

# Residents' Perceptions of Sports Tourism Impacts: Host Provinces Perspective of Sporting Events in Thailand

*Sirinkaanta Pongprasert*

Faculty of Sports Science, Chulalongkorn University, Thailand

E-mail: sirinkaanta.p@gmail.com

*Sombat Karnjanakit*

Faculty of Sports Science, Chulalongkorn University, Thailand

E-mail: sombatkarn@hotmail.com

## Article History

**Received:** 4 March 2019

**Revised:** 18 March 2019

**Accepted:** 19 March 2019

## Abstract

The purpose of this study is to examine Thai residents' perceptions towards the sports tourism impacts. A total of 1,104 useful questionnaires selected residents from Bangkok/Chiang Mai/Chonburi/ Nakhon Ratchasima/Phuket were analyzed. An original sports tourism impacts scale comprising 23 items was purified by exploratory factor analysis, revealing 21 impacts items with four impact factors: cultural, environmental and social benefits, cultural, social, and economic costs, economic benefits, and environment deterioration. It was found that four factors which explained 59.96% of variance in residents' perceptions were both benefits and costs. The findings of this study can be used as valuable information for realizing how residents perceive the impacts of sports tourism, and consequently government/related organizations should consider.

**Keywords:** Sports Tourism, Sporting events, Residents' Perceptions, Sports Tourism Impacts

## Introduction

One of the fastest growing sector in the tourism industry is sports tourism, which is illustrated as travel associated with sporting events either passively or actively and/or physical activities (Gibson, 1998; Hall, 1992; Hritz and Ross, 2010; Roche, Spake, and Joseph, 2013; Standeven and De Knop, 1999). Mega sporting events increase dramatically the tourists in the year of the event by roughly 8% in the same year (Fourie and Santana-Gallego, 2011). Because sports and tourism complement and add value to each other, sports tourism generates income for local communities that stage a sporting event. Additionally, sports tourism has a positive effect on local culture (Standeven and De Knop, 1999). Such tourists spend money not only on the event but also on transportation, lodging, food, recreation and other activities, injecting money into the local economy (Yu, 2010). And due to the interaction occurring between activities, people and settings, sports tourism also positively effects the social, economic, cultural and environmental aspects of that locality (Hritz and Ross, 2010; Weed and Bull, 2004).

Sports tourism is a worldwide trend, and Thailand is no exception. Drawing both professional and amateur sports participants and observers, Thailand is a major world sports tourism destination. Bangkok, Thailand's capital city, has hosted international sporting events including the first South East Asian Peninsula (SEAP) Games, the ASIAN Games (1966, 1970, 1978 and 1998). Bangkok has been the host of the most ASIAN Games events in Asia,

and was also a five-time host of the South East Asian Games. In 1977 the South East Asian Peninsula Games was renamed to the South East Asian Games, adding the Philippines and Indonesia to country participants. Since then, Bangkok has hosted the SEA games in 1995 and 2007 (Karnjanakit and Samahito, 2007). National sporting events such as The Thai League (T1) is a Thai Professional League for Football Association of Thailand club, take place in different locations depending on which teams/clubs are playing or which province is hosting. T1 is popular in Thailand, which has attracted football fans continuously. More than 62 million baht (approximately \$US 1.9 million) that were revenues for twice a T1 season with approximately 1.9 million spectators (sport mthai, 2016). The other of the undeniably popular sporting events in Thailand is running (TAT news, 2017). Running is social sport activity for all health and fitness people to participate. Events are held whole year such as marathon, mini marathon, and triathlon. The route takes runners past cities, multiple local landmarks, cultural attractions, and natural settings. The Top 10 running events in Thailand for sport tourists/participants are 1) The Chombueng Marathon, Ratchaburi 2) The Chiang Mai University Marathon, Chiang Mai 3) The inaugural Bangkok Midnight Marathon, Bangkok 4) The Laguna Phuket International Marathon, Phuket 5) The Pattaya Marathon, Chonburi 6) The Bangkok Marathon, Bangkok 7) The Foremost Ironman 70.3 Thailand, Phuket 8) The Ayutthaya Marathon, Ayutthaya 9) The Khon Kaen International Marathon, Khon Kaen, and 10) The Khao Yai Trail Marathon, Nakhon Ratchasima, respectively (TAT news, 2017). Moreover, the Laguna Phuket International Marathon is the most popular and longest triathlons in Asia with more than 1,100 participants, more than 40 countries around the world and more than 74 million baht (approximately \$US 2.2 million) spending sports tourism segments for Phuket (Lagunaphuket, 2016).

At present, sports tourism in Thailand is progressed and supported by the Sports Authority of Thailand (SAT) as well as the Tourism Authority of Thailand (TAT). Both organizations promote Thailand as the ultimate destination for sport tourism in Asia (TAT news, 2016). Sports tourists travel to Thailand for historic Thai kickboxing (Muay Thai), running/marathons, biking, golf, football, diving and snorkeling, all boom sporting activities in Thailand. Whether professional or amateur athletes or sport fans or simply outdoor adventure lovers, Thailand attracts both Thais and international tourists to numerous sporting events 12 months a year.

According to studies, sports tourism is broadly defined as traveling to a destination to participate in or attend a professional, amateur or recreational sports competition or event. Professional and recreational sports have always enjoyed domestic support in Thailand, and both sectors are seeing an increase of tourists who are coming to Thailand primarily to participate in or observe sporting events or activities. While sports tourism is an upward trend and economic boom for Thailand, many Thai residents are unaware of the positive impact the sports tourism phenomenon is having on their home towns and nation. As researchers, we aim to investigate how local residents perceive sports tourism impacts.

## **Literature Review**

Sports tourism is a phenomenon that binds Sports and Tourism together. It is a remarkable segment among countries. Over the past two decades, while each scholar defines sports tourism somewhat differently, Hall (1992) explains about sports tourism as travelling for non-commercial reasons to participate in or observe sporting activities away from the home range. Gibson (1998) discusses about sports and travelling as leisure-based travel which may take individuals temporarily outside of their home communities to participate in physical activities, to watch physical activities, or to venerate attractions associated with physical activity. Also, Standeven and De Knop (1999) identify sports as associated with tourism; it is “all form of active and passive involvement in sporting activity, participated in casually or in

an organized way for non-commercial or business/commercial reasons that necessitates travel away from home and the work locality". Weed and Bull (2004) point out sports tourists are divided into two groups: people who travel to participate in sports competitions and people who travel to use particular facilities or resources which may not be available to them in their own locality.

As mentioned above, their definitions are quite similar in general. However, for the purpose of this study, sports tourism refers to travel which involves either passively or actively in a sporting event.

Sports tourism is the other types of tourism (Hritz and Ross, 2010). And, sports tourism impacts are no different from other tourism impacts because there are both positive and negative influences of tourism (Higham, 2005). Past research has examined the perceived sports tourism-mega sporting events-impacts by local residents. On the positive side, studies report that hosting of mega events creates more jobs and increases employment opportunities, attracts more investments to local community, gives economic benefits to local residents and small business, brings community closer, provides residents a chance to meet new people, increases residents' pride among local residents, helps local residents and tourists to understand other cultures, provides more facilities, other recreational areas, infrastructure or public transportation, and restores in the host city and surrounding areas. Nevertheless, on the negative side, studies report that hosting of mega events increases cost of living, leads to increase tax rates for local residents, increases prices of goods and services, increases the crime rate, leads to overcrowding of local facilities, damages the natural environment, increases traffic congestion, increases environmental pollution, and more litters (Hinch and de la Barre, 2005; Hritz and Ross, 2010; Kim et al., 2015; Prayag et al., 2013; Ritchie et al., 2009; Zhou and Ap, 2009).

For instance, Hritz and Ross (2010) in their research on the Indianapolis residents perceived impacts on sports tourism found that Indianapolis residents perceived both positive-negative impacts, but perceived positive impacts mostly such as negative impacts: sports tourism increased crime rate and led to residents suffer; economic benefits: sports tourism increased economic benefits for locals and small business and created more jobs for residents; social benefits: sports tourism increased positive cultural identity and encouraged cultural activities; and environmental benefits: sports tourism created more parks and recreation areas and restored historical buildings and preserved the areas, respectively.

Also, Prayag et al. (2013) in their research on the 2012 London Summer Olympic Games found that London residents perceived significantly several positive-negative impacts equally such as positive socio-cultural impacts: the games strengthened local community bonds and brought community closer; negative socio-cultural impacts: the games disrupted residents quality of life and increased crime; positive environmental impacts: the game stimulated planning and administrative controls and improved environmental conservation and protectionism; negative environmental impacts: the game increased noise pollution and damaged the natural environment; positive economic impacts: the games promoted London as a tourist destination and increased business opportunities; and negative economic impacts: the game increased tax rates for London residents, respectively.

Furthermore, Kim et al. (2015) in their research on formula one Korean Grand Prix (F1 Korean GP) found that Korean residents perceived varies positive-negative impacts equally such as community development: the event increased the understanding of the other cultures and societies of visitors and increased interest in international sports events; enhanced media visibility; community pride: the event enhanced the sense of being a part of community and provided an incentive for the preservation of the local culture; economic benefits: the event improved economic conditions and increased leisure facilities; traffic problems: the event increased hardship for finding parking spaces and resulted traffic congestion; security risks;

the event increased risk of cyber-attack and terrorists; and economic costs: the event spent on the new infrastructure, and building the Korean International Circuit excessively, respectively.

Based on the mentioned issues, the past studies reported mega sporting events impacts into positive and negative perceptions. The reason why this research has to examine local residents' perceptions towards the sports tourism impacts because sporting events in Thailand is a new phenomenon during the past two decades. Specifically, studies on host perceptions - local residents-will provide an opportunity to better understand the impacts of sports tourism, assist government bodies, related organizations, or local residents, and other stakeholders, gain better benefits, and plan for sports tourism development in the future.

## Method

**Survey instrument:** For this study, a survey questionnaire used to measure respondents' demographics, sports interests, and perceptions towards sports tourism impacts. The section of residents' perceptions towards sports tourism impacts, these questions were represented by 23 items of sports tourism impacts scale that contained statements assessing residents' perceptions of sports tourism impacts in term of economic, social, cultural, and environmental impacts, which were assessed by the questions, "How do you perceive sports tourism impacts ?". The questions were adapted from studies conducted by Chen (2001), Yoon, Gursoy, and Chen (2001), Gursoy, Jurowski, and Uysal (2002), Ko and Stewart (2002), Fredline (2004), Gursoy and Rutherford (2004), McGehee and Andereck (2004), Hinch and de la Barre (2005), Dyer, Gursoy, Sharma, and Carter (2007), Sánchez, Mejía, and Bueno (2009), Ritchie et al. (2009), Zhou and Ap (2009), Hritz and Ross (2010), Nunkoo and Gursoy (2012), Lee (2013), and Prayag et al. (2013). The questionnaire utilized a checklist with a 5-Rating scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

**Sites and Participants:** The area of Bangkok, Chiang Mai, Chonburi, Nakhon Ratchasima and Phuket, which represented 5 regions around Thailand, was selected as the research sites for this study due to their hosting of international sporting events such as the Southeast Asian Games (SEA), Asian Games or other significant national sporting events such as Thai league, running events (as shown in Figure 1).

The target population was composed of 18-year-old or older residents in the metropolitan area of Bangkok, Chiang Mai, Chonburi, Nakhon Ratchasima and Phuket. The number of surveys distributed to each province was determined using a sample size table (Krejcie and Morgan, 1970) which estimated the necessary sample size required to adequately represent the population size of residents in each province. The questionnaires were distributed by hand to 1,920 residents by the researcher and research assistants. Data collection took place over a six-month period (June 2014 to December 2014). From the 1,920 questionnaires distributed, 1,104 responses (57.50% response rate) were collected and coded for data analysis.



**Figure 1** Sampling research sites in Thailand

**Data Analysis:** To complete descriptive statistics of the respondents' demographics, sports interests, and perceptions towards sports tourism impacts, Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 21 was utilized. Frequencies and percentages were completed to describe the demographic characteristics, and sports tourism interests. Means and standard deviation (S.D.) were completed to describe the sports tourism impacts perception of the sample.

In the factor analysis, to reduce the 23 impact attributes assessing residents' perceptions of sports tourism impacts, exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was performed. A principle component analysis with varimax rotation was used to extract the underlying impact factors. To determine the appropriateness of factor analysis, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sample adequacy and Bartlett's test of sphericity were utilized. KMO values were greater than 0.8, which reveals that these variables were acceptable for factor analysis. The communality statistics were calculated, and factors with an eigenvalue greater than 1 were used for factor inclusion. In order to ensure that each factor identified by EFA had only one dimension and each attributes loaded only on one factor, attributes that had a factor loading of lower than 0.4 were eliminated from the analysis (Blunch, 2008; Kitnuntaviwat and Tang, 2008; Tabachnick and Fidell, 2001). The internal consistency of each factors was evaluated through reliability analysis (Cronbach's coefficient alpha) greater than 0.7 was acceptable (Nunnally, 1978).

## Results

As described in Table 1, the results of the descriptive analysis of the socio-demographic information indicated that of the analyzed sample ( $N = 1,104$ ; 57.50% response rate), 54.2% of the respondents were female. In terms of their highest level of education, 53.2% of the respondents graduated with a bachelor's degree, while 41.7% of respondents had lived in their province for over 20 years. Furthermore, 80.7% of survey respondents liked to play sports, while 83.3% enjoying watching sporting events.

**Table 1** Demographic characteristics of residents

Items		Frequency	%
<b>Name of province</b>			
	Bangkok (384)	283	25.64
	Chiang Mai (384)	225	20.38
	Chonburi (384)	214	19.38
	Nakhon Ratchasima (384)	208	18.84
	Phuket (384)	174	15.76
	Total	1,104	57.50
<b>Gender</b>			
	Male	506	45.83
	Female	598	54.17
<b>Education</b>			
	less than a Bachelor degree	298	26.99
	Bachelor degrees	587	53.17
	Master degrees	187	16.94
	Doctoral degrees	22	1.99
	Other	10	0.91
<b>Length of residency in the province</b>			
	less than or equal to 5 years	195	17.66
	6-10 years	218	19.75
	11-15 years	110	9.96
	16-20 years	121	10.96
	more than 20 years	460	41.67
<b>Do you like playing sports?</b>			
	Yes	891	80.71
	No	134	12.13
	Uncertain	79	7.16
<b>Do you like watching sports?</b>			
	Yes	920	83.33
	No	94	8.52
	Uncertain	90	8.15

The results in Table 2, illustrate the residents' perceptions of the sports tourism impacts. Residents generally perceived sports tourism impacts at a high level. The average of "Enhanced reputation through world media" was the highest (4.27), followed by "Increase revenue of sports tourists" (4.24), "Create more jobs and more opportunity" (4.17), respectively, and "Create negative effect on the local culture" (2.88) was the lowest.

**Table 2** Residents' Perceptions towards the Sports Tourism Impacts

Items	Mean	S.D.	Interpretations
1. Create more jobs and more opportunity	4.17	0.736	High
2. Increase revenue of sports tourists	4.24	0.734	High
3. Attracted more investment to the community	4.01	0.775	High
(4. Sports tourism has led to regeneration and redevelopment of town and cities	4.08	0.739	High
5. Enhanced reputation through world media	4.27	0.710	High
6. Improve quality of life	3.95	0.806	High
7. Residents meet new people	4.08	0.733	High

**Table 2** (Con.)

<b>Items</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>S.D.</b>	<b>Interpretations</b>
8. Encouraged a variety of cultural activities by the local residents	4.00	0.705	High
9. More culture exchange between sports tourists and residents	3.97	0.734	High
10. Create positive impact on the cultural identity of the community	3.94	0.768	High
11. Sports event become popular	3.96	0.724	High
12. Improve the appearance of area	3.92	0.754	High
13. Sports tourism has led to improve living utilities infrastructure such as supply of water, electricity, roading, etc.	4.11	0.694	High
14. Provided incentives for restoration of historical buildings	3.91	0.763	High
15. The prices of goods and services have increased because of sports tourism	3.76	0.940	High
16. Increasing cost of living	3.56	0.985	High
17. Local residents have suffered from living in sports tourism destination areas	3.25	1.035	Moderate
18. Increase the crime rate	2.99	1.123	Moderate
19. Create negative effect on the local culture	2.88	1.068	Moderate
20. Change in traditional culture	3.08	1.034	Moderate
21. Unpleasantly over crowded beaches, hiking, trails, parks, and leisure spaces	3.58	0.883	High
22. Construction of hotels and sports tourists facilities has destroy the nature environment	3.54	0.912	High
23. Led to traffic congestion, more litter, increase environmental pollution	3.60	0.975	High
<b>Total</b>	<b>3.78</b>	<b>0.447</b>	<b>High</b>

**Note:** a 5-Rating scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

To reduce items and identify factors by exploratory factor analysis (EFA), 23 impact items were examined by principle component analysis (PCA) with varimax rotation. Items with a factor loading of lower than 0.4 were eliminated. Two items did not meet the factor loading criteria and were excluded (“sports tourism has led to regeneration and redevelopment of town and cities” and “the prices of goods and services have increased because of sports tourism”).

After the adjustments (as shown in Table 3), the result of EFA revealed four factors which were derived from 21 items with each factor containing 3 to 10 items which explained 59.96% of the variance. To test the appropriateness of the factor analysis, two measures were used. First, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) was 0.893 which was the acceptable range. Secondly, the Bartlett's test of sphericity was 12,425.239, significant at  $p = 0.000$  which showed a significant correlation among the variables (Hair, Anderson, Tatham and Black, 1998). The internal consistency of each factor was examined through reliability analysis (Cronbach's coefficient alpha), improved ranged from 0.77 to 0.90.

Factor 1 contained ten impact items with the highest eigenvalue (6.953) and greatest variance (30.23%). The items included “more culture exchange between sports tourists and residents”; “encouraged a variety of cultural activities by the local residents”; “create positive impact on the cultural identity of the community”; “sports event become popular”; “improve the

appearance of area”; “provided incentives for restoration of historical buildings”; “improve quality of life”; “residents meet new people”; “sports tourism has led to improve living utilities infrastructure such as supply of water, electricity, roading, etc.”; and “enhanced reputation through world media”. These ten items were related to positive cultural, environmental, social impacts, and therefore were named “cultural, environmental and social benefits”.

Factor 2 comprised five impact items with an eigenvalue of 3.997 and accounted for 17.38% of the variance. The items included “create negative effect on the local culture”; “change in traditional culture”; “increase the crime rate”; “local residents have suffered from living in sports tourism destination areas”; and “increasing cost of living”. These five items were related to negative cultural, social, economic impacts, and therefore were named “cultural, social, and economic costs”.

Factor 3 comprised three impact items with an eigenvalue of 1.635 and accounted for 7.11% of the variance. The items included “increase revenue of sports tourists”; “create more jobs and more opportunity”; and “attracted more investment to the community”. These three items were related to positive economic impacts, and therefore were named “economic benefits”.

Factor 4 was the fourth and final factor, which comprised three impact items with an eigenvalue of 1.206 and accounted for 5.24% of the variance. The item included “construction of hotels and sports tourists facilities has destroy the nature environment”; “led to traffic congestion, more litter, increase environmental pollution”; and “unpleasantly over crowded beaches, hiking, trails, parks, and Unpleasantly over crowded beaches, hiking, trails, parks, and leisure spaces”. These three items were related to negative environmental impacts, and therefore were named “environment deterioration”.

**Table 3** Factor Analysis Results with Varimax Rotation of Residents’ Perceptions towards the Sports Tourism Impacts

	F1	F2	F3	F4	Mean	Communality
<b>Factor 1: Cultural, Environmental and Social Benefits<sup>a</sup></b>						
1. More culture exchange between sports tourists and residents	0.767			3.97	0.603	
2. Encouraged a variety of cultural activities by the local residents	0.763			4.00	0.611	
3. Create positive impact on the cultural identity of the community	0.739			3.94	0.565	
4. Sports event become popular	0.696			3.96	0.510	
5. Improve the appearance of area	0.692			3.92	0.522	
6. Provided incentives for restoration of historical buildings	0.656			3.91	0.546	
7. Improve quality of life	0.621			3.95	0.523	
8. Residents meet new people	0.619			4.08	0.519	
9. Sports tourism has led to improve living utilities infrastructure such as supply of water, electricity, roading, etc.	0.565			4.11	0.613	
10. Enhanced reputation through world media	0.546			4.27	0.562	
<b>Factor 2: Cultural, Social, and Economic Costs<sup>a</sup></b>						
1. Create negative effect on the local culture	0.777			2.88	0.692	
2. Change in traditional culture	0.752			3.08	0.640	

**Table 3** (Con.)

	<b>F1</b>	<b>F2</b>	<b>F3</b>	<b>F4</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Communality</b>
3. Increase the crime rate	0.749				2.99	0.647
4. Local residents have suffered from living in sports tourism destination areas	0.701				3.25	0.558
5. Increasing cost of living	0.690				3.56	0.673
<b>Factor 3: Economic Benefits<sup>a</sup></b>						
1. Increase revenue of sports tourists		0.769			4.24	0.712
2. Create more jobs and more opportunity		0.724			4.17	0.633
3. Attracted more investment to the community		0.702			4.01	0.613
<b>Factor 4: Environment Deterioration<sup>a</sup></b>						
1. Construction of hotels and sports tourists facilities has destroy the nature environment			0.734	3.54	0.684	
2. Led to traffic congestion, more litter, increase environmental pollution			0.731	3.60	0.666	
3. Unpleasantly over crowded beaches, hiking, trails, parks, and leisure spaces			0.640	3.58	0.574	
<b>Eigenvalue</b>	6.953	3.997	1.635	1.206		
<b>Variance explained (%)</b>	30.23	17.38	7.11	5.24		59.96 <sup>b</sup>
<b>Cronbach's alpha</b>	0.90	0.84	0.78	0.77		
<b>Number of items</b>	10	5	3	3		

**Notes:** <sup>a</sup> Extraction method: principle component analysis (PCA) with varimax rotation.

<sup>b</sup> Total variance explained by residents = 59.96%

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) = 0.893, Bartlett's test of sphericity:  $\chi^2 = 12,425.239$ , df = 253, p = 0.000

## Discussion

The purpose of this study is to examine Thai residents' perceptions towards the sports tourism impacts. The data was collected from June 2014 to January 2015. Of all the questionnaires collected, 1,104 questionnaires (57.5%) were suitable for analysis. The survey study revealed that respondents were of both genders, aged over 18 and residents of Bangkok, Chiang Mai, Chonburi, Nakhon Ratchasima and Phuket, all of which are tourist destinations. These areas are used to host both national sporting events (such as the National Games and the Football Thai Premier League) as well as international sporting events such as the Asian Games and the SEA Games. The hosted sporting events related to tourism included marathons, triathlons, rock climbing and water sports (surfing, jet skiing, white water rafting, etc.), Thai boxing (or "Muay Thai"), golfing and paragliding. The residents of these provinces were therefore the best representatives for this study.

The number of females who participated in this study was significantly higher than the number of males, with the majority of the respondents graduates with a bachelor degree. The majority of length of residency was more than 20 years. Both male and female respondents enjoyed both playing and watching sports.

Based on sports tourism impacts, Cronbach's reliability test resulted in an alpha score of 0.89 among the 23 impact items was preferable. This finding suggests good reliability for sports tourism impacts scale with 23 items.

Overall, this study revealed that residents' perceptions of sports tourism impacts were at a high level. Interestingly, the sports tourism impacts statements outlined in Table 2 illustrate the highest average of residents' perception towards sports tourism impacts was "Enhanced reputation through world media", followed by "Increase revenue of sports tourists", "Create more jobs and more opportunity", respectively, the lowest average was "Create negative effect on the local culture".

The exploratory factor analysis identified four factors explaining 59.96% of the total variance: cultural, environmental and social benefits, cultural, social, and economic costs, economic benefits, and environment deterioration (as shown in Table 3). Regarding internal consistency, these four factors showed satisfactory Cronbach's coefficient alpha scores (Nunnally, 1978), ranging from 0.77 to 0.90. This implies that the sports tourism impacts scale could be described best by these four impact factors, which comprised 21 impact items. For this study, the four factors revealed the residents perceived both positive and negative sports tourism impacts with each, therefore positive factors are "cultural, environmental and social benefits" and "economic benefits" and negative factors are "economic costs" and "environment deterioration". This supports the findings of Chen (2001) reported that residents perceived positive and negative impact factors, which split into economic benefits, social costs, cultural enrichment and environmental deterioration. Also, Hritz and Ross (2010) revealed impact factors were social costs (negative impacts), economic benefits, social benefits and environmental benefits. Moreover, Prayag et al. (2013) identified positive and negative for each impact factors, such as positive socio-cultural impacts, negative socio-cultural impacts, positive environmental impacts, negative environmental impacts, positive economic impacts, and negative economic impacts.

Uniquely, the strong factor of this study is the first factor, which is cultural, environmental and social benefits, which has positively important impacts for residents because Thailand has hosted international sporting events such as SEA Games and Asian Games, such mega sporting events attracted various groups of people including athletes, staff and spectators from many countries. As hosting of mega sporting events, brings the local areas and country together, provides residents with opportunities exchange cultures with sports tourists or meet new people, encourages a variety of cultural activities (Hall, 1989; Zhou and Ap, 2009), improves the appearance of local area, restores host city (Prayag et al., 2013), provides incentives for historical buildings (Kim, Gursoy, and Lee, 2006). The same economic benefits increase revenue of sports tourists, create more jobs and more opportunity for local residents (Hritz and Ross, 2010; Prayag et al., 2013). However, the negative impacts are cultural, social, and economic costs or environment deterioration, which are likely to create negative effect on the local problems such as increase crime rate, destroy the nature environment, traffic congestion, increase environmental pollution, or over crowded leisure spaces (Hritz and Ross, 2010; Prayag et al., 2013).

## Conclusion

In the five provinces where sports tourism is currently on the upswing, Thai residents perceived sports tourism impacts at a high level. It can be concluded that residents perceived both positive and negative sports tourism impacts with each. Like "cultural, environmental and social benefits", "cultural, social, and economic costs", "economic benefits", and "environment deterioration", the Thai government should consider how residents perceive the impacts of sports tourism when allocating funds for related programs and sporting events. Additionally, the private sectors or related organizations can benefit by taking advantage of

Thai residents when do planning or holding professional, amateur or recreational sporting events, or by developing additional sports recreational opportunities in Thailand.

## Acknowledgements

The authors would like to express their sincere thanks to The Sports Science Chulalongkorn University Research Fund (under Grant 7/57) and the 90th Anniversary of Chulalongkorn University Fund (under Grant GCUGR11255725039D No. 37) for their financial assistance. We additionally thank the Faculty of Sports Science, Chulalongkorn University, who supported and encouraged this study.

## References

Blunch, N. 2008. **Introduction to Structural Equation Modelling using SPSS and AMOS** Wiltshire: SAGE Publications Ltd.

Chen, J. 2001. "Assessing and Visualizing Tourism Impacts from Urban Residents' Perspectives." **Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research** 25 (3): 235-250.

Dyer, P., Gursoy, D., Sharma, B., and Carter, J. 2007. "Structural modeling of resident perceptions of tourism and associated development on the Sunshine Coast, Australia." **Tourism Management** 28 (2): 409-422.

Fourie, J., and Santana-Gallego, M. 2011. "The impact of mega-sport events on tourist arrivals." **Tourism Management** 32 (6): 1364-1370.

Fredline, L. 2004. "Chapter 8 - Host Community Reactions to Motorsport Events: The Perception of Impact on Quality of Life." In B. Ritchie & D. Adair (eds.). **Sport Tourism Interrelationships, Impacts and Issues**. Clevedon: Cromwell Press.

Gibson, H. 1998. "Sport Tourism: A Critical Analysis of Research." **Sport Management Review** 1 (1): 45-76.

Gursoy, D., Jurowski, C., and Uysal, M. 2002. "Resident Attitudes: A Structural Modeling Approach." **Annals of Tourism Research** 29 (1): 79-105.

Gursoy, D. and Rutherford, D. 2004. "Host attitudes toward tourism: An Improved Structural Model." **Annals of Tourism Research** 31 (3): 495-516.

Hair, J., Anderson, R., Tatham, R., and Black, W. 1998. **Multivariate Data Analysis**. 5<sup>th</sup> ed. New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Hall, C. 1989. "The definition and analysis of hallmark tourist events." **GeoJournal** 19 (3): 263-268.

Hall, C. 1992. "Adventure, sport and health tourism." In W. B. & C. Hall (eds.). **Special Interest Tourism**. London: Belhaven Press, pp. 141-158.

Higham, J. 2005. "Chapter 2 - Introduction to sport tourism destination analysis." In J. Higham (ed.). **Sport Tourism Destinations**. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann, pp. 17-24.

Hinch, T., and de la Barre, S. 2005. "Chapter 19 - Culture, sport and tourism: The case of the Arctic Winter Games." In J. Higham (ed.). **Sport Tourism Destinations**. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann, pp. 260-273.

Hritz, N., and Ross, C. 2010. "The Perceived Impacts of Sport Tourism: An Urban Host Community Perspective." **Journal of Sport Management** 24 (2): 119-138.

Karnjanakit, S., and Samahito, S. 2007. "Thailand and the Asian Games: Coping with Crisis." In F. Hong (ed.). **Sport, Nationalism and Orientalism** New York: Taylor & Francis, pp. 37-45.

Kim, H., Gursoy, D., and Lee, S. 2006. "The impact of the 2002 World Cup on South Korea: comparisons of pre- and post-games." **Tourism Management** 27 (1): 86-96.

Kim, W., Jun, H., Walker, M., and Drane, D. 2015. "Evaluating the perceived social impacts of hosting large-scale sport tourism events: Scale development and validation." **Tourism Management** 48: 21-32.

Kitnuntaviwat, V., and Tang, J. 2008. "Residents' Attitudes, Perception and Support for Sustainable Tourism Development." **Tourism and Hospitality Planning & Development** 5 (1): 45-60.

Ko, D. and Stewart, W. 2002. "A structural equation model of residents' attitudes for tourism development." **Tourism Management** 23 (5): 521-530.

Krejcie, R. and Morgan, D. 1970. "Determining Sample Size for Research Activities." **Educational and Psychological Measurement** 30 (3): 607-610.

Lagunaphuket. 2016. **2017 Laguna Phuket Triathlon's Date Announced.** Retrieved from [www.lagunaphukettri.com/2017-laguna-phuket-triathlons-date-announced](http://www.lagunaphukettri.com/2017-laguna-phuket-triathlons-date-announced).

Lee, T. H. 2013. "Influence analysis of community resident support for sustainable tourism development." **Tourism Management** 34: 37-46.

McGehee, N. and Andereck, K. 2004. "Factors Predicting Rural Residents' Support of Tourism." **Journal of Travel Research** 43 (2): 131-140.

Nunkoo, R. and Gursoy, D. 2012. "Residents' support for tourism: An Identity Perspective." **Annals of Tourism Research** 39 (1): 243-268.

Nunnally, J. 1978. **Psychometric Theory.** 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Orams, M. 2005. "Chapter 18 - Sport tourism and natural resource impacts." In H. James (ed.). **Sport Tourism Destinations** Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann, pp. 248-259.

Prayag, G., Hosany, S., Nunkoo, R., and Alders, T. 2013. "London residents' support for the 2012 Olympic Games: The mediating effect of overall attitude." **Tourism Management** 36: 629-640.

Ritchie, B., Shipway, R., and Cleeve, B. 2009. "Resident Perceptions of Mega-Sporting Events: A Non-Host City Perspective of the 2012 London Olympic Games." **Journal of Sport & Tourism** 14 (2): 143-167.

Roche, S., Spake, D., and Joseph, M. 2013. "A Model of Sporting Event Tourism as Economic Development." **Sport, Business and Management: An International Journal** 3 (2): 147-157.

Sánchez, A., Mejía, M., and Bueno, N. 2009. "Understanding Residents' Attitudes toward the Development of Industrial Tourism in a Former Mining Community." **Journal of Travel Research** 47 (3): 373-387.

Sport Mthai. 2016. **Football Thai.** Retrieved from [sport.mthai.com/football-thai/250257.html](http://sport.mthai.com/football-thai/250257.html).

Standeven, J. and De Knop, P. 1999. **Sport Tourism.** Illinois: Human Kinetics.

Tabachnick, B. and Fidell, L. 2001. **Using multivariate statistics.** 4<sup>th</sup> ed. New York: Harper & Row.

TAT news. 2016. **Thailand aims at becoming Asia's ultimate destination for sports tourism.** Retrieved from [www.tatnews.org/thailand-aims-at-becoming-asias-ultimate-destination-for-sports-tourism](http://www.tatnews.org/thailand-aims-at-becoming-asias-ultimate-destination-for-sports-tourism).

TAT news. 2017. **Top 10 running events in Thailand.** Retrieved from [www.tatnews.org/top-10-running-events-thailand](http://www.tatnews.org/top-10-running-events-thailand).

Weed, M. and Bull, C. 2004. **Sports tourism: participants, policy, and providers.** Oxford: Elsevier Butterworth-Heinemann.

Yoon, Y., Gursoy, D., and Chen, J. 2001. "Validating a tourism development theory with structural equation modelling." **Tourism Management** 22 (4): 363-372.

Yu, C. 2010. "Factors that Influence International Fans' Intention to Travel to the United States for Sport Tourism." **Journal of Sport & Tourism** 15 (2): 111-137.

Zhou, Y. and Ap, J. 2009. "Residents' Perceptions towards the Impacts of the Beijing 2008 Olympic Games." **Journal of Travel Research** 48 (1): 78-91.