2006), Ohmann et al. (2006), and Bull and Lovell (2007) have all identified social impacts that might occur as resultants of sporting events. Higham did not present any

positive social impacts of sport events, recommending they were mostly negative. Different from all other authors recognized positive social impacts in addition to the negative impacts. Incidentally, Fredline (2005), Ohmann et al. (2006), and Bull and Lovell (2007) explored sense of community as a positive impact, while poor fan behavior (Fredline, 2005; Higham, 1999; Ohmann et al., 2006) and crime (Ohmann et al., 2006; Preuss and Solberg, 2006) were viewed as negative impacts. In terms of categories of events and sites investigated in these researchs, Higham (1999) discussed mega-events, Ohmann et al. (2006) considered a mega-event (FIFA World cup) in a large city (Munich, Germany, population 1.28 million), Bull and Lovell (2007) studied one leg of mega-event (Tour de France) in a small city (Canterbury, England, UK, population 150,000), Preuss and Solberg (2006) contrasted secondary data on five different events (Olympics, FIFA World Cup, EURO, Rugby World Championship, and Nordic World Ski Championships), Whilst Fredline (2005) reviewed residents' perceptions at three different events (Australian Formula One Grand Prix, Australian Open Tennis Tournament, and Rugby World Cup).

Methodology

The population used in this study is finite population. There are 67,931 people live around Huamark, Bangkapi District, Bangkok (Population statistic, Bangkapi District Office, Bangkok access online February 15 2017). Nevertheless, simple random sampling is a probability technique for survey method, and as such, its generalizability to a larger population is limited. Due to finite population, this research is calculated the number of samples by probability sampling. To get the right size of sample enough to cite the population (Siljaru, Thanin, 2005, page 47). The survey are collected from people who living at Huamark, Bangkapi District, Bangkok. A total of 400 questionnaires are distributed between August - October 2017. This research calculates the size of the sample when we know the population and use formula to calculate. Since, the population has 67,931 members, researcher was concerned with 400 subjects.

Development measuring instrument and scale measurement

The instrument was based on the social indicators developed by Sherwood, P. (2007) and a set of additional questions that had previously been used surveys in event research (Harris and Huyskens, 2002, Fredline et al. 2005, Guizzardi, Andrea; Mariani, Marcello; Prayag, Girish, 2017). The reason for the use of the additional questions was that a survey that only used the four social indicators derived from this study would be too short. Additional questions not only added to the quality of the survey instrument, but also allowed for some of the other social issues to be addressed such as the level of community involvement in the event. Table 1 reveals the key items that were contained in the survey instrument

Table 1. Host population survey instrument items

Item	Details
Awareness	Aware of event being staged
Event Impacts	Open ended questions about positive and negative impacts of event

Impacts and scale of impacts	Personal quality of life, quality of life of community, sense of community and community pride
Attendance	Attendance at current or previous football events
Interest in event	Level of interest in event
Involvement	Type of involvement in event by respondent or household member
Proximity	Distance that respondent lives from the event
Demographic	Gender and Age

Data Analysis

In this study, perceptions were measured through a two-page self-completed questionnaire written in Thai, administered to a sample of 400 residents of the district of Bangkapi (population 67,931 members) in Bangkok, Thailand. Resident questionnaires were distributed within 2 months. The questionnaire comprised 27 questions. The first part aimed to identify awareness of event being staged. The second part of instrument contained 2 Open ended questions about positive and negative impacts of event and 8-item measure of residents' perceptions of impact relate to personal quality of life, quality of life of community, sense of community and community pride. The third and final part of the instrument included questions about attendance at current or previous football events, level of interest in event, type of involvement in event by respondent or household member, and participants' distance, gender and age. Once collected, all data were entered into SPSS version 15.0 for further analysis. Descriptive statistics are used to describe the subjects and the perceived impacts of sport event. Because of qualitative approach, the findings are described the central position of a frequency distribution for a group of data by mode. Mode is the number that occurs most often in a set of numbers. The results information presented by descriptive with percentage (%) in the form of tables, and text.

Findings

1. Sporting event created both positive and negative impacts: a qualitative approach
The residents were asked to list the most positive impacts and negative impacts of sporting events. While not everyone gave distinct reasons, several themes emerged from the majority of the responses. The findings were identified as four main positive impacts. Whether sporting events provide a recreational opportunity for the community, they offer stadium/sporting venue and infrastructures development, this may lead to community the technological progress and better productivity in the economy of host community. Sporting events as form of entertainment; provide relaxation, bring people in the community together, people enjoy events, and good for health. Sporting events bring the economic growth to community, several economic benefits to local communities such as the visitors generated enormous economic activity through different forms of expenditure on sporting and non-sporting activities. There was an increased demand for various forms of food services and accommodation services business. As a result, sporting event as well as infrastructure development promote job creation, because a lot of markets, accommodation services, entertainment facilities like concerts, art and entertainments are most likely to be created for the visitors. In addition, during the major sport events thousands of people are able to go to the hosting

community to watch it. Also they can purchase hotel rooms, meals, drinks, transportation, tickets on the games or matches etc. This means that sporting event boosts the expenditure and promotes an increase in retail trade, which is very beneficial for the hosting economy. The findings were identified as four main positive impacts; recreational, venue and infrastructures development, entertainment, and economic benefits, different from. Fredline (2005), Ohmann et al. (2006), and Bull and Lovell (2007) explored sense of community as a positive impact.

After identifying the positive impacts, the residents were asked: "What do you think were the most negative impacts of sporting events?" The intention of this question was to ascertain the perceived impacts of sporting events as well as to distinguish these impacts, which are no previously cited in the extant literature. The findings were identified as six main negative impacts. Sporting events also results in negative impact on host community, including heavy traffic jam, inconvenient for transportation, overcrowding, disruptions in the normal life of the residents, and local community displacement. The findings were identified the negative impact of sporting event on the environment as a result of increased pollution, noise pollution, air pollution, and too much garbage. They thought sporting events effect environment, nevertheless, they did not mentioned cultural impacts. Different from Fredline (2005); Higham (1999); Ohmann et al., (2006) identified poor fan behavior and crime (Ohmann et al., 2006; Preuss and Solbeg, 2006) were viewed as negative impacts.

2. Perceptions of sporting events and social impacts

First, we explored the perception of personal quality of life variable. The residents were asked: "Did sporting events have any impact on your personal quality of life?" After that, "If yes, please rate this impact on the scale below by circling the appropriate number. This item come with 7 points rating scale from very negative impact (-3) to very positive impact (+3). Respondents' perceptions in terms of personal quality of life is presented in Table 2-Table 3.

Table 2. Frequency Distribution based on personal quality of life

Independent variable	Frequency	%	Valid %	Cumulative %
Impact on personal quality of life yes	71	17.8	17.8	17.8
no	329	82.3	82.3	100.0
Total	400	100.0	100.0	

Table 3. Frequency Distribution based on personal quality of life impact level

Independent variable	Frequency	%	Valid %	Cumulative %
Impact level ^a very negative	4	1.0	1.0	1.0
more negative	6	1.5	1.5	2.5
negative	47	11.8	11.8	14.3
neutral	341	85.3	85.3	99.5
More positive	2	.5	.5	100.0
Total	400	100.0	100.0	

Note: ^a7 points Scale from -3= very negative impact to +3 very positive impact

In relation to personal quality of life, 82.3 % of respondents' agreement that sporting event have no impact on their personal quality of life, although 17.8 % of respondents perceived impact on personal quality of their life. However, the majority of them, 85.3 % agree that the impact on quality of life are neutral level.

Second, we explored the perception of quality of life of community variable. The residents were asked: "Do you think sporting event affected the community as a whole?" After that, "If yes, please rate this impact on the scale below by circling the appropriate number. This item come with 7 points rating scale from very negative impact (-3) to very positive impact (+3). Respondents' perceptions in terms of quality of life of community is presented in Table 4-Table 5.

Table 4. Frequency Distribution based on quality of life of community

Independent variable		Frequency	%	Valid %	Cumulative %
Impact on quality of life of community	yes	91	22.8	22.8	22.8
	no	309	77.3	77.3	100.0
Total		400	100.0	100.0	

Table 5. Frequency Distribution based on quality of life of community impact level

Independent variable		Frequency	%	Valid %	Cumulative %
Impact level ^a	very negative	4	1.0	1.0	1.0
	more	16	4.0	4.0	5.0
	negative	48	12.0	12.0	17.0
	neutral	325	81.3	81.3	98.3
	positive	3	.8	.8	99.0
	more	4	1.0	1.0	100.0
Total		400	100.0	100.0	

Note: ^a7 points Scale from -3= very negative impact to +3 very positive impact

In relation to quality of life of community, 77.3 % of respondents' agreement that sporting event have no impact on their personal quality of life, although 22.8 % of respondents perceived impact on quality of life of community. However, the majority of them, 81.3 % agreed that the sporting events impact on quality of life of community are neutral level.

Third, we explored the perception of sense of community variable. The residents were asked: "Do you think sporting events affected your sense of community?" After that, "If yes, please rate this impact on the scale below by circling the appropriate number. This item come with 7 points rating scale from very negative impact (-3) to very positive impact (+3). Respondents' perceptions in terms of sense of community is presented in Table 6-Table 7.

Table 6 Frequency Distribution based on sense of community

Independent variable		Frequency	%	Valid %	Cumulative %
Impact on sense of community	yes	66	16.5	16.5	16.5
	no	334	83.5	83.5	100.0
Total		400	100.0	100.0	

Table 7 Frequency Distribution based on sense of community impact level

Independent variable	Frequency	%	Valid %	Cumulative %
Impact level ^a very negative	1	.3	.3	.3
more negative	4	1.0	1.0	1.3
neutral	40	10.0	10.0	11.3
positive	348	87.0	87.0	98.3
more positive	4	1.0	1.0	99.3
	3	.8	.8	100.0
Total	400	100.0	100.0	

Note: ^a7 points Scale from -3= very negative impact to +3 very positive impact

In relation to sense of community, 83.5 % of respondents' agreement that sporting event have no impact on sense of community, although 16.5 % of respondents perceived impact on sense of community. However, the majority of them, 87.0 % agreed that the sporting events impact on sense of community are neutral level. Fourth, we explored the perception of community pride variable. The residents were asked: "Do you think sporting events affected your pride in your community?" After that, "If yes, please rate this impact on the scale below by circling the appropriate number. This item come with 7 points rating scale from very negative impact (-3) to very positive impact (+3). Respondents' perceptions in terms of community pride is presented in Table 8-9.

Table 8. Frequency Distribution based on community pride

Independent variable	Frequency	%	Valid %	Cumulative %
Impact on community pride yes	82	20.5	20.5	20.5
no	318	79.5	79.5	100.0
Total	400	100.0	100.0	

Table 9. Frequency Distribution Based on community pride impact level

Independent variable	Frequency	%	Valid %	Cumulative %
Impact level ^a very negative	2	.5	.5	.5
negative	23	5.8	5.8	6.3
neutral	343	85.8	85.8	92.0
positive	14	3.5	3.5	95.5
more positive	10	2.5	2.5	98.0
very positive	8	2.0	2.0	100.0
Total	400	100.0	100.0	

Note: ^a7 points Scale from -3= very negative impact to +3 very positive impact

In relation to community pride, 79.5 % of respondents' agreement that sporting event have no impact on community pride, although 20.5 % of respondents perceived impact on community pride. However, the majority of them, 85.8 % agreed that the sporting events impact on community pride are neutral level.

Results and Discussion

The socio-demographic profiles of respondents almost 57 % are female and 43 % are male. Concerning the age of the respondents, the majority of them (54.3 %) are between

20-29 years old. Another important segment, representing almost 25 % is aged between 30 and 39. Those that are under 20 years old represent 10.8 %. There are 7.5 % of respondents in the 40-49 age group. Seniors (up to 50 years old) represent a small percentage (2.4 %). In relation to awareness of sport event news, 54.5 % of respondents perceived the news and 45.5 % did not perceive. The researcher found that sporting event created both positive and negative impacts. The findings were identified as seven main positive impacts.

1. Sporting events provide a recreational opportunity for the community.
2. Sporting events offer stadium/sporting venue and infrastructures development.
3. Sporting events lead to community the technological progress and better productivity in the economy of host community.
4. Sporting events as form of entertainment; provide relaxation, bring people in the community together, people enjoy events, and good for health.
5. Sporting events bring the economic growth to community.
6. Sporting events as well as infrastructure development promote job creation.
7. Sporting events boosts the expenditure and promotes an increase in retail trade

The findings were identified as four main positive impacts; recreational, venue and infrastructures development, entertainment, and economic benefits, different from. Fredline (2005), Ohmann et al. (2006), and Bull and Lovell (2007) explored sense of community as a positive impact.

The findings were identified as six main negative impacts.

1. Sporting events increase heavy traffic jam.
2. Sporting events bring inconvenient for transportation.
3. Sporting events bring overcrowding.
4. Sporting events bring disruptions in the normal life of the residents.
5. Sporting events lead to local community displacement.
6. Sporting events increase noise pollution, air pollution, and too much garbage.

The residents thought sporting events effect environment, nevertheless, they did not mentioned cultural impacts. Different from Fredline (2005); Higham (1999); Ohmann et al., (2006) identified poor fan behavior and crime. In relation to personal quality of life, 82.3 % of respondents' agreement that sporting event have no impact on their personal quality of life, although 17.8 % of respondents perceived impact on personal quality of their life. However, the majority of them, 85.3 % agree that the impact on quality of life are neutral level. In relation to quality of life of community, 77.3 % of respondents' agreement that sporting event have no impact on their personal quality of life, although 22.8 % of respondents perceived impact on quality of life of community. However, the majority of them, 81.3 % agreed that the sporting events impact on quality of life of community are neutral level. In relation to sense of community, 83.5 % of respondents' agreement that sporting event have no impact on sense of community, although 16.5 % of respondents perceived impact on sense of community. However, the majority of them, 87.0 % agreed that the sporting events impact on sense of community are neutral level. In relation to community pride, 79.5 % of respondents' agreement that sporting event have no impact on community pride, although 20.5 % of respondents perceived

impact on community pride. However, the majority of them, 85.8 % agreed that the sporting events impact on community pride are neutral level. As analyzing attend sporting event in year 2017, an interesting fact can be noticed: the vast majority (70.8 %) did not attend sporting event in this year. There are 29.3 % of respondents had attended sporting event in year 2017. Considering the attendance in previous years, 66 % of respondents did not attend sporting event in previous years. There are 34 % of respondents had attended sporting event in previous years. Regarding the interested in football event, an interesting fact can be noticed: the vast majority (29.5 %) interest in football event and follow when they can. There are 22.8 % of respondents are avid fan of football. There are 20.3 % of respondents were not interested in football but sometimes attend or watch football. There are 14.5 % of respondents were not particularly interested in football event but football is an enjoyable experience. A total of 13.% reported that they absolutely not interested in football.

Considering the involvement characteristics of surveyed respondents, 2.7 % of respondents work at football event in year 2017. There are 1.8 % of respondents are volunteer worker at football event in year 2017. There are 1.5 % of respondents had worked at football event (either paid or a volunteer) in previous years. There are 1 % of respondents work for or own a company that is involved with football events (e.g. supplied goods or services, sponsor). There are 1.8 % of respondents receive benefits in some way (e.g. rented a property to a visitor for the football events). There are 2 % of respondents work in other events. There are 2.5 % of respondents work in the hospitality industry. There are 1.3 % of respondents participate in football events as a competitor. There are five respondents are athletes. Mostly more than 94 % of respondents and household member were not involved in sporting events at Rajamangala National Stadium.

As analyzing proximity, an interesting fact can be noticed: the vast majority (36.3 %) live 1-5 km from Rajamangala National Stadium. There are 22.3 % of respondents live more than 15 km from Rajamangala National Stadium. There are 18.8 % of respondents live within 1 km from Rajamangala National Stadium. Considering the distance 6-10 km from Rajamangala National Stadium, 14.8 % of respondents stayed at this area. There are 8 % of respondents live 11-15 km from Rajamangala National Stadium.

Higham (1999), Fredline (2005), Preuss and Solberg (2006), Ohmann et al. (2006), and Bull and Lovell (2007) explained all identified social impacts that might occur as resultants of sporting events as following:

Positive impacts

1. Developing cross-cultural partnerships.
2. Development of skills among planners.
3. Enhanced country pride.
4. Enhanced international recognition of region and values.
5. Enhance national identity.
6. Enhanced national pride
7. Enhanced resident pride
8. Festival/fun atmosphere

9. Future use of new facilities
10. Heritage preservation
11. Impacts on sport
12. Improved interethnic relationships
13. Improved leisure facilities
14. Improved local infrastructure
15. Increased awareness of non-local perceptions.
16. Increased community spirit.
17. International understanding.
18. More cultural events.
19. More entertainment opportunities.
20. More shopping opportunities.
21. Opportunity for family togetherness.
22. Self-actualization.
23. Sport/health promotion.
24. Strengthening of local values and traditions.
25. Unique/interesting event.

Negative impacts

1. Changes in community structure.
2. Commercialization of activities which may be of a personal or private nature.
3. Congestion/overcrowding.
4. Corruption.
5. Culture shock.
6. Dislocation of local residents.
7. Disruption of local lifestyle.
8. Distortion of true nature of event to reflect elite values.
9. Fan delinquency.
10. Heritage destruction.
11. Increased in (organized) crime.
12. Increased housing/apartment rent.
13. Increased housing/apartment prices.
14. Increased interethnic tensions.
15. Infrastructural congestion.
16. Legitimizing of ideology and Sociocultural reality.
17. Locals avoid places frequented by fans.
18. Misunderstandings leading to varying degrees of host/ visitor hostility.
19. Modification of nature of event or activity to accommodate tourism.
20. Prostitution increase.
21. Reductions of psychological well-being due to perceived loss of control over local environment.
22. Road closures.
23. Suppression of human rights.
24. Tendency toward defensive attitudes concerning host region.
25. Unused facilities.

26. Use of event to legitimate unpopular decisions.

Future research

The directions for future sporting events research on environmental studies: impact and evaluation studies including: sustainability and greening of sporting events such as reducing garbage. More research on consequences of sporting events effect local culture community.

Acknowledgement

Grateful acknowledgement is here made to Faculty of Business Administration and Accountancy, Khon Kaen University. This work would not have reached its present form without their supports.

Reference

- ALBA COLOMBO. (2016). How to evaluate cultural impacts of events? A model and methodology proposal. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*. 16:4, 500-511.
- ANDREA COLLINS, CALVIN JONES, AND MAX MUNDAY. (2009). Assessing the environmental impacts of mega sporting events: Two options? *Tourism Management*. Vol.30. pp.828-837.
- BULL, C. AND LOVELL, J. (2007). The impact of hosting major sporting events on local residents: an analysis of the views and perceptions of Canterbury residents in relation to the Tour de France 2007. *Journal of Sport & Tourism*. Vol.12 No.3-4. Pp.229-248.
- FREDLINE, E. (2005). Host and guest relations and sport tourism. *Sport in Society*. Vol. 8 No.2. pp. 263-279.
- FREDLINE, E., JAGO, L. AND DEERY, M. (2005), *Host Community Perceptions of the Impacts of the Australian Formula One Grand Prix*, Melbourne: a comparison of resident reactions in 1999 with 2002, Sustainable Tourism CRC, Gold Coast.
- FREDLINE, E., RAYBOULD, M., JAGO, L. AND DEERY, M. (2004). *Triple bottom line evaluation: progress toward a technique to assist in planning and managing an event in a sustainable manner*, in MacLennan, R. (Ed.), *Proceedings of Tourism: State of the Art II International Scientific Conference*, University of Strathclyde, Glasgow, 27-30 June, University of Strathclyde, Glasgow.
- GETZ, D. (2009). Policy for sustainable and responsible festivals and events: institutionalization of a new paradigm. *Journal of Policy Research in Tourism, Leisure and Events*, Vol. 1 No.1, pp. 61-78.
- GUIZZARDI, ANDREA; MARIANI, MARCELLO; PRAYAG, GIRISH, (2017). Environmental impacts and certification: evidence from the Milan World Expo 2015. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*. Bradford 29.3. pp. 1052-1071.
- HARRIS, R. AND HUYSKENS, M. (2002). *Public events: can they make a contribution to ecological sustainability*. Paper presented to Annual Council of Australian Tourism and Hospitality Educators' Conference, Fremantle, WA, 6-9 February.
- HEDE, A. (2007). Managing special events in the new era of the triple bottom line. *Event Management*, Vol.11. Nos 1/2 , pp. 13-22.
- Higham, J. (1999), Sport as an avenue of tourism development: an analysis of the positive and negative impacts of sport tourism. **Current Issues in Tourism**. Vol. 2 No. 1. Pp. 82-90.
- LJUDEVIT PRANIC, LIDIJA PETRIC AND LILJANA CETINIC. (2012). Host population perceptions of the social impacts of sport tourism events in transition countries. Evidence from Croatia. *International Journal of Event and Festival Management*. Vol. 3 No. 3, pp. 236-256.

- OHMANN, S., JONES, I. AND WILKES, K. (2006). The perceived social impacts of the 2006 Football World Cup on Munich residents. *Journal of Sport & Tourism*. Vol. 11 No.2. pp.129-152.
- PHILIP XIE AND ANDY SINWALD. (2016). Perceived impacts of special events by organizers: a qualitative approach. *International Journal of Event and Festival Management*. Vol. 7 No.1. pp. 50-65.
- PREUSS, H. AND SOLBEG, H.A. (2006). Attracting major sporting events: the role of local residents. *European Sport Management Quarterly*. Vol. 6 No. 4. Pp.391-411.
- SHERWOOD, P. (2007). *A triple bottom line evaluation of the impact of special events: the development of indicators*, unpublished doctoral dissertation, Victoria University, Melbourne, Victoria.
- SMARANDA COSMA, MARIUS BOTA, CRISTINA FLESERIU, ADINA NEGRUSA, VALENTIN TOADER, AND ROZALIA VERONICA RUS. (2016). Some considerations regarding motivations and overall perceptions on film festivals. *Contemporary Approaches and Challenges of Tourism Sustainability*. Vol.18. Special Issue No.10. pp.929-943.
- WACKERNAGEL, M. AND REES, W. (1996). *Our Ecological Footprint: Reducing Human Impact on the Earth*. Gabriola Island, BC and Philadelphia, PA: New Series.