Spor Bilimleri Araştırmaları Dergisi
Journal of Sport Sciences Research
Vol: 9, Issue: 3, 2024
E-ISSN: 2548-0723
URL: http://www.dergipark.org.tr/jssr

Analysis of the Relationships between Residents' Perceived Social Impacts of a Publicly Subsidized Multipurpose Facility and Behavioral Intentions

Wonyoung KIM[1*], Namhun LIM[2], Yong-Chae RHEE[3]

[1]Wichita State University, Wichita, USA
[2]Elizabeth City State University, Elizabeth City, USA
[3]Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond, USA

Research Article
DOI: 10.25307/jssr.1550357
Received: 16.09.2024 Accepted: 04.10.2024 Online Published: 31.10.2024

Abstract

Despite challenging economic conditions, municipalities have justified the utilization of public subsidies to build or renovate multipurpose sports facilities due to the lack of modern features and the aging of existing facilities. To secure public support for the utilization of public subsidies, promises are often made about the transformative potential of events and teams for the community. The current study aims to examine the relationship between residents' perceived social impact and their behavioral intentions regarding a newly developed multipurpose sports facility. The survey instrument was administered to assess residents' perceived social impacts related to the multipurpose sports facility as well as their behavioral attributes. The findings revealed that perceived social impacts such as community development and economic benefits significantly influenced the attendance of future sports and entertainment events as well as word-of-mouth on sports and entertainment events. Respondents' level of involvement and attendance in sports and entertainment events were significant predictors of positive behavioral intentions and word-of-mouth. Lastly, certain demographic variables indicated significant relationships with behavioral attributes. This study highlights the importance of understanding residents' perceived social impact concerning their behavioral attributes. The findings can be used by policymakers and administrators to plan and execute the facility development using public subsidies, aiming to reduce social conflicts and enhance social cohesion among residents.
Keywords: Perceived social impact, Sport facility development, Public subsidy

[*] **Corresponding Author:** Wonyoung Kim, Wichita State University, USA,
E-mail: wonyoung.kim@wichita.edu

INTRODUCTION

Over the years, there has been a significant influx of the development of sports facilities including arenas, stadiums, and multipurpose sports facilities in the United States (Smith & McCormick, 2024). Despite challenging economic conditions due to interest rate hikes and historic inflation in the United States, local and state governments continue to invest heavily in the construction of new and renovated sports facilities, with approximately $5.8 billion expected to be spent to complete them in 2024 for professional and college sports (Broughton, 2024). Smaller, mid-sized cities have embraced the trend of developing new facilities to attract professional sports organizations such as Minor League Baseball teams by using new downtown facility developments (Buckman & Pemberton, 2023). Local and national governments believe that the development of sports facilities ranging from regional sports and recreation facilities to large-scale sports and multipurpose facilities could produce critical benefits to residents and other stakeholders including enhancing residents' well-being, civic pride, the image of the community and residents, social cohesion, opportunities for entertainment and leisure activities while driving economic developments to the hosting communities (Kim et al., 2015). In other words, sports facility developments garner multi-dimensional benefits such as social, psychological, and economic values to the community and its stakeholders.

A crucial driver behind new facility developments is the aging of facilities that were built before the 2000s due to the lack of modern amenities and accommodations to meet the current demand of tenants, media, fans, and visitors. As a result of a higher demand for new or renovated sports facilities, over 280 stadium and arena projects are expected to be completed by 2025 in the U.S. which is capped with a record high of $31.4 billion in cost (Smith & McCormick, 2024). Moreover, the development of sports facilities often requires not only the facility developments to meet the needs of tenants and spectators but also the integration of mixed-use districts around sports facilities including housing, entertainment venues, and retail options for generating incremental revenue for owners or tenants of the facilities.

Nevertheless, flourishing facility developments come with a price of significant financial investment (Dehring et al., 2007). The development of multipurpose sports facilities has been sourced in various methods such as public financing (e.g., increased tax rates, selling public bonds, special taxes, etc.), private financing (e.g., mutual funds, personal funds, etc.), and mixed financing (Greenberg, 2004). Many multipurpose sports facilities built in the U.S. have used substantial public subsidies such as sales taxes, sin taxes, real estate investment trusts, and other forms of taxes to financially support new or renovated venues through debts which intensifies acrimony among the public (Santo & Mildner, 2010). Regional and national governments acknowledged that the development of new multipurpose sports facilities would bring a wide range of tangible and intangible benefits (e.g., income generation, increasing job opportunities, enhancing the image of the community, etc.) to residents and communities (Baade & Matheson; 2011; Ritchie & Aitken, 1985). However, most of the communities have experienced social conflicts among stakeholders including residents, politicians, and media due

to the substantial financial burden on the governments and residents. Rather than creating significant benefits including economic and social impacts to stakeholders, various research indicates that the financial burden of public subsidies outweighs the positive impacts (Kim et al., 2015).

To secure public support for the utilization of public subsidies, promises are often made about the transformative potential of events and teams for the community (Sparvero et al., 2015). Administrators of multipurpose sports facility developments have experienced significant contests in utilizing public subsidies because of numerous negative impacts including economic costs, social conflicts, and security concerns. Residents who support public subsidies expect to obtain not only significant economic benefits but also positive social impacts (Feng & Humphreys, 2008; Siegfried &Zimbalist, 2000). On the other hand, residents who do not support public subsidies claim that the social legacy and economic benefits may not compensate for the excessive spending on developing multipurpose sports facilities (Santo, 2005). Hence, governments and administrators need to diminish potential social conflicts among stakeholders by executing effective public relations strategies (Dehring et al., 2007; Kaplanidou & Karadakis, 2010). This involves disseminating more information on expected social impacts such as enhancing civic pride, economic benefits, infrastructure development, and many other tangible and intangible impacts resulting from the development of multipurpose sports facilities to generate more support from the general public toward facility development using public subsidies.

According to Mathieson and Wall (1982, p. 137), social impact is defined as "…the changes of quality of life of residents of tourist destination" based on hosting tourism events. Perceived social impact is a critical result that stakeholders could experience after hosting the event as a result of their interpretations of event outcomes (Chalip, 2006). The concept of social impact and perceived social impact have been utilized by various research contexts such as sports teams, events, and facility developments (Howard & Crompton, 2004; Inoue & Havard, 2014), entertainment events (Delamare, 2001); mega-sport events (Kim & Walker, 2012; Wu et al., 2023), and international sports events (Balduck et al., 2011; Bull & Lovell, 2007; Kim et al., 2015). Both social impacts and perceived social impacts can differ significantly among stakeholders based on socio-demographic characteristics, political preferences, level of involvement, length of residency, or the level of identification with the community (Inoue & Havard, 2014; Kim et al., 2015; Kim & Petrick, 2005). Stakeholders (e.g., residents, fans, etc.) who perceive social impacts from a sports event indicate substantial positive impact, which express support and interest in getting involved with the event. Numerous studies have explored the perceived social impacts of hosting sports events and found that positive social impacts positively influence planning prospective events and facility developments (e.g., Balduck et al., 2011; Inoue & Havard, 2014; Kim et al., 2015).

To better understand both social impacts and perceived social impacts the current study adopts social exchange theory as the theoretical framework. Social exchange theory encompasses psychological and sociological perspectives that provide a rigorous framework for

understanding social stability and change through stakeholder exchanges (Ap, 1990). Particularly, social exchange theory allows for "... the examination of large-scale social issues employing the investigation of small-scale social situations" (Stolte, Fine, & Cook, 2001, p. 388), stakeholders would shape their perceptions toward hosting events and infrastructure developments from the expected value exchange before an exchange occurring (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005; Kim et al., 2006). Social exchange theory suggests that the interaction by stakeholders results from the exchange process of both tangible and intangible benefits. Based on the social exchange theory, people engage in the exchange process by seeking rewards and avoiding punishment as the anticipated positive outcomes (Bandura, 1977; Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005). Numerous research in tourism, sport management, and hospitality management have investigated stakeholders' perceived impacts from hosting sport tourism events and related facility developments using social exchange theory (Gursoy et al., 2002; Kim et al., 2006; Kim & Petrick, 2005).

The utilization of perceived social impact based on social exchange theory is appropriate for this study to examine the relationship between perceived social impact and behavioral attributes of residents. Residents of publicly subsidized multipurpose sports facilities can assess the expected outcomes after not only experiencing the facility and events but also even not physically experiencing the facilities from the facility development and hosting events as a form of perceived social impact (Crompton, 2004). If residents are satisfied with the perceived benefits from the event and facility developments, they will possess positive perceptions and supportive behaviors toward prospective event and facility developments (Ap, 1990; Kim et al., 2006; Kim & Petrick, 2005). For instance, administrators of the 2012 London Olympic Games executed numerous social leveraging public relations strategies focused on informing positive social impacts such as enhanced well-being of the local community to facilitate positive attitudes toward hosting the event and facility developments (Burrows, 2017; Testa et al., 2023). If residents experienced unsatisfied post-event exchanges, residents might not support prospective event hosting and facility developments. Conversely, if residents perceived benefits from the event, they might provide positive support (Delamer, 2001; Fredline & Faulkner, 2002; Kim & Petrick, 2005). Hence, it is important to investigate the perceived social impacts of residents toward hosting sports events and developing multipurpose sports facilities for prospective developments while minimizing potential social conflicts.

Based on the proceeding commentary, the purpose of this study is two-fold: (1) to explore the residents' perceived social impacts on the development of a publicly subsidized multipurpose sports facility, and (2) to analyze relationships among perceived social impacts, word-of-mouth, and behavioral intentions by residents toward the publicly subsidized multipurpose sports facility. This study is vital for administrators of sports events and facilities as well as government personnel as the findings would provide valuable insights into understanding residents' attitudes towards developing new publicly funded facilities, their expected outcomes, and related behavioral intentions.

METHOD

Study Design

The current study used a quantitative research design and a questionnaire to assess the perceived social impacts that residents of a mid-major city in the Central U.S. resulting from the development of a publicly subsidized multipurpose sport facility. The data collection was conducted in 2022 through a partnership with practitioners and the assistance of the authors. Participants were selected via convenience sampling and verified whether they knew the newly developed multipurpose sports facility in the city. After the confirmation, they were asked to complete a self-administered survey assessing their perceived social impacts of the facility and associated behavioral intentions. In 2016, the city initiated a recruitment proposal to bring a minor league professional baseball team to revitalize the downtown through a multipurpose sports facility development (Swaim, 2022). To afford the financial resources to build a new facility, the city secured a state sales tax and revenue bond and established a tax incremental finance district where they could add a new stadium, baseball museum, aerial improvements, and related infrastructure developments (e.g., built a bridge over the river).

Based on the support from the regional government to utilize the public subsidy, a sales tax-based bond for $42.12 million, which would be repaid by generated revenue from the project over 20 years, the multipurpose sports facility was built in 2020 (Kelly & Rengers, 2023). Due to the COVID-19 Pandemic, the inaugural season was canceled in 2020, but various events were hosted including minor league professional baseball games, collegiate and high school football games, and various entertainment and community events. However, there was a lower attendance than projected in the first two years of operations which generates serious concerns for taxpayers because if the annual payment of the bond cannot be made, the city will have to cover the shortfall by utilizing local sales tax.

Participants

This study analyzed the perceived social impacts of a publicly subsidized multipurpose facility using survey data collected from 307 residents of a metropolitan area in the Central U.S. Participants were selected through convenience sampling to represent a diverse demographic background, including 54.72% males and 45.28% females, with ages ranging from 18 to over 60 years. The sample was predominantly Caucasian (77.52%), with additional representation from Hispanic (7.49%), Asian Pacific Islander (5.54%), and African American (5.21%) groups. Most participants had a college education or higher, and various income levels were represented.

Table 1. Socio-demographic characteristics of the respondents (N = 307)

Variables		***N***	**%**
Age	18-20	42	13.7
	21-30	117	38.1
	31-40	49	16.0
	41-50	49	16.0
	51-60	32	10.4
	61 or older	18	5.9
Gender	Male	168	54.7
	Female	139	45.3
Ethnicity	African American	16	5.2
	American Indian	2	0.7
	Asian Pacific Islander	17	5.5
	Caucasian	238	77.5
	Hispanic	23	7.5
	Other	6	2.0
	Two or more races	5	1.6
Household Income	Below $20,000	87	28.3
	$20,000-$39,999	40	13.0
	$40,000-$59,999	57	18.6
	$60,000-$79,999	40	13.0
	$80,000-$99,999	38	12.4
	$100,000 or above	45	14.7
Education	High school graduate	73	23.8
	Associate degree	25	8.1
	In college	97	31.6
	College graduate	86	28.0
	Advanced degree	26	8.5
Length of Residency	Less than 1 year	39	12.7
	1-3 years	46	15.0
	3-5 years	34	11.1
	5-10 years	30	9.8
	10 years or longer	158	51.5

Ethical Approval

Data were obtained from the practitioner partners as secondary data without any indications of confidential information of the participants. The authors had permission to utilize the data for the scholarly manuscript.

Data Collection Tools

The current study aims to examine the relationship between residents' perceived social impacts and their behavioral intentions regarding a newly developed multipurpose sports facility. The survey instrument was designed to assess residents' perceptions of the perceived social impacts related to the multipurpose sports facility. It included several scales adapted from the Modified Perceived Social Impact Scale (Kim et al., 2015) consisting of 23 items under six factors. Each item was rated on a 1-7 Likert scale (1 = Strongly Disagree, 7 = Strongly Agree), with higher scores indicating stronger agreement or higher levels of the measured construct. The scales included:

- Community Development: This scale consisted of 5 items measuring the perceived benefits of community enhancement and image improvement, such as increased opportunities to promote the city. The internal consistency for this scale was α = .764.
- Community Pride: Comprising 4 items, this scale assessed the sense of pride residents felt about their community due to the facility, with a reliability of α = .830.
- Economic Benefits: This scale measured perceived economic advantages brought by the facility using 4 items, such as boosting local business trade, with a reliability of α = .801.
- Economic Costs: Including 3 items, this scale captured residents' concerns about financial burdens, such as excessive spending on new infrastructure, with an internal consistency of α = .811.
- Traffic Problems: This scale measured perceived issues related to traffic caused by the facility using 3 items, such as increased road closures, and had a reliability of α = .830.
- Security Risks: Consisting of 4 items, this scale assessed residents' perceptions of safety concerns, such as increased risks of terrorism, with α = .897.
- Level of Involvement (Bennett et al., 2009): This scale, consisting of 4 items, evaluated the degree of residents' engagement with the facility, such as frequency of attending events, and showed high reliability with α = .901.
- Word-of-Mouth: Measured using 3 items, such as recommending others to attend sports events, entertainment events, and community events, assessed the extent to which residents would recommend the facility to others, with α = .913.
- Behavioral Intentions: Measured using 3 items, this scale assesses the intention of attending various events (e.g., sports, entertainment, or community events) in the future, with α = .853.

Lastly, demographic variables including age, gender, ethnicity, household income, education, marital status, and length of residency were added to gather descriptive information on the participants.

Data Preparation

Data were imported and processed using SAS software, with key variables renamed for clarity and consistency. Ordinal and nominal variables were re-coded into numeric formats to facilitate statistical analysis. For example, income levels were re-coded from categorical labels (e.g., 'Below $20,000' to '$100,000 or above') into a numeric ordinal scale ranging from 1 to 6, reflecting increasing income. Similarly, residency duration categories were recoded to reflect increasing length, with values from 1 ('Less than 1 year') to 5 ('10 years or longer'). Gender, originally labeled as 'Male' and 'Female', was recoded into binary numeric values (0 for 'Female', 1 for 'Male'). Age ranges were also simplified into a binary format, distinguishing younger (ages 18-30, coded as 1) from older groups (ages 31 and above, coded as 0). Additionally, event attendance variables—specifically attendance at sports (*ASE*), entertainment (*AEE*), and community events (*ACE*)—were coded as binary variables where 'Yes' responses were coded as 1 and 'No' responses as 0. This binary coding was used to capture the influence of prior event attendance on behavioral intentions and word-of-mouth outcomes.

For the scales measuring perceptions (e.g., Community Development, Community Pride), average scores were calculated by taking the mean of item responses within each scale. These average scores were used as independent variables in the analysis to represent overall perceptions in each domain, allowing for a more concise and comprehensive measure of each construct. This approach ensured that the variables were appropriately prepared for statistical techniques requiring numeric inputs, facilitating a more accurate and meaningful analysis of the data.

Analysis of Data

Based on the collected data, multiple statistical analyses were conducted. First, Cronbach's alpha values and validity tests were performed to verify the internal consistency and applicability of the questionnaire. Second, descriptive and frequency statistics were executed to understand the residents' perceived social impacts from developing the new multipurpose sports facility and related behavioral intentions. Finally, the Generalized Linear Models (GLM) were utilized to examine the relationships between perceived social impacts and various demographic factors on behavioral intentions and word-of-mouth outcomes. The independent variables included Community Development (*CD*), Community Pride (*CP*), Economic Benefits (*EB*), Economic Costs (*EC*), Traffic Problems (*TP*), Security Risks (*SR*), Level of Involvement (*LI*), and event attendance types (*ASE*, *AEE*, & *ACE*). Demographic covariates such as income (*Income*), residency duration (*Residency*), gender (*Gender*), and age (*Age*) were also included.

The GLM was specified as follows for each dependent variable (Y):

$$Y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 CD + \beta_2 CP + \beta_3 EB + \beta_4 EC + \beta_5 TP + \beta_6 SR + \beta_7 LI + \beta_8 ASE + \beta_9 AEE + \beta_{10} ACE + \beta_{11} Income + \beta_{12} Residency + \beta_{13} Gender + \beta_{14} Age + \epsilon_i$$

In this model, Y_i represents each dependent variable, including behavioral intentions for sports events (*BIS*), entertainment events (*BIE*), and community events (*BIC*), as well as word-of-mouth outcomes (*WM1*, *WM2*, & *WM3*). The β coefficients represent the weights of each independent variable in predicting the dependent variable, and ϵ_i is the error term. Model fit was assessed using R^2 values, which indicate the proportion of variance in the dependent variables explained by the model. Statistical significance was evaluated with a threshold of $p < .05$.

FINDINGS

Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics for the survey variables are presented in Table 2. Community Development items had mean scores ranging from 4.78 to 5.41, indicating moderate to high agreement with positive impacts. Economic Benefits were consistently rated high, with means between 5.11 and 5.43, whereas Economic Costs and Security Risks were rated lower, reflecting some concerns among residents.

Table 2. Descriptive statistics of dependent and independent variables (N = 307)

Variable	N	Mean	SD
BIS	307	5.60	1.50
BIE	307	5.37	1.68
BIC	307	4.86	1.61
WM1	307	5.03	1.63
WM2	307	5.16	1.47
WM3	307	5.27	1.47
CD	307	5.05	0.81
CP	307	4.75	1.01
EB	307	5.23	0.90
EC	307	4.05	1.23
TP	307	4.87	1.16
SR	307	3.09	1.41
LI	307	3.94	1.59
ASE	307	0.68	0.47
AEE	307	0.64	0.48
ACE	307	0.21	0.41
Income	307	3.12	1.79
Residency	307	0.61	0.49
Gender	307	0.55	0.50
Age	307	0.52	0.50

Generalized Linear Models

The Generalized Linear Models (GLM) assessed the impact of perceived social impacts and demographic factors on behavioral intentions to attend sports, entertainment, and community events, as well as word-of-mouth behaviors.

Behavioral Intentions: Sports, Entertainment, and Community Events

- **Sports Intentions**: Significant predictors included Community Development (β = .38, p < .05), Economic Benefits (β = .21, p < .05), and Level of Involvement (β = .14, p < .05). Notably, prior attendance at sports events (*ASE*; β = 1.11, p < .001) showed a strong positive effect on the intention to attend future sports events, highlighting that previous sports participation is a key driver for sports attendance intentions. This strong relationship was particularly pronounced compared to its influence on other event

types, such as entertainment and community events, where the impact was less significant. Income (β = .11, p < .05) was also significant, indicating that higher income levels were associated with increased sports attendance intentions. Age (β = .46, p < .05) indicated that younger individuals (coded as 1) had higher intentions to attend sports events compared to older individuals (coded as 0).

- **Entertainment Intentions**: For entertainment intentions, Economic Benefits (β = .26, p < .05) and Level of Involvement (β = .15, p < .05) were significant predictors. Attendance at entertainment events (*AEE*; β = 1.34, p < .001) was a strong predictor, whereas prior attendance at sports events did not exhibit a significant influence, underscoring the specificity of prior experiences on related event types. Income (β = .13, p < .05) played a significant role, and Age (β = .53, p < .05) again suggested that younger individuals were more inclined towards attending entertainment events.
- **Community Intentions**: Level of Involvement (β = .13, p < .05) was a significant predictor of intentions to attend community events. Attendance at community events (*ACE*; p > .05) showed a positive trend but was not statistically significant. Importantly, prior sports participation had a minimal impact on community event intentions, highlighting the event-specific nature of previous participation influences. Income (β = .16, p < .05) was significant, while Age (β = .47, p < .05) showed that younger individuals were more likely to attend community events.

Table 3. Generalized linear model results for behavioral intentions (BI)

Independent Variable	Sports Events (β)	Entertainment Events (β)	Community Events (β)
Intercept	1.02	.81	.91
Community Development (CD)	.38 *	.23	.26
Community Pride (CP)	-.02	.00	.10
Economic Benefits (EB)	.21 *	.26 *	.18
Economic Costs (EC)	.00	-.06	-.11
Traffic Problems (TP)	-.16 *	-.02	-.06
Security Risks (SR)	.01	.05	.07
Level of Involvement (LI)	.14 *	.15 *	.13 *
Sports Attendance (ASE)	1.11 **	.07	.01
Entertainment Attendance (AEE)	.54 **	1.34 **	.75 **
Community Attendance (ACE)	-.11	-.26	.38
Income	.11 *	.13 *	.16 *
Residency	.04	.03	-.03
Gender	.01	-.04	.00
Age	.46 *	.53 *	.47 *
R^2	.383	.410	.378

Note: *p< .05 and **p<.001

Word-of-Mouth

- **WM1 (Positive recommendations of sports events)**: Significant predictors were Community Development (β = .47, p < .05), Level of Involvement (β = .25, p < .001),

and prior attendance at sports (*ASE*; β = .76, p < .001) and entertainment events (*AEE*; β = .61, p < .001). Income (β = .12, p < .05) significantly influenced word-of-mouth, WM1, indicating that higher-income individuals were more likely to engage in positive word-of-mouth. Age did not show a significant effect in this model (p > .05), suggesting no strong influence of age on positive word-of-mouth for sports events.

- **WM2 (Positive recommendations of entertainment events)**: Community Development (β = .28, p < .05), Community Pride (β = .20, p < .05), and Level of Involvement (β = .22, p < .001) were significant predictors. Attendance at entertainment events (*AEE*; β = .54, p < .001) also played a significant role, and prior attendance at sports events (*ASE*; β = .64, p < .05) was found to have a significant positive effect, indicating its substantial influence on word-of-mouth for entertainment contexts as well. Additionally, Traffic Problems (*TP*; β = -.12, p < .05) showed a significant negative effect, suggesting that perceived traffic issues reduce the likelihood of positive word-of-mouth sharing.
- **WM3 (Positive recommendations of community events)**: Significant effects were found for Community Development (β = .29, p < .05), Level of Involvement (β = .20, p < .001), and prior attendance at sports (*ASE*; β = .64, p < .001) and entertainment events (*AEE*; β = .43, p < .05). Income (p > .05) was not significant in this model, and Age (p > .05) did not show a significant effect, indicating no strong influence of age on the likelihood to recommend the facility.

Table 4. Generalized linear model results for word-of-mouth (WM)

Independent Variable	WM 1 (β)	WM 2 (β)	WM 3 (β)
Intercept	-.16	1.42 *	1.28 *
Community Development (CD)	.47 **	.28 *	.29 *
Community Pride (CP)	.11	.20 *	.15
Economic Benefits (EB)	.06	.04	.11
Economic Costs (EC)	.03	-.04	-.05
Traffic Problems (TP)	-.11	-.15 *	-.14 *
Security Risks (SR)	-.01	.00	.08
Level of Involvement (LI)	.25 **	.22 **	.20 **
Sports Attendance (ASE)	.76 **	.55 **	.64 **
Entertainment Attendance (AEE)	.61 **	.54 **	.43 *
Community Attendance (ACE)	-.53 *	.20	.19
Income	.12 *	.07	.03
Residency	.03	.03	.04
Gender	-.07	-.22	-.19
Age	.30	.39 *	.30 *
R^2	.383	.410	.378

Note: *p<.05 and **p<.001

Overall, the results highlight that perceived social impacts, particularly Community Development and Level of Involvement, play significant roles in shaping behavioral intentions and word-of-mouth. Income emerged as a significant factor in predicting engagement across

various contexts, particularly in sports and entertainment. Effects were generally more positive among younger generations, particularly in word-of-mouth outcomes, suggesting that younger individuals were more supportive and likely to recommend the facility. Additionally, the influence of prior sports participation was notably stronger for sports event intentions, underscoring the event-specific nature of prior experience effects.

DISCUSSION and CONCLUSION

The current study addresses the demand for assessing the perceived impacts of the development of multipurpose sports facilities using public subsidies. Developing a multipurpose sports facility through the utilization of public subsidies produces both positive and negative perceived social impacts on residents who reside in the region where the public subsidy is utilized to build the multipurpose sports facility (Seifried & Clopton, 2013; Siegfried & Zumbalist, 2000). Over the decades, regional and national governments have routinely subsidized multipurpose sports facilities based on the primary argument that building new facilities would produce economic benefits for the community and its residents. Despite some studies indicating evidence of multipurpose sports facilities generating public goods for the community, a majority of studies argued that there was a limited level of tangible and intangible impacts on the community (Matheson, 2019; Wallstem et al., 2018). However, public subsidies could still be justified by providing a great deal of understanding of significant intangible impacts derived from the development of new multipurpose sports facilities to the community.

The respondents of this study express positive attitudes toward the positive social impacts such as community development and economic benefits compared to negative social impacts (e.g., traffic problems and economic costs) along with positive intentions to share information about sports, entertainment, and community events as well as intention to attend future sports and entertainment events. Public subsidies are frequently utilized for the development of new multipurpose sports facilities based on the argument that the development by utilizing public subsidies would fuel both economic and social benefits in the community (Agha, 2013; Bradbury et al., 2022). However, according to Matheson (2019), sports facilities do not generate significant economic activities and social goods although they could generate critical neighborhood effects for residents such as enhancing the quality of life and social cohesion even those who are not sports fans. For instance, 60% of voters in Oklahoma City in the U.S. approved $120 million of public subsidies to renovate the downtown arena in the hope of luring an NBA franchise. Based on the public relations strategies by the administrators of Oklahoma City and the State of Oklahoma that emphasized elevating public acceptance of the utilization of public subsidies for becoming a "big-league city" and "put Oklahoma City on the map" garnered more long-term support among residents those who did not support the public subsidies (Merrefield, 2024). Thus, it is crucial to cultivate social cohesion on expected social impacts among residents that potential social impacts from the facility developments could serve as an amenity that can improve the quality of residents' lives even those who do not support the utilization of public subsidies (Groothuis & Rotthoff, 2016).

The findings on the relationship among perceived social impacts, the level of involvement, and intention to consume prospective events indicate that prior attendance at sports events triggers a strong positive effect on future attendance in sports events. In addition, perceived social impacts such as community development and economic benefits showed a significant effect on increasing the intention to attend future sports events. Interestingly, perceived traffic problems negatively influenced attending future sports events. In addition, perceived economic benefits and previous attendance at entertainment events were strong predictors of attending entertainment events in the future. Lastly, attendance at community events was the only key driver of intention to attend future community events. The results highlight the event-specific nature of previous participation influences on behavioral intentions for prospective events while residents' perceptions of community development and economic benefits derived from publicly subsidized multipurpose sports facility development significantly increase the intention to attend future sports events and entertainment events.

The analysis of the relationships among perceived social impacts, level of involvement, and word-of-mouth revealed somewhat different results compared to behavioral intentions to consume prospective events. First, respondents revealed that community development, level of involvement as a mediating variable, and previous attendance at sports and community events positively influence sharing positive word-of-mouth about consuming sports and entertainment events. On the other hand, respondents' word-of-mouth for entertainment events was significantly influenced by perceived social impacts such as community development and community pride, level of involvement, and previous attendance at sports and entertainment events in a positive manner. It is worth noting that community pride only significantly increases word-of-mouth for entertainment events although it was not an important predictor of any other word-of-mouth and behavioral intentions. In addition, the concern about traffic issues negatively influences word-of-mouth for recommending entertainment events which indicates that respondents might possess negative experiences relating to parking, traffic congestion, and road closures. Interestingly, the level of involvement in various events demonstrates a mediating role in developing positive influences on word-of-mouth of all types of events at the multipurpose sports facility.

This result is well-fitted with the previous literature focusing on the assessment of social impacts using the contingent valuation method which collects residents' opinions on what they prefer to sacrifice the financial commitments to build the multipurpose sports facility (Bradbury et al., 2024). The estimated outcomes such as social impacts and excitement of enhancing quality of life are extended to the broader population regardless of their preference for public subsidies when residents gain both social and psychological benefits from the development of facilities. For example, the previous study revealed that communities with more unified growth coalitions, building like-minded politicians, business leaders, and most importantly residents who share an ideology and social network, are more efficiently approving public subsidies for the facility development (Delaney & Eckstein, 2003). Thus, the community should assess all prospective proposals through referendums with voter preferences and careful

consideration of all relevant foreseeable issues so that residents can make informed decisions while mitigating consistent public sentiment against such concerns on financial burdens.

Lastly, concerning the demographic variables on the behavioral intentions, respondents who were younger ages with higher income levels had higher intentions to attend sports, entertainment, and community events in the future. In contrast, demographic variables were not significant predictors of word-of-mouth across all types of events. According to Waitt (2003), perceived social impacts and related behaviors could be different by socio-demographic characteristics. Therefore, the results herein could be generalized to other populations concerning the behavioral intentions toward publicly subsidized multipurpose sports facilities. This result is very interesting that younger generations may favor access to entratin their leisure activities through various sports and entertainment events at the multipurpose sports facility that was funded by public subsidies. It indicates that nonpecuniary social impacts from quality-of-life improvements, enhanced welfare, and the improvement of community image image from the development of multipurpose sports facilities could effectively lessen the lack of economic justifications for the burden of public financings as commonly observed from existing studies (Buckman & Pemberton, 2023). Indeed, it is very common for younger residents to list entertainment and things to do as the most important factor in deciding whether they relocate or live in certain cities (Merrefield, 2024). It is commonly argued that the energetic and vigorous atmosphere in the downtown by developing first-class sports facilities generates unique and valuable intangible benefits for the community (Agha & Coates, 2014; Kim et al., 2015). Therefore, local governments should develop effective informational strategies to offer a full understanding of the expected benefits of having multipurpose sports facilities in the region through disseminating persuasive messages to older and lower-income residents who might be sensitive to the financial concerns of the publicly subsidized facilities.

Limitations and Future Research Suggestions

This paper addresses the importance of understanding residents' perceived social impacts concerning their behavioral attributes; however, the study is not without its limitations. First, respondents in this study demonstrated a moderate level of perceived social impact toward the newly developed multipurpose sports facility. This might hinder a full understanding of the perceived social impacts derived from the development of the facility. Second, the modified Perceived Social Impact Scale was adopted from the study of assessing the intangible impacts of hosting a large-scale sports event; thus, the applicability of the scale and the fit with the current context may be limited.

In terms of future research suggestions, the current study identifies a wide-open door for policymakers and administrators to pay closer attention to analyzing residents' attitudes focusing on preference toward public subsidies and demographic characteristics. As Wallstem et al. (2018) indicate there has been a critical absence of a comprehensive analysis of social impacts and significant limitations on the strategic engagement strategies to facilitate the understanding of social impacts derived from the facility developments and hosting various

events to the local community. Therefore, more studies need to be conducted to develop a valid measurement tool for assessing the intangible impacts of multipurpose sports facility developments to mitigate misreading of expected intangible impacts such as social impacts among the residents. In addition, it would be valuable to assess a variety of contexts such as large, middle, and small-size facilities as well as different main tenants for those facilities (e.g., professional football, basketball, baseball, etc) to provide managerial insight for administrators and policymakers based on a comprehensive understanding of residents' affirmative attitudes.

Conflicts of Interest: There is no conflict of interest on the part of the authors in this study.

Authors' Contribution: All authors have contributed substantial and intellectual contributions to the literature review, data analysis, and interpretation of findings for the manuscript's completion. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Ethical Approval: The current study was exempt from obtaining ethical approval from the Internal Review Board of Wichita State University as the secondary data were obtained and used for the study.

Acknowledgment: This study was supported by Dr. Homun JUN and the International Collaborative Research Grant at Mokpo National University in Muan-gun, South Korea.

REFERENCES

Agha, N. (2013). The Economic impact of stadia and teams: The case of minor league baseball. *Journal of Sports Economics, 14*(3), 227-252. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1527002511422939

Agha, N., & Coates, D. (2014). A compensating differential approach to valuing the social benefit of minor league baseball. *Contemporary Economic Policy, 33*(2), 285-299. https://doi.org/10.1111/coep.12080

Aitken, C. E. (1985). Olympulse II: Evolving resident attitudes toward the 1988 Olympic Winter Games. *Journal of Travel Research, 23*(1), 28-33.

Ap, J. (1990). Residents' perceptions research on the social impacts of tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research, 17*(4), 610-616. https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383(90)90032-M

Balduck, A., Maes, M., & Buelens, M. (2011). The social impact of the Tour de France: Comparisons of residents' pre- and post-event perceptions. *European Sport Management Quarterly, 11*(2), 91-113. https://doi.org/10.1080/16184742.2011.559134

Bennett, G., Ferreira, Lee, J., & Polite, F. (2009). The role of involvement in sports and sport spectatorship in sponsors' brand use: The case of Mountain Dew and action sports sponsorship. *Sport Marketing Quarterly, 18*(1), 14-24.

Bradbury, J. C., Coates, D., & Humprey, B. R. (2024). Public policy toward professional sports stadium: A review. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management, 43*(3), 899-937. https://doi.org/10.1002/pam.22534

Bradbury, J. C., Coates, D., & Humprey, B. R. (2022). The impact of professional sports franchises and venues on local economies: A comprehensive survey. *Journal of Economic Surveys, 37*(4), 1389-1431. https://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4022547

Broughton, D. (2024). Three-year skid ends as spending on projects completed in 2024 climbs to $5.8 billion. Retrieved from https://www.sportsbusinessjournal.com/Articles/2024/01/29/facilities-spending.

Buckman, S., & Pemberton, A. (2023). Suicide squeeze: How minor league cities chase economic development with big-league stadium schemes. *Journal of Urban Affairs, 45*(8), 1452-1468. https://doi.org/10.1080/07352166.2021.1943420

Bull, C., & 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 and Tourism, 12*(3-4), 229-248. https://doi.org/10.1080/14775080701736973

Burrows, T. (2017). Legacy, what legacy? Five years on the London Olympic Park battle still rages. Retrieved from: https://www.theguardian.com/cities/2017/jul/27/london-olympic-park-success-five-years-depends.

Chalip, L. (2006). Towards social leverage of sport events. *Journal of Sport and Tourism, 11*(2), 109-127. https://doi.org/10.1080/14775080601155126

Crompton, J. L. (2004). Beyond economic impact: An alternative rationale for the public subsidy of major league sports facilities. *Journal of Sport Management, 18*(1), 40-58. https://doi.org/10.1123/jsm.18.1.40

Cropanzano, R., & Mitchell, M. (2005). Social exchange theory: An interdisciplinary review. *Journal of Management, 31*(6), 874-900. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206305279602

Dehring, C. A., Depken, C.A., & Ward, M. R. (2007). The impact of stadium announcements on residential property values: Evidence from a natural experiment in Dallas-Fort Worth. *Contemporary Economic Policy, 25*(4), 627-638. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1465-7287.2007.00077.x

Delaney, K. J., & Eckstein, R. (2003). *Public dollars, private stadiums: The battle over building sports stadiums*. Rutgers University Press

Feng, X., & Humphreys, B. R. (2008). Assessing the economic impact of sports facilities on residential property values: A spatial hedonic approach. *International Association of Sports Economists Working Paper, 19* (0812), 188-210.

Greenberg, M. J. (2004). Sport facility financing and development trends in the United States. *Marquette Sports Law Review, 15*(1), 93-173.

Groothuis, P. A., & Rotthoff, K. W. (2016). The economic impact and civic pride effects of sports teams and mega-events: Do the public and the professionals agree? *Economic Affairs, 36*(1), 21-32. https://doi.org/10.1111/ecaf.12156

Howard, D. R., & Crompton, J. L. (2004). *Financing sport*, (2nd Ed). Fitness Information Technology.

Humphreys, D. R. (2018). Should the construction of new professional sports facilities be subsidized? *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management, 38*(1), 264-270. https://doi.org/10.1002/pam.22099

Inoue, Y., & Havard, C. (2014). Determinants and consequences of the perceived social impact of a sport event. *Journal of Sport Management, 28*(3), 294-310. https://doi.org/10.1123/jsm.2013-0136

Kelly, M., & Rengers, C. (2023). Should Wichitans care when ballpark development starts? If you pay taxes, then yes. Retrieved from https://www.kansas.com/news/politics-government/article278616494.html.

Kim, H., Gursoy, D., & 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. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2004.07.010

Kim, S. S., & Petrick, J. F. (2005). Residents' perception on impacts of the FIFA 2002 World Cup: The case of Seoul as a host city. *Tourism Management, 26*(1), 25-38. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2003.09.013

Kim, W., Jun, H., Walker, M., & Drane, D. (2015). Evaluating the perceived social impacts of hosting large-scale sport tourism events: Scale development and validation. *Tourism Management, 48*(2015), 21-32. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2014.10.015

Kim, W., & Walker, M. (2012). Measuring the social impacts associated with Super Bowl XLIII: Preliminary development of a psychic income scale. *Sport Management Review, 15*(1), 91-108. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.smr.2011.05.007

Matheson, V. (2019). Is there a case for subsidizing sports stadiums? *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management, 38*(1), 271-277. https://doi.org/10.1002/pam

Mathieson, A., & Wall, G. (1982). *Tourism economic, physical and social impacts*. Longman Group Limited.

Merrefield, C. (2024). Public funding for sports stadiums: A primer and research roundup. Retrieved from: https://journalistsresource.org/economics/sports-stadium-public-financing/

Santo, C. (2005). The economic impact of sports stadiums: Recasting the analysis in context. *Journal of Urban Affairs, 27*(2), 177-191.

Santo, C., & Mildner, G. (2010). *Sport and public policy: Social, political, and economic perspectives*. Human Kinetics.

Seifried, C., & Clopton, A. (2013). An alternative view of public subsidy and sport facilities through social anchor theory. *City, Culture and Society, 4*(1),49-55. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ccs.2013.01.001

Siegfried, J., & Zumbalist, A. (2000). The economics of sports facilities and their communities. *Journal of Economic Perspectives, 14*(3), 95-114. https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.14.3.95

Smith, C., & McCormick, B. (2024). Worth the cost. Retrieved from https://www.sportsbusinessjournal.com/Articles/2024/01/29/facilities.

Sparvero, E. S., Warner, S., & Tingle, J. K. (2015). RuxTex: A community landmark run out of business. *Sport Management Review, 19*(3), 343-351. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.smr.2015.10.003

Swaim, C. (2022). Wichita City Council Oks millions more in public money for Riverfront Stadium district. Retrieved from https://www.kansas.com/news/politics-government/article260550382.html.

Testa, L., Parra-Camacho, D., Gomez-Tafalla, A. M., Garcia-Pascual, F., & Duclos-Bastias, D. (2023). Local impact of a sports centre: Effects on future intentions. *Sustainability, 15*(6), 5550. https://doi.org/10.3390/su15065550

Waitt, G. (2003). Social impacts of the Sydney Olympics. *Annals of Tourism Research, 30*(1), 194-215. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383(02)00050-6

Wallstem, M., Loannides, D., Petterson, R. (2018). Evaluating the social impacts of events: in search of unified indicators for effective policymaking. *Journal of Policy Research in Tourism, Leisure and Events, 12*(2), 122-141. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/19407963.2018.1515214

Wu, J., Orr, M., Inoue, Y., & Chang, Y. (2023). Drivers of the perceived social impact of the Super Bowl: mediation and moderation analyses. *International Journal of Sports Marketing and Sponsorship, 24*(5), 837-852. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJSMS-12-2022-0208