

Resident Perceptions toward the Social Impacts of a Mega Sport-Event:
The case of Fédération Internationale de Basketball (FIBA) EuroBasket
2011 in Vilnius, Lithuania.

by

Alexis Antoniou

A Thesis Presented in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Science

Approved November 2011 by the
Graduate Supervisory Committee:

Rhonda Phillips, Chair
Wendy Hultsman
Lindsey Mean

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

December 2011

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to examine the local residents' perceptions toward the social impacts of FIBA EuroBasket 2011, held September 7th to September 12th, 2011 in Vilnius, Lithuania. This study focuses on the social impacts of the event since most of the mega-event academia is dominated by economic impact studies and this research attempts to go beyond a narrow quantitative approach to examine the social impacts in relation to two important academic contributions: 1) the embracement-withdrawal continuum and 2) the social exchange theory. A mixed methods analysis was adopted as the best approach for this research. Both a quantitative survey and qualitative questionnaire were used which yielded a total usable sample of 128 residents of Vilnius. Exploratory Factor Analysis was conducted to examine the underlying themes of the quantitative data and coding and thematic development was used to make sense of the qualitative data. The results confirmed that the event was considered successful (97% of residents embraced the event) and they generated 6 factors, or impacts, that were deemed important for influencing resident perceptions: social costs, social benefits, sociocultural impacts, socioeconomic impacts, sociopolitical impacts, and socioenvironmental impacts. These results indicate that the use of mixed methods analyses is crucial to investigate the interdependence between each impact that affects residents' perceptions toward sport mega-events.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	iv
LIST OF FIGURES	v
INTRODUCTION	1
SPORT TOURISM (SPORT AS A FORM OF TOURISM).....	3
SPORT MEGA-EVENTS	4
SOCIAL IMPACTS OF SPORT MEGA-EVENTS.....	7
STAKEHOLDERS	8
SPORT TOURISTS.....	8
HOST COMMUNITY RESIDENTS.....	9
RELEVANT AND INFLUENTIAL STUDIES	11
HOST COMMUNITY CONTINUUMS.....	12
SOCIAL EXCHANGE THEORY	13
BACKGROUND.....	15
FIBA AND EUROBASKET 2011	15
LITHUANIA AND VILNIUS	16
PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES	17
METHODOLOGY	17
RESEARCH METHODS AND DATA COLLECTION.....	18

DATA ANALYSIS	23
NARRATIVE OF FINDINGS	38
DISCUSSION	48
SOCIOCULTURAL IMPACTS	51
SOCIOECONOMIC IMPACTS	52
SOCIOENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS	53
SOCIOPOLITICAL IMPACTS	54
SOCIAL COSTS	55
SOCIAL BENEFITS	56
CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS	58
REFERENCES	62
APPENDIX	
A IRB APPROVAL	64

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. List of 36 impact items used in quantitative survey.....	20
2. Perceptions towards the EuroBasket 2011 tournament.....	24
3. Rotated Component Matrix of 36 impact items.....	28
4. Correlation Matrix for each generated factor.....	30
5. Means and standard deviation values of the six factors.....	34
6. Mean differences between each cluster of resident groups.....	37

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Page
1. Map of Lithuania and Vilnius.....	16

INTRODUCTION

The sport mega-event phenomenon is one that has only been studied over the past two decades and is relatively new in the field of social science. The social sciences interest in sport mega-events tends to be dominated by economic impact studies (Andranovich et al., 2001; Graton et al., 2001, 2005; Kasimati, 2003; and Lee et al., 2005) and presently, there are not many published journal articles associated with the other impacts of sporting mega-events, namely in social, cultural, political, and environmental contexts (Getz, 2008). This indicates that there is a lack of research in relation to sport tourism and its impacts on the host community, particularly from the host community perspective (Gursoy, Kim, & Uysal, 2004; Zhou, 2010).

Although mega-events are multi-dimensional and multi-purpose phenomena with diverse impacts, the complexity of these impacts has led to the debate that all these impacts are “interconnected” and that the “sustainable development of sport tourism destinations necessitates that destination planners and tourism organizations are aware of these impacts of sports tourism” (Higham, p. 224, 2005). Higham implies that in order for a sport mega-event to be ultimately successful, the planning process must be sustainable and closely monitored by the destination planners and tourism organizations so that they can minimize the negative impacts and maximize the positive impacts.

Consequently this research attempts to go beyond a narrow economist approach and examine the social impacts of the FIBA EuroBasket 2011 basketball tournament in Vilnius, Lithuania, in relation to two important academic contributions dealing with the relationships between host communities and tourists: 1) the embracement-withdrawal continuum that determines which residents respond to sport tourism/ tourism development in a positive or negative way, and 2) the social exchange theory, which suggests that residents are likely to support tourism development as long as they believe that the expected benefits exceed the expected costs on their community. Each theory was important to this study since they allowed for the detailed investigation of what really affects residents' perceptions of EuroBasket 2011 by evaluating which impacts are perceived as beneficial/positive or costly/negative and how important they are in influencing residents' perceptions and attitudes toward the sport mega-event.

As part of these objectives, it is necessary to identify the academic emergence of sport tourism as a whole, to explore the background and meaning of sport mega-events, identify some of the stakeholders and impacts as revealed in the existing academic literature, and examine the host-community continuum and social exchange theory.

SPORT TOURISM (SPORT AS A FORM OF TOURISM)

Sport tourism was not given significant academic focus until the establishment of the electronic journal titled *Journal of Sports Tourism* in 1993 (Hinch & Higham, 2001) and certain articles published in other tourism journals such as *Progress in Tourism and Hospitality Research* (Glyptis, 1991; Weed & Bull, 1997). In particular, Glyptis (1991) drew attention to the fact that tourism and sport are “treated by academics and practitioners alike as separate spheres of activity” (p. 165). Glyptis realized the similarities between sport and tourism participants and argued for the integration of the two in terms of government policy, strategic planning, the development of facilities and services, urban planning, and promotion (Hinch & Higham, 2001). These initial contributions to the study of sport and tourism within the same context, as opposed to them being mutually exclusive, inspired further research studies of the confluence of sport and tourism, i.e. sport tourism (Gammon & Robinson, 1997; Hinch & Higham, 2001; Kurtzman & Zauhar, 1995; Standeven & De Knop, 1999).

Hinch and Higham (2001) identified that sport is an important activity within tourism and tourism is a fundamental characteristic of sport. They also defined sport tourism as “sport-based travel away from the home environment for a limited time, where sport is characterized by unique rule sets, competition related to physical prowess, and a playful nature” (Hinch and Higham, 2001, p. 49). This definition of sport tourism

parallels the underlying structure of most tourism definitions in terms of their spatial (travel away from home), temporal (for a limited time), and activity dimensions (sport-based travel). This three-dimensional definition also characterizes sport as having unique rule sets (unique sporting events), competition related to physical ability (degree of sport professionalism and competitiveness), and a playful nature, signifying sport on the basis of simple play. In agreement with this definition, a form of sport tourism, known as sport mega-events, arose as one of the most intensively studied phenomena in the academic field of sport tourism (Horne & Manzenreiter, 2006; Hughes, 1993; Roche, 1992, 1994).

SPORT MEGA-EVENTS

The international recession of the early 1980s and the renewal of economic growth in the mid- and late-1980s in the more advanced industrial societies of the US and Europe have incurred major consequences for many towns and cities in their old established manufacturing regions. Roche (1992) did a good job of explaining this process of deindustrialization:

“In the early 1980s a relatively sudden, unanticipated and apparently uncontrollable collapse of employment occurred in traditional materials and manufacturing industries (e.g. coal, steel, etc.). A process of 'deindustrialization' occurred leading to the graphic popular description of these regions as 'rust belts'. However, in the mid and late 1980s, 'rust belt' cities have begun to respond to their decline with local economic strategies aimed at boosting employment, attracting new inward investments,

diversifying into new service sector industries, and generally modernizing local economic and social infrastructure” (p. 2)

In response to this urban decline in the US and Europe, during the late 1980s and early 1990s, Horne et al. (2006) suggest that many cities invested heavily in the sports infrastructure so that each city and nation could possess a portfolio of major sports facilities that are capable of holding major sporting events. Therefore national government urban policy inspired and invested in the development of active urban tourism strategies, which included the creation of sport mega-events (Roche, 1994). According to Roche (1992), “Mega-events are large-scale cultural or sporting events designed to attract tourists and media-attention (p.563). Roche (1994) also added that mega-events are usually short-term events with long-term consequences for the cities that stage them and that these events are usually associated with the creation of new infrastructure and event facilities. Certain impact analyses studies conducted at other sport mega-events, such as the Olympic Games of Barcelona, Spain in 1992 (Horne et al., 2006) and the Winter Olympic Games of Albertville, France in 1992 (Higham, 2005), identified that sport mega-events carry with them the creation of local and sport infrastructure that have helped host communities develop in the short-term, but has also hindered long-term development due to long term debts from the creation of these new infrastructures.

Moreover Horne et al. (2006) discuss that contemporary sport mega-events have two central features: firstly, they are considered to have significant consequences for the host community in which they occur and secondly, that they will attract extensive media coverage. With this bi-fold definition, Horne et al. (2006) bring in the important element of media to sports mega-events. They add that the size of sport mega-events as well as the enthusiasm to host and participate in sport mega-events has grown in the past twenty years due to three main reasons: first, new developments in the technologies of mass communication have attracted substantial media interest and commercial partners; second, the formation of a sport-media-business alliance has transformed professional sport generally in the late 20th century, through the “tri-partite model” of sponsorship rights, exclusive broadcasting rights, and merchandizing, due to the vast global audience exposure that mega-events achieve; and third, they have grown due to fact that they are seen as valuable promotional opportunities for cities and regions through the “show case effect”, which is purely a reflection of what a city or region has to offer. If these sport mega-events are deemed successful, they can project a new positive image and identity for the host city through national and international media, particularly TV coverage (Roche, 1994). As a result, city leaders and event organizers typically claim that mega-events help to address the economic, cultural, and social needs and rights of local citizens,

regardless of whether the citizens have actually been consulted about or involved in their production (Roche, 1994).

SOCIAL IMPACTS OF SPORT MEGA-EVENTS

Sport mega-events and sport tourism, like any other form of tourism, bring both positive and negative impacts on tourism destinations and according to Higham (2005), “the impacts associated with sport tourism are inevitably viewed subjectively by different stakeholder groups” (p. 224). Higham suggests that different stakeholders, whether locals or tourists, can subjectively view the many impacts of sports tourism as good or bad experiences depending on how these impacts affect them in a negative or positive way.

Many sport mega-events are associated with both short-term and long-term social impact issues. Short term issues deal with host community displacements, evictions, increases in rates and rent, temporary or seasonal employment, urban regeneration, the disruptions of daily routines due to overcrowding and traffic congestion, and increased security issues and crime (vandalism) due to the exaggerated behavior of sports junkies (Chen, 2006). Long term issues include unemployment, poverty, poor education and housing (Evans, 2005). Thus sport mega-events offer different degrees of opportunity for both locals and sport tourists to engage in visitor activities at a host destination. In order to understand how these social impacts affect each stakeholder individually,

this paper will split the stakeholders into their two respective sides: the demand (sport tourists) and the supply (locals) of sport mega-event tourism.

STAKEHOLDERS

SPORT TOURISTS

The profile of sports tourists is of great interest to destination managers since they offer various differences in demographic and psychographic characteristics, especially when referring to the tourists' behaviors and experiences. In terms of behavior, Higham (2005) suggests that there are three macro-behaviors which connote a particular type of sport tourism: participating (active sports tourism) watching (event sport tourism), and visiting sports-related attractions (nostalgia sports tourism).

Experiences of tourists refer to interactions with the places where the mega-events are held and the communities of people who reside in those places. Sport mega-events bring large groups of people together in collective displays of devotion and celebration and Horne et al. (2006) suggest that the adoption of symbols act as signs of social inclusion in expressive displays of sportive nationalism. Hughes (1993) further advises that the product or service consumed by sports tourists is, to a significant extent, the community as a whole, "its heritage and customs, its hospitality and goodwill, its milieu and ambience" (p.4). What Hughes is implying is

that all these experiences that the sports tourists gain are part of the host community's exposure to the world through their personal experiences, which helps with the image and promotion of the host community.

Whereas the demand side of the social impacts of mega-events focuses more on the experiences and behaviors that the sport tourists are hoping to achieve, the supply side deals with actual changes in the urban environment.

HOST COMMUNITY RESIDENTS

According to Horne et al. (2006), "Sports mega-events are important elements in the orientation of nations to international or global society and they have had an important role in the transformation of the modern urban environment" (p. 1). What Horne is implying is that sport mega-events have particular importance to urban regeneration and improvements in relation to inner city problems found in Europe and N. America" (Hughes, 1993). Hughes (1993) discusses that many inner city areas are characterized by net population outflow, high-population density, a high level of unemployment, and poor quality housing. Hosting these phenomenal sport mega-events makes considerable investments and improvements to the host community prior to the mega-event and the prospect is based on improvements to the environment and infrastructure and a generally enhanced image or awareness of an area. In turn, this leads to the raising of land values and the re-imaging of the host-

community for outsiders, particularly future potential tourists. Evans (2005) adds to this point, emphasizing that “regeneration is not simply about bricks and mortar. It’s about the physical, social, and economic well-being of an area; it’s about the quality of life in our neighborhoods” (p. 975).

Even though urban regeneration usually leads to positive impacts of the urban environment, they can also lead to evictions of certain, less affluent populations. This negative impact can be seen in the study of the 2008 Beijing Olympic Games included in the Horne et al. (2006) article, where forced evictions estimated at over 300,000 to make way for new infrastructure and sports facilities. However urban regeneration can also lead to increases in inward and foreign investment (Hughes, 1993) and employment.

With regards to employment, sport mega-events can create many jobs, however most of these jobs are low paid and seasonal. Regardless of this fact, sport mega-events still create temporary jobs which in the long run can ultimately lead to less employment due to worker experiences. Another social issue that needs to be addressed is overcrowding, which usually hinders locals and sport tourists alike from visiting or participating in certain community events related to the mega-event. Finally, mega-events can also cause a disruption in the lives of community residents, which can generate host community resentment (Higham, 2005) and

leave a legacy of sports facilities and infrastructure that cannot be utilized fully (Hughes, 1993).

For the most part of this research, interest is in the supply side of the sport mega-event tourism, particularly the host community's perspectives of these impacts. The following section will explore some previous studies that were influential in examining social impacts of tourism development and mega-events from a host-community perspective.

RELEVANT AND INFLUENTIAL STUDIES

In the broader context of tourism academia, there has been a number of community perception studies conducted in the last decade (Fredline & Faulkner, 2000; Gursoy & Kendall, 2006; Gursoy & Rutherford, 2004; Vanclay, 2003), particularly with respect to host-community continuums (Ap & Crompton, 1993; Zhou & Ap, 2009; Zhou, 2010). Other major theoretical frameworks, such as the social exchange theory (Ap, 1992; Waitt, 2003; Gursoy & Rutherford, 2004; Hritz & Ross, 2010) and the social representation theory (Pearce, Moscardo, & Ross, 1996), have also been applied to identify and measure local communities' responses and perceptions toward tourism and event development.

HOST COMMUNITY CONTINUUMS

With respect to host-community continuums, Fredline and Faulkner (2000) examined the local community's attitudes of the impacts of the Gold Coast Indy Grand Prix by developing a 36 impact item scale. The study utilized exploratory factor analysis and six factors were identified: 1) community benefits, 2) short term negative impacts, 3) international profile and economic benefits, 4) negative economic impacts, 5) negative physical impacts, and 6) amenity and facility development benefits. Moreover cluster analysis was performed on the 36 impact statements and they identified five clusters of resident groups with similar response patterns: haters, lovers, ambivalent supporters, realists, and concerned for a reason. Likewise, Ap & Crompton (1993) reported an influential four-stage strategy continuum for responding to tourism impacts: embracement, tolerance, adjustment, and withdrawal. There is a common underlying theme among these studies in that a continuum is established, with supporters (embracement) on one side of the continuum and haters (withdrawal) on the other side.

Zhou (2010) examined the host residents' perceptions toward a major sporting event, the Macao Formula-3 Grand Prix in China. Zhou classified his sample into two groups based on their responses to his survey, the embracers and tolerators. The results indicated that the three most significant factors that influence resident perceptions in Macao were:

age group, attitude about government performance in organization of Grand Prix, and preferences regarding having more tourists visiting Macao. Similarly Zhou and Ap (2009) classified their sample into two groups, 'embracers' and "supporters" and also discovered that the most influential factors were residents' perceptions about government performance, their preference of more tourism development, and tourism-industry work experience. However a considerable limitation for both studies was that they were conducted in China, a destination influenced by Chinese and Eastern traditions which surely differ from the traditional Western culture where this study will be conducted, specifically Vilnius, Lithuania.

SOCIAL EXCHANGE THEORY

The social exchange theory suggests that residents support or evaluate tourism or tourist events as positive in terms of whether they perceive the benefits (positives) as outweighing the costs (negatives) (Waitt, 2003). If the costs exceed the benefits, then residents could be against the event or even consider the event to be negative. In his study, Waitt used the social exchange theory to examine the changes in enthusiasm between 1998 and 2000 towards the Sydney Olympics. The majority of his respondents perceived gains as out-weighting costs, indicating that "an exchange relationship between the individual and the event is not static but rather constantly negotiated and renegotiated"

(Waitt, 2003, p.975). This means that over time, peoples' attitudes toward certain events are always changing and are never permanent.

Gursoy and Rutherford (2004) proposed that the social exchange theory suggests that residents "are likely to support development as long as they believe that the expected benefits exceed the costs" (p. 497). They used this theory to test a series of hypotheses for a theoretical tourism support model and discovered that host community backing for tourism development is affected by nine determinants of residents' support: the level of community concern, ecocentric values, utilization of tourism resource base, community attachment, the state of the local economy, economic benefits, social benefits, social costs, and cultural benefits. These cost and benefit factors were important contributions from the study and Hritz and Ross (2010) reinforced their importance by finding similar results.

Hritz and Ross (2010) utilized the social exchange theory with residents of Indianapolis, Indiana to explore their support of sport tourism. The study revealed a four factor structure of social benefits, environmental benefits, economic benefits, and general negative impacts. It is clear to see that in order for residents to accept social change, a process of negotiated exchanges between both tourists and residents has to predominately affect the residents positively, in order for them to accept this change and rule in favor of the tourism event.

BACKGROUND

FIBA AND EUROBASKET 2011

FIBA is a French acronym, which in English stands for the International Basketball Federation. FIBA holds many large-scale global basketball events at the highest competitive level, including EuroBasket, the European Basketball Championship that is a biennial mega-sporting event where European men's national teams compete to be crowned the basketball champions of Europe.

This year, the event was held in six different cities in the country of Lithuania. The tournament included three different rounds: 1) the group stages (held in 4 of the 6 cities), 2) the qualifying stages, held in Vilnius, and 3) the playoffs, held in Kaunas. This particular research study solely focused on the qualifying stages held in Vilnius from September 7th to September 12th, 2011 at the Siemens Basketball Arena. The city of Vilnius was chosen for this case-study research since it is the capital of Lithuania and has the largest population of any other city in the country. In the end of the tournament, Lithuania finished in fifth place and Spain were crowned EuroBasket 2011 Champions by beating France in the Final game of the championship.

LITHUANIA AND VILNIUS

The Republic of Lithuania gained its independence from the Soviet Union in the early 1990's and joined both NATO and the European Union in the spring of 2004. The country is located in Eastern Europe (see Figure 1) and in accordance to the CIA World Factbook, as of July 2009, it has a population of 3,535,547 people. Close to 70% of the population is between the ages of 15-64, with 1,211,707 males and 1,254,195 females, and the median age is 40.1 years old. The capital of Lithuania is Vilnius and it is located in the southeast region of Lithuania. According to the official website of the Vilnius municipality, www.vilnius.lt, the city of Vilnius has a total population of 554,400 people and in 2009, the city was elected as the European Capital of Culture, signifying its emergence as one of Europe's most beautiful and significant cities.

Figure 1 – Map of Lithuania and Vilnius



PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES

The aim of this study was to examine the local Lithuanian residents' perceptions toward the social impacts of EuroBasket 2011 on their community. The specific objectives of this study were to:

1. Investigate and explore Vilnius residents' perceptions and attitudes toward the impacts of the FIBA EuroBasket 2011 tournament held at the Siemens Arena in Vilnius, Lithuania;
2. Identify the factors that affect residents' perceptions toward the FIBA EuroBasket 2011 tournament using quantitative and qualitative analyses; and
3. Compare and examine the different residents' attitudes towards the impacts associated with EuroBasket 2011 in accordance to these mixed methods techniques to explore the embracement-withdrawal continuum and evaluate the social exchange theory.

METHODOLOGY

This specific study was intended as case-study survey research, which followed a mixed methods design that integrated both quantitative and qualitative data. This research method allowed for the exploration and examination of the residents' perceptions of the impacts associated with FIBA EuroBasket 2011. The data collection and analysis of this research included two key elements.

RESEARCH METHODS AND DATA COLLECTION

The qualitative element of this research used a face-to-face, individual semi-standardized interview process where each respondent was asked to answer six open-ended questions that deal with the impacts associated with EuroBasket 2011. Each interview lasted approximately 40 minutes and the six open-ended questions were based from a study by Ap and Crompton (1998), where they developed and tested a standardized tourism impact scale to measure perceived impacts of tourism development in three small Texas communities. They conducted 38 personal interviews that were broadly guided by four open-ended questions and developed a 35 item impact scale. This study's qualitative interviews were broadly guided by these six questions:

1. How do the tourism impacts created by EuroBasket 2011 personally affect your way of life?
2. What do you like best about EuroBasket 2011 and its impacts on Vilnius residents?
3. What do you like least about EuroBasket 2011 and its impacts on Vilnius residents?
4. What do you think are the resident's concerns about tourism caused by the event?
5. How do you feel about the government's performance in regards to the event?

6. Is there anything else that you would like to add that we might not have discussed?

Since several studies have shown that certain groups in a community have different attitudes toward tourism (Ap and Crompton, 1993; Gursoy, Kim, and Uysal, 2004; Chen, 2006; Zhou and Ap, 2009; Zhou, 2010) it was crucial to seek diverse views from residents who are employed in the different industries of Vilnius. Four individuals were purposely-randomly selected to participate in this interview process and each interview was tape-recorded in order to minimize bias. The participants included a professor of the Institute of Journalism at Vilnius University, a manager of the Vilnius Convention and Visitors Bureau, a marketing director of FIBA Europe, and a manager of the Marketing and Public Relations Division of Vilnius Municipality. However two limitations of this qualitative phase should be considered. First, only English-speaking locals were invited to participate in these open-ended interviews since none of the researchers have the ability to speak Lithuanian. Secondly, these four participants were selected because they were the only residents who were willing to participate in this interview process. Since this study by nature follows a mixed-methods design, it was deemed sufficient to conduct only four face-to-face, in-depth interviews.

The quantitative aspect of this research utilized a survey with 36 impact items (Table 1), which incorporated a five point Likert-type scale

varying from “strongly disagree” (1) to “strongly agree” (5).

Table 1 – 36 impact items used in quantitative survey

A	FIBA EuroBasket 2011 as source of entertainment
1	EuroBasket 2011 provides an opportunity to attend an interesting event in Vilnius
2	EuroBasket 2011 provides an opportunity to have fun with family and friends
3	EuroBasket 2011 provides the opportunity to meet new people and interact with tourists
4	EuroBasket 2011 increases entertainment opportunities for the locals of Vilnius
5	The nightlife in Vilnius is more exciting because of EuroBasket 2011
B	Host perceptions of public spending on the event by the Lithuanian government
6	The government spent too much public money on EuroBasket 2011
7	The money spent on the event could have been spent on other government projects and activities
8	EuroBasket 2011 assists in increasing public spending for other sporting events in Vilnius
9	The appearance of the area is improved because of EuroBasket 2011
C	Economic Impacts of EuroBasket 2011
10	EuroBasket 2011 is good for the economy since it creates jobs for the Lithuanian community
11	EuroBasket 2011 is good for local businesses
12	There are increased business opportunities because of EuroBasket 2011
13	EuroBasket 2011 attracts future businesses to Vilnius
D	EuroBasket 2011 disruption to local residents of Vilnius
14	EuroBasket 2011 disrupts the lives of local residents and creates inconvenience
15	EuroBasket 2011 causes traffic congestion and parking difficulties
16	EuroBasket 2011 increases crime in Vilnius
17	Visitors to EuroBasket 2011 are inconsiderate of local residents
18	EuroBasket 2011 brings too many tourists to the area
E	Use of public facilities in Vilnius, Lithuania
19	The event promotes the development and better maintenance of public facilities such as roads, parks, sporting facilities and/ or public transport
20	The event denies local residents access to public facilities such as roads, parks, sporting facilities and/ or public transport because of closure or overcrowding
F	Community impacts of EuroBasket 2011
21	The event makes locals feel more proud of Vilnius and brings the community closer together
22	The community benefits directly from EuroBasket 2011
23	Only some members of the community benefit from the event
24	Local residents have a say in the planning and management of EuroBasket 2011
25	EuroBasket 2011 has made Vilnius a more interesting place to live
G	Environmental impacts of EuroBasket 2011
26	EuroBasket 2011 causes damage to the environment
27	EuroBasket 2011 creates noise levels which annoy local residents
28	EuroBasket 2011 has a negative impact on the environment through excessive litter and pollution
29	EuroBasket 2011 has a negative impact on the environment through damages to natural areas
30	EuroBasket 2011 has a negative impact on the environment due to overcrowding
H	EuroBasket 2011 as a regional showcase of the Lithuanian community
31	EuroBasket 2011 showcases the city of Vilnius and the Lithuanian community in a positive light
32	EuroBasket 2011 has increased media coverage of Vilnius
33	EuroBasket 2011 enhances Lithuania's international identity by world media exposure
34	EuroBasket 2011 promotes Vilnius as a tourism destination
I	Impact of EuroBasket 2011 on prices
35	EuroBasket 2011 increases the overall cost of living during the event

36	EuroBasket 2011 leads to increases in the price of community goods such as food, transportation, accommodation, and real estate values
----	--

This impact-item scale was developed by Fredline and Faulkner (2000) and it allowed participants to state their level of agreement with each impact statement. The 36 impact items in the survey were categorized into nine different sections: FIBA EuroBasket 2011 as source of entertainment; Host perceptions of public spending on the event by the government; Economic impacts of EuroBasket 2011; EuroBasket 2011 disruption to local residents of Vilnius; Use of public facilities in Vilnius; Community impacts of EuroBasket 2011; Environmental impacts of EuroBasket 2011; EuroBasket 2011 as a regional showcase of the Lithuanian community; and impact of EuroBasket 2011 on prices. The second part of this survey asked participants their demographics, such as gender, age range, length of residency, marital status, education level, employment status, and whether or not they derived direct economic benefit from tourism in Lithuania or EuroBasket 2011. Participants were also asked to pick an option that best described their activities during the tournament, such as: attend EuroBasket 2011; watch it on TV; work; usual weekend activities not involving event; leaving the city altogether during the event; and other, where participants were able to state any other activity they engaged in during the tournament. Subsequently the survey was translated into Lithuanian in order to minimize any language barriers.

The initial data collection phase in Vilnius began during the

EuroBasket qualifying stages, September 7-12, 2011 and the second phase of data collection commenced upon immediate conclusion of the qualifying stages, September 13-20, 2011. In order to identify the study's participants, a purposive random sampling technique was used to identify a sample of local residents, who were over the age of 18 and were currently living in Vilnius, Lithuania. This close-ended questionnaire was conducted in three different locations in Vilnius: 1) at local businesses and restaurants in proximity of 5 miles of the Siemens Arena, 2) Osaz Shopping Centre, the largest shopping and entertainment mall in Vilnius, and 3) The Vilnius University campus, which is located in Old Town Vilnius. Furthermore the survey was also posted online in both languages so that participants, who did not have time to physically fill one out, were able to go online and fill it out electronically in either language:

www.surveymonkey.com/eurobasket2011 (English)

www.surveymonkey.com/eurobasket2011lit (Lithuanian).

At the end of the data collection phase, a total of 137 surveys were collected, but only 124 were usable since any questionnaires with missing values were not considered in order to ensure consistency and validity throughout the data. 63 usable interviews were collected physically at the three different locations in Vilnius and the remaining 61 usable interviews were collected online. The reason for the many online respondents could be as a result of the social media, which was utilized to access the tech-

savvy residents of Vilnius. The description of the study and links to the survey were posted on the official Facebook pages of Lithuania, Vilnius, University of Vilnius, and the Lithuanian National Basketball Team.

DATA ANALYSIS

The quantitative data were first analyzed to explore the descriptive statistics of the respondents' demographics. The majority of respondents, approximately 70%, preferred answering the survey in Lithuanian. This was anticipated since Lithuanian is the national language and almost everyone speaks it fluently. There were slightly more females (64.5%) than males (35.5%) represented in the sample and most respondents were between the age range of 18-27. This could be due to the fact that one of the locations where the survey was held was at the Vilnius University campus. Additionally this is reinforced due to the large amount of online responses from posting the survey links on social media outlets, which are usually used by young adults that have Facebook accounts. About 81% of the respondents also stated that they were currently single, which was not surprising given that the majority of the participants were still young adults in their 20s. Twenty nine percent of respondents had lived in Vilnius for over 15 years, 28% lived there between 1-4 years, and 16% lived in Vilnius between 5-9 years. A large percentage of the respondents, around 41%, had a Bachelor's degree and 30% had a graduate degree. Half the respondents were employed (49%) and only

seven percent of participants were employed in the Lithuanian tourism industry. Finally the most preferred activity amongst the respondents was watching the tournament on TV (55%), physically attending the tournament (21%), or working (8%). A surprising answer in the activities the respondents engaged in were volunteerism, with five percent of respondents saying they willingly helped out at the tournament with no economic incentive or reimbursement. Table 2 presents the resident perceptions of all 36 impact items in the survey along with each impact's mean and standard deviation values.

Table 2 – Perceptions towards the EuroBasket 2011 tournament (n=124)

General Perceptions	Frequencies %					Mean	SD
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree		
Provides an opportunity to attend an interesting event in Vilnius	0.8	4.8	3.2	54	37.1	4.2	0.79
Provides an opportunity to have fun with family and friends	0.8	3.2	6.5	57.3	32.3	4.2	0.75
Provides the opportunity to meet new people and interact with tourists	0.8	7.3	12.1	47.6	32.3	4	0.9
Increases entertainment opportunities for the locals of Vilnius	1.6	10.5	8.9	51.6	27.4	3.9	0.96
The nightlife in Vilnius is more exciting because of EuroBasket 2011	0.8	15.3	19.4	39.5	25	3.7	1.03
The government spent too much public money on EuroBasket 2011	11.3	33.1	41.1	11.3	3.2	2.6	0.94
The money spent on the event could have been spent on other government projects and activities	13.7	34.7	29	19.4	3.2	2.6	1.05
EuroBasket 2011 assists in increasing public spending for other sporting events in Vilnius	1.6	19.4	45.2	28.2	5.6	3.2	0.86
The appearance of the area is improved	3.2	13.7	16.9	50	16.1	3.6	1.02
EuroBasket 2011 is good for the economy since it creates jobs for the Lithuanian community	4	16.9	23.4	43.5	12.1	3.4	1.04
EuroBasket 2011 is good for local businesses	1.6	1.6	12.1	62.1	22.6	4	0.75

There are increased business opportunities	1.6	7.3	16.9	59.7	14.5	3.8	0.84
It attracts future businesses to Vilnius	2.4	19.4	44.4	27.4	6.5	3.2	0.9
It disrupts the lives of local residents and creates inconvenience	18.5	54	15.3	11.3	0.8	2.2	0.91
EuroBasket 2011 causes traffic congestion and parking difficulties	8.9	44.4	15.3	25.8	5.6	2.8	1.11
It increases crime in Vilnius	13.7	47.6	27.4	10.5	0.8	2.4	0.88
Visitors to EuroBasket 2011 are inconsiderate of local residents	12.9	48.4	25.8	9.7	3.2	2.4	0.95
It brings too many tourists to the area	41.1	43.5	5.6	8.1	1.6	1.9	0.96
It promotes the development and better maintenance of public facilities such as roads, parks, sporting facilities and/ or public transport	0.8	8.9	11.3	56.5	22.6	3.9	0.87
The event denies local residents access to public facilities such as roads, parks, sporting facilities and/ or public transport because of closure or overcrowding	11.3	46.8	17.7	24.2	0	2.5	0.98
The event makes locals feel more proud of Vilnius and brings the community closer together	1.6	0.8	5.6	54.8	37.1	4.3	0.74
The community benefits directly	2.4	5.6	34.7	46	11.3	3.6	0.86
Only some members of the community benefit from the event	1.6	30.6	33.9	29	4.8	3	0.93
Local residents have a say in the planning and management	8.9	40.3	34.7	12.9	3.2	2.6	0.93
EuroBasket 2011 has made Vilnius a more interesting place to live	6.5	12.9	18.5	43.5	18.5	3.5	1.13
It causes damage to the environment	22.6	46	20.2	10.5	0.8	2.2	0.94
EuroBasket 2011 creates noise levels which annoy local residents	17.7	57.3	8.1	12.9	4	2.3	1.03
EuroBasket 2011 has a negative impact on the environment through excessive litter and pollution	11.3	51.6	19.4	14.5	3.2	2.5	0.98
EuroBasket 2011 has a negative impact on the environment through damages to natural areas	16.1	58.1	16.1	8.1	1.6	2.2	0.87
It has a negative impact on the environment due to overcrowding	16.9	55.6	16.9	8.1	2.4	2.2	0.91
EuroBasket 2011 showcases the city of Vilnius and the Lithuanian community in a positive light	0.8	3.2	4.8	59.7	31.5	4.2	0.73
EuroBasket 2011 has increased media coverage of Vilnius	0	5.6	16.1	46.8	31.5	4	0.84
EuroBasket 2011 enhances Lithuania's international identity by world media exposure	0.8	2.4	16.1	51.6	29	4.1	0.79

EuroBasket 2011 promotes Vilnius as a tourism destination	0	3.2	10.5	54.8	31.5	4.1	0.73
EuroBasket 2011 increases the overall cost of living during the event	4.8	29	22.6	33.9	9.7	3.1	1.09
It leads to increases in the price of community goods such as food, transportation, accommodation, and real estate values	6.5	38.7	22.6	25	7.3	2.9	1.09

This table illustrates that approximately 37% of respondents strongly agreed that EuroBasket 2011 provided a great opportunity to attend an interesting event in Vilnius as well as it gave them a great sense of pride hosting such a mega-event, which they believe brought the community closer together. Over 60% of respondents also agreed that the event was good for local businesses (62%), that it provided an increase in business opportunities (60%), and it showcased the city of Vilnius in a positive light (60%). These three impact items had the highest level of agreement than the other 33 remaining impact items. Other high levels of agreement between respondents were the event provided an opportunity to have fun with friends and family (57%) and the event promoted Vilnius as a good tourism destination (55%).

On the other hand, 41% of respondents strongly disagreed that the event brought too many tourists to the area indicating that they did not feel bothered by the influx of sport tourists. Approximately 23% of respondents strongly disagreed that the event caused any damage to the environment. Furthermore, over 55% of respondents disagreed with impact statements that EuroBasket 2011 had any type of negative impact on the

environment: through noise levels that annoyed the residents (57%), through damages to natural areas (58%), or due to overcrowding (56%). The highest percentage of neutral responses was 45%, and that was in relation to the event potentially assisting in the increase of public spending for other sporting events in Vilnius.

In order to gain a better understanding of the underlying concepts of the 36 impact items, exploratory factor analysis was utilized to reduce the data into smaller, more meaningful factors (Fredline & Faulkner, 2000; Zhou & Ap, 2008; Zhou, 2010). Additionally, DeCoster (1998) argued that the primary objectives of exploratory factor analysis (EFA) are to determine “the number of common factors influencing a set of measures and the strength of the relationship between each factor and each observed measure” (p.2). DeCoster (1998) added that EFA is commonly used to identify the nature of the constructs underlying responses in a specific content area and to determine what sets of items “hang together” in a questionnaire. As such, it was decided that EFA would help create a more meaningful data set to these impacts. Similarly to Fredline and Faulkner (2000), Zhou and Ap (2008), and Zhou (2010), this study used principal component analysis with Varimax rotation to extract the underlying impact factors. Since this study utilized a similar 36 impact-item scale developed by Fredline and Faulkner (2000), it was deemed acceptable to use principal component analysis to categorize the data into

six factors, which were the same number of factors reported in Fredline and Faulkner (2000). Furthermore reliability analysis was performed to test the validity of each factor, which yielded into high Cronbach's alpha values confirming the significance of each factor. The total variance of the principal component analysis with Varimax rotation explained 56.3% and each of the generated six factors included a number of impact items that were characterized by their underlying factor themes. Table 3 shows the rotated component matrix and the significance of each impact item in relation to the six generated factors.

Table 3 – Rotated Component Matrix of 36 impact items (n=124)

	Component					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
Q4	.748	-.052	.096	-.009	.222	-.084
Q5	.690	-.113	.176	.169	.142	.044
Q1	.662	-.119	.267	-.081	.251	.051
Q3	.614	-.086	.033	-.165	.126	.232
Q25	.551	-.223	.416	-.085	.075	-.132
Q19	.550	.011	.316	-.376	.005	.033
Q9	.511	.025	.173	-.273	.263	-.268
Q21	.477	-.136	.269	-.335	.360	.260
Q22	.476	-.184	.265	-.221	.184	.100
Q29	-.071	.800	-.092	.197	-.127	-.050
Q26	-.173	.788	-.134	.113	-.021	.078
Q28	-.200	.773	-.085	.138	.042	.116
Q30	.042	.737	-.081	.350	-.166	-.047
Q27	-.063	.635	-.123	.364	-.163	.116
Q23	-.104	.448	-.440	-.098	-.015	.181
Q32	.181	.019	.726	.014	.192	.055
Q33	.262	-.118	.698	-.211	.232	.182
Q31	.386	-.170	.644	-.207	.231	.104
Q34	.146	-.005	.568	-.120	.305	.328

Q36	.134	-.309	.565	-.245	.024	-.014
Q35	.137	-.334	.530	-.059	.053	-.157
Q24	.191	.240	.298	.183	.285	-.161
Q14	-.271	.308	-.129	.734	-.061	-.049
Q15	.028	.154	.001	.701	-.188	.171
Q16	-.027	.419	-.181	.589	-.030	.001
Q17	-.225	.393	-.180	.539	.038	.090
Q18	-.165	.147	-.129	.459	.271	-.070
Q20	-.067	.328	.004	.445	-.038	.239
Q8	.380	-.071	-.012	.397	.236	.189
Q11	.125	-.051	.063	.087	.791	.035
Q12	.330	-.063	.185	-.018	.692	-.021
Q10	.387	-.096	.160	.038	.610	-.118
Q13	.181	-.131	.289	-.164	.560	.017
Q2	.351	-.142	.272	-.197	.457	.095
Q6	.044	.170	-.074	.077	.061	.802
Q7	.094	.072	.228	.181	-.098	.739

Once the exploratory factor analysis was concluded, reliability analysis was conducted to test the validity of each factor. The reliability analysis produced high Cronbach's alpha values thus confirming the reliability of all six factors. Each factor was labeled according to how the EFA grouped the impact items based on the strength of the variables relationships. These six factors were further examined by utilizing a Bivariate correlation analysis, which yielded into a correlation matrix presented in Table 4. The correlation matrix was able to identify significant relationships at the 0.05 significance level between each factor, indicating strong correlations amongst the factors.

The first factor, labeled "sociocultural impacts", contained seven impact items and explained the highest variance of all factors with 12.1%.

This factor's reliability score was 0.82 signifying the validity of the factor and the bivariate correlation indicated a mean score of 27 with a standard deviation of 4.7. In accordance with the correlation matrix, the highest positive correlations with this factor were social benefits (.589) and socioeconomic impacts (.573). This could hold true since sociocultural impacts are related to community issues, which deal with the social benefits of this event on the community, as well as the economic boost the event had on the community. The remaining three factors were also significant yet negatively correlated due to the fact that the impact items in each factor were phrased negatively and as a result, high negative correlations were calculated.

Table 4 – Correlation Matrix of the six generated factors

		sociocultural	socioenvironmental	social_ benefits	social_ costs	socioeconomic	sociopolitical
sociocultural	Pearson Correlation Sig. (2- tailed)	1	-.332** .000	.589** .000	-.350** .000	.573** .000	-.406** .000
socioenvironmental	Pearson Correlation Sig. (2- tailed)	-.332** .000	1	-.298** .001	.606** .000	-.244** .006	.418** .000
social_benefits	Pearson Correlation Sig. (2- tailed)	.589** .000	-.298** .001	1	-.291** .001	.494** .000	-.453** .000

social_costs	Pearson	-.350**	.606**	-.291**	1	-.192*	.416**
	Correlation n						
	Sig. (2- tailed)	.000	.000	.001		.033	.000
socioeconomic	Pearson	.573**	-.244**	.494**	-.192*	1	-.337**
	Correlation n						
	Sig. (2- tailed)	.000	.006	.000	.033		.000
sociopolitical	Pearson	-.406**	.418**	-.453**	.416**	-.337**	1
	Correlation n						
	Sig. (2- tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	
	N	124	124	124	124	124	124

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

The second factor contained five impact items and was labeled “socioenvironmental impacts”. This factor explained approximately 11.5% of the variance and had a reliability score of 0.88, which was the highest Cronbach’s alpha score of all the factors. The bivariate correlation analysis produced a mean score of 11.4 and a standard deviation of 3.9 amongst the items in this factor and according to the correlation matrix, every factor was deemed significant at the 0.05 significant level. The most significant negative correlation was socioeconomic impacts (-0.244) and the highest positive correlation was social costs (0.606). The high positive correlation with social costs could be due to the fact that the impact items in this factor were presented as statements where the event had a

negative impact on the environment thus the matrix yielded a high positive correlation with perceived social costs of the event. All these impact items had high levels of disagreement among respondents (Table 3) indicating that most respondents believed that the event did not cause any damage to their environment.

The third factor was named “social benefits”, it explained about 10.1% of the variance, and included four impact items. The reliability score of this factor was 0.84 and the bivariate correlation created a mean score of 16.4 and standard deviation of 2.5. These items were related with the perceived benefits the society accrues throughout the duration of the tournament in Vilnius. Based on the correlation matrix, sociocultural and socioeconomic impacts were the highest positive correlation scores with 0.589 and 0.494 respectively. This is probably because the benefits attained from the event were mainly identified as cultural and economic benefits. The sociopolitical factor was the highest negative correlated factor (-0.453) and again, this was because the impact statements in the sociopolitical factor were worded as the government spending too much money on the event, which many respondents, approximately 45%, disagreed with (over 30% of responses to this factor were neutral).

The fourth factor comprised six items and explained about 9.2% of the variance. This factor was named “social costs” since the impact items included deal with some of the costs the society tolerated with during the

event in Vilnius. The reliability score of the factor was 0.80 and the bivariate correlation produced a mean of 14.2 and a standard deviation value of 4.1. The correlation matrix computed that the highest positive correlations with this factor were socioenvironmental (0.606) and sociopolitical (.416) impacts. However these two correlations were based on the fact that these two factors included impact items where disagreement levels were highest amongst the responses, indicating that these two factors had the least effect on social costs.

Factor five had four impact items that were categorized together, and this factor explained 8.2% of the variance. Since the impact items included in this factor were considered economic impacts, it was labeled “socioeconomic impacts”. The Cronbach’s alpha value was 0.77, indicating the reliability of this factor, and the mean and standard deviation values were 14.4 and 2.7 respectively. The correlation matrix evaluated that the most significant negative correlation was social costs (-1.92) and the second highest positive correlation was social benefits (0.494). This illustrates that socioeconomic impacts are directly correlated to both social costs (negative correlation) and social benefits (positive correlation).

Lastly factor six was labeled “sociopolitical impacts”, and consisted of only two impact items, which accounted for 5.2% of the variance. The reliability score of this factor was 0.72, which was the lowest Cronbach’s alpha score of all six factors, yet high enough to ensure validity among the

impact items grouped in this factor. The bivariate correlation produced a mean of 5.3 and standard deviation of 1.8. The correlation matrix indicated that all remaining five factors had high correlations with this factor; positive correlations included socioenvironmental impacts (0.418) and social costs (0.416), and the negative correlations consisted of the remaining three factors, socioeconomic (-0.337), sociocultural (-0.406), and social benefits (-0.453). All the means and standard deviation values of each factor are presented in Table 5 for convenience.

Table 5 – Means and standard deviations of each factor

Factors	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
sociocultural	26.9839	4.69558	124
socioenvironmental	11.4032	3.88225	124
social_benefits	16.4194	2.54743	124
social_costs	14.1613	4.07927	124
socioeconomic	14.3952	2.74030	124
sociopolitical	5.2581	1.75708	124

In order to gain a deeper understanding of how the EuroBasket 2011 impacts were perceived among different resident groups within the study's sample, Hierarchical cluster analysis was conducted to group the respondents based on Ap and Crompton's "embrace-tolerance-adjustment-withdrawal" continuum (1993). This four-stage strategy continuum suggested by Ap and Crompton (1993) was used to explore residents' perceptions on responding to tourism impacts by classifying the local residents into four categories: embracement, tolerance, adjustment,

and withdrawal. Embracers are the residents who view the overall impacts of the event as more positive than negative thus tend to be more supportive of the event. Tolerators are the residents that do not oppose the event completely, yet they perceive the negative impacts to outweigh the positive impacts.

Hierarchical cluster analysis was utilized in SPSS, which applied the squared Euclidian distance to identify the range and number of clusters for the study's sample residents. This led to the identification of two clusters. The two cluster solution was then developed for all 124 cases, with 120 cases in cluster A and four cases in cluster B. Based on the terminology of Ap and Crompton (1993) and Zhou (2010), cluster A was labeled as "embracers" and cluster B as "tolerators" (Zhou, 2010).

Whereas cluster A, the "embracers", constituted the majority of the respondents with approximately 97%, cluster B constituted the minority of the sample, 3%, with respondents 35, 77, 98, and 110 consisting of the "tolerators". This large disparity between cluster A and B is consistent with the literature since Zhou and Ap (2009) reported that the embracers in their study constituted the majority of their respondents, 88%, and that only 12% of respondents were identified as tolerators. However it must be noted that a limitation of this study and the Zhou and Ap (2009) study is that the perceptions that were gathered from their respective respondents were dramatically in favor of their respective events. In other words, each

study collected data by interviewing individuals who were willing to participate in the study, which is usually the case when residents are interested about the event and are keen to spend the time asked of them to answer the surveys. This leads to an implicit bias in the responses of residents who accepted to participate, since they are most likely supportive of the event.

Specifically for this study, the social media was incorporated to gather responses from tech-savvy residents and half of the completed surveys utilized were gathered from the social media, particularly Facebook. However some of the official Facebook pages were the Lithuanian National Basketball Team and EuroBasket 2011 pages, which are pages that most likely residents, who are fans of basketball and ultimately supporters of the event, would have access to. This implicit bias was a main challenge in the culmination of this study since access to residents who truly are not supportive of the event, especially in a country where basketball is the national sport, was hard to obtain. Therefore the sample was not representative of entire Vilnius population.

The mean differences between both clusters were significant and are illustrated in Table 6. Table 6 shows that the “tolerators” cluster had low means when the “embracers” cluster had high means for each impact item, and where the “tolerators” had high means, the “embracers” had lower mean scores. Therefore it can be inferred that the embracers were

much more supportive of the event than the tolerators, and they viewed the positive impacts as exceeding the negative ones. The tolerators believed that the government spent too much money on this event (mean score of 4.25) and that the money could have been used for other government projects and activities (mean score of 4.5). They also strongly agreed that the event only benefits some members of the community (4.5). On the other hand, the “embracers” believed that the event promoted tourism in Vilnius (4.18) and that the event made them feel more proud of their city and brought them closer together (4.33). Consequently a positive social exchange is in effect among the respondents in Cluster A (embracers) and a negative social exchange has taken effect for respondents in Cluster B (tolerators).

Table 6 – Mean Differences between each Cluster

Statements	Cluster A	Cluster B
Provides an opportunity to attend an interesting event in Vilnius	4.3	1.75
Provides an opportunity to have fun with family and friends	4.22	2.75
Provides the opportunity to meet new people and interact with tourists	4.11	1.75
Increases entertainment opportunities for the locals of Vilnius	4.08	1.5
The nightlife in Vilnius is more exciting because of EuroBasket 2011	3.78	2.25
The government spent too much public money on EuroBasket 2011	2.57	4.25
The money spent on the event could have been spent on other government projects and activities	2.58	4.5
EuroBasket 2011 assists in increasing public spending for other sporting events in Vilnius	3.2	2.25
The appearance of the area is improved	3.69	1.5
EuroBasket 2011 is good for the economy since it creates jobs for the Lithuanian community	3.5	1.25
EuroBasket 2011 is good for local businesses	4.08	2.25
There are increased business opportunities	3.85	1.75
It attracts future businesses to Vilnius	3.22	1.5
It disrupts the lives of local residents and creates inconvenience	2.16	4
EuroBasket 2011 causes traffic congestion and parking difficulties	2.72	3.75
It increases crime in Vilnius	2.34	3.25

Visitors to EuroBasket 2011 are inconsiderate of local residents	2.37	4
It brings too many tourists to the area	1.85	2
It promotes the development and better maintenance of public facilities such as roads, parks, sporting facilities and/ or public transport	3.98	1.75
The event denies local residents access to public facilities such as roads, parks, sporting facilities and/ or public transport because of closure or overcrowding	2.52	3.5
The event makes locals feel more proud of Vilnius and brings the community closer together	4.33	1.75
The community benefits directly	3.66	1.25
Only some members of the community benefit from the event	3	4.5
Local residents have a say in the planning and management	2.65	1.5
EuroBasket 2011 has made Vilnius a more interesting place to live	3.63	1
It causes damage to the environment	2.18	3
EuroBasket 2011 creates noise levels which annoy local residents	2.23	4
EuroBasket 2011 has a negative impact on the environment through excessive litter and pollution	2.45	3
EuroBasket 2011 has a negative impact on the environment through damages to natural areas	2.19	3
It has a negative impact on the environment due to overcrowding	2.22	2.75
EuroBasket 2011 showcases the city of Vilnius and the Lithuanian community in a positive light	4.24	2.25
EuroBasket 2011 has increased media coverage of Vilnius	4.07	3.25
EuroBasket 2011 enhances Lithuania's international identity by world media exposure	4.12	2.25
EuroBasket 2011 promotes Vilnius as a tourism destination	4.18	3
EuroBasket 2011 increases the overall cost of living during the event	3.16	2.75
It leads to increases in the price of community goods such as food, transportation, accommodation, and real estate values	2.88	2.75

NARRATIVE OF FINDINGS

In order to analyze the qualitative data in this study, it was primarily required to decide which qualitative analytical approach was most appropriate for this specific research study. Consequently, it was determined that the best method would be an instrumental case study analysis, where the focus is more on description than interpretation, i.e. to organize the data into meaningful descriptive constructs (Padgett, 2008). This was done by performing data management manually and transcribing the qualitative data (face-to-face interviews) using coding and thematic

development (Padgett, 2008). Many researchers tend to use both codes and themes interchangeably; however Morse (2008) argues that ‘codes’ are a collection of similar data sorted into the same place and ‘themes’ are a meaningful essence that runs through the data. Thus coding is a way to organize data by the same subject for further analysis, and themes are developed from the coded data, as main study findings. Using this process, six themes were identified and are presented as findings:

1. Sociocultural Impacts (SCU)

Sociocultural impacts are impacts related to community issues i.e. they involve the combination of social and cultural factors. When asked about how these impacts created by EuroBasket 2011 personally affected their way of lives, one respondent said,

“I was very proud to see all of our people united/unified, and this event made us very friendly with one another, and all ages of people are very emotional and sentimental. When all the fans were singing all the national songs it was very beautiful, I cried. Everyone becomes unified and I become very happy to hear us all celebrate together”.

Another respondent added, “basketball is our disease. It is our national sport.” She mentioned that the event also brought about 115 cultural events so that tourists could experience the Lithuanian culture by participating in events and eating their national food. Another responded added that there was a world record set for 5,000 people bouncing the ball

at the same time for 5 minutes during one of their cultural events. These statements indicate how happy and grateful these respondents were for the event because it brought about a feeling of a more unified country that embraced its culture. The respondents wanted to reflect their culture on all the tourists who were in town to participate in this historic moment for the Lithuanian people. Another respondent explained,

“I like it when my city is celebrating an occasion, and everywhere there are happy faces, especially if we win! This event is great for our independence, to reinforce it, cause so many years we were under Soviet Union, it is amazing to see all these different nations and especially it reinforces our freedom, especially that we can hold such a big sport event. And our country is really good in basketball, which makes it our national sport”.

It seems that the most important sociocultural impacts for the residents tend to be the opportunity to celebrate the country's independence, especially since this is the first large-scale event they have had in over 20 years. The locals' genuine love for basketball and the fact that Vilnius was voted the European Capital of Culture by the European Union (EU) in 2009, made them an immediate preferred location to host EuroBasket 2011, and as one respondent put it,

“For me, Lithuania is no doubt the number 1 country in the world for basketball. I personally know the director of Football (soccer) in Lithuania and I can for sure say that he is the only one out of every country in Europe and even on the planet, to complain that they are number 2 as a sport; basketball is first and soccer is second. EuroBasket is huge for the Lithuanian people.”

Another surprising quote by one of the respondents was, “Lithuania is not a country where you have a landmark like the Eiffel tower, Big Ben, or anything like that...what you have is the people and their love for their national sport, basketball”. These quotes imply that basketball is an important part of the Lithuanian culture and the EuroBasket tournament is one that is most welcome, particularly since the residents believed that their national team had a chance to win the entire tournament.

2. Socioeconomic Impacts (SEC)

Socioeconomic impacts are usually self-explanatory in that they consist of variables such as income, standard of living, employment, and business opportunities in the city of Vilnius. A response from a participant was that, “it (EuroBasket) is good for jobs and employment, more jobs created to help. More waitresses for cafes and restaurants, more volunteers from younger people.” This respondent feels that EuroBasket created the opportunity for more employment, regardless if it is temporary or not. Another respondent added,

“The media, government, and locals had discussions and predicted that there would be more tourists, but due to economic crisis In Europe, there were fewer tourists than predicted... the business trade centers were preparing for more funds, but none really came in. They completely overestimated the number of tourists who would come in”.

The respondent informed us that this problem was attributed to the fact that the Lithuanian national airlines went bankrupt in 2008 so accessibility to Vilnius has been an issue. Moreover the same respondent added that the airport is too small and presently, this is the city's biggest problem since the EU will presently not help them fund its expansion.

An additional major socioeconomic issue discovered was the overwhelming need from entrepreneurs and corporations to be involved in the EuroBasket hype, either as official or unofficial partners, purely as an economic incentive to profit from this once-in-a-lifetime event. The respondent said,

“This is first year that so many people are trying to get a piece of the cake but unfortunately not everyone can. And so we have many ambushes throughout this tournament where people are stealing the image of EuroBasket and using to promote their own business and make profit out of something they have no rights to. So they get involved and advertise falsely and we have a lot of problems because FIBA Europe isn't ready to face such a problem. That's how big of a market this is. So what we like least is the lack of control over this ambushes these businesses and corporations that use our mark and the event for their gain when they don't even have any rights to it!”

This quote indicates that since this event is so big and important for the country, everyone tries to use EuroBasket for a quick profit and this can create a lot of problems. However it seems that whether or not anyone owns the rights to use EuroBasket, almost every business incorporated the tournament to get involved and maintain the 'buzz' within their

clientele. It seems that many businesses were able to use the tournament for their economic advantage, indicating the significance of the event's socioeconomic impact on Vilnius and Lithuania as a whole.

3. Socioenvironmental Impacts (SEN)

These impacts consist of the variables used to measure the impacts of tourism on traffic, overcrowding, and any other impacts related to the urban and natural environment in Vilnius. Physical infrastructure provision is often cited as a key benefit of major events and this was reinforced by this quote, "they built new public infrastructure for sports, such as basketball and volleyball courts, and more professional sports will be held here because of our improved infrastructure." This respondent feels that the event has brought with it the action to improve existing infrastructure, which she believes is crucial for holding other major sporting events in the future. Another respondent added,

"The recession affected the whole country and many Vilnius residents, however not the EuroBasket plans. Stadiums were still being constructed, as were hotels and any other renovations needed to have accessibility to these entire new infrastructures".

Accessibility seems to be a major problem for Vilnius, but the EuroBasket 2011 has offered the city an opportunity to develop their urban environment by improving roads, hotels, parks, sport facilities, parks, and public transportation. Two of the four respondents (50%) expressed that the influx of cars from neighboring cities and countries did not cause more

traffic problems, and all four respondents believed that the event did not cause any major negative environmental impacts.

4. Sociopolitical Impacts (SP)

These impacts are related to the structure or affairs of government and politics in Vilnius. Politics is a process by which groups of people make collective decisions for running governmental or country/city affairs and essentially the decision to hold a large scale event is a political one. Usually the concern is if the residents were involved in the planning process of these sport mega-events. A respondent said,

“We (FIBA Europe) were working with local organizing committee and there are, at times, some arguments but what they have done here they have put us above them, and for me this really is the best EuroBasket ever! New stadiums, new sport infrastructure, a very supportive government.”

The same respondent added,

“They (the government) are all dedicated to this event for their country, including president and prime minister. My boss was for 2 years in direct contact with the prime minister; they were told that they did not have enough hotels for the tourists, and so they build more hotels, they renovated many other ones, did everything to give a good and lasting impression.”

This respondent makes it clear that FIBA Europe was in direct contact with the Lithuanian government and local organizing committees long before the event was in its final stages. The event really impacted the Lithuanian government by forcing it to improve all facilities and city infrastructure,

particularly new stadiums and more accommodation. Another respondent mentioned,

“Yes, the municipalities were involved in the planning. Lithuanian government helped a lot, in 2008 the Lithuanian budget dropped extremely, 3 years before EuroBasket 2011, and many stadiums were in the process of building, so they cut many public spending and increased taxes.”

The same respondent believed that due to the obligations the nation had to Europe and EuroBasket 2011, there was a national consensus that the government should finish all the projects. The government considered this event extremely important and even though the recession in 2008 hindered many of its plans, they were still able to endure these economic hardships and follow through with the completion of all new infrastructures.

5. Social Costs (SC)

Social Costs are the cost to society as a whole from the event.

These costs refer to the negative impacts associated with the event that were identified by the residents of Vilnius as harmful to their society. One of the respondents associated overcrowding with being a social cost, “When Lithuania plays, you can’t go out to bars/ restaurants because it is too crowded and all tables are reserved.” Another response, “for residents who live around Siemens arena, there are many blocked streets, different routes, inconvenient, but it’s only temporary”. This shows that although

they do not consider overcrowding to be a huge problem, it can definitely become annoying and frustrating when it is at its peak.

Another social cost created by the event was vandalism and the potential for increased crime. As a respondent put, “too much alcohol, depending on fans’ teams winning or losing, can create vandalism, increases in crime. Someone will always try to gain from tourists (stealing)”. In order to combat these difficulties, the city increased the amount of police officers and placed them on a 24 hour rotation in an attempt to make residents and even tourists themselves feel safer.

Another negative impact that presented itself during the event was prostitution. One of the respondents explained that in the past, many Eastern European countries have had a dramatic increase in prostitution during global sport mega-events. In order to fight this cost to their society, the government helped create the program “a real man does not pay for sex”. This plan was an attempt to battle any prostitution related activities and to educate the tourists that paying locals for sex is not the right or “manly” thing to do.

6. Social Benefits (SB)

The final theme determined from coding and thematic development was Social Benefits and these refer to the positive impacts that were identified as being essential or positive to the Vilnius community. One of

the most prevalent benefits was the mass exposure that Vilnius and Lithuania received because of the tournament. A respondent said that “The event had advertised well for the country and Vilnius” and another added that “Lithuania has been given more media exposure and has become more of a household name in Europe”. Recognition, especially for smaller countries in large regions like Lithuania, is vital to the tourism and urban developments of a city like Vilnius.

When referring to the social benefits associated with mega sport events, it is important to realize how much interaction is going on between the residents of the host nation and the sport tourists. In this vein, the EuroBasket provided the benefit for many locals to interact with foreigners and a respondent reiterates, “There is opportunity for residents to communicate with tourists. Especially younger generation, who want to talk to different fans who come from different locations.” Host-visitor interactions are crucial for locals, particularly the younger generation who are taught many second and third languages in school and look forward to the opportunity of putting their language skills to the test with visitors.

Other social benefits come in the form of government programs, such as the hospitality program where “Vilnius municipality tourism division, give out surveys and people rate the hospitality and the winners are given recognition.” This program was implemented as an extra incentive for people, particularly those employed in the hospitality industry,

went above and beyond the norms of customer service in order to make some peoples' experience of Vilnius more special. In return, they are given recognition in the form of a certificate and free promotion as one of the most hospitable properties in Vilnius. Lastly, other programs discussed by one of the respondents,

“A program to fight people who are poor, beggars, and we cut people from the tourist public places, and we built shelters and food courts for them so that they can stay there and not bother tourists. Fight with taxis too, they wanted to increase prices, but our municipality fought them and controlled their prices too keep them regular for tourists also”.

These programs are effective ways to fight important issues and turn them into society benefits. In this case, the social benefit of the event was that it helped build more shelters and food courts for the poor and homeless population, allowing tourists and locals to walk around Old Town Vilnius without having to be constantly bothered by beggars.

DISCUSSION

This research study was intended to explore and examine resident perceptions toward the social impacts associated with EuroBasket 2011 in Vilnius, Lithuania. This examination was arranged using a mixed-methods procedure, known as the concurrent triangulation strategy. According to Creswell (2009), in this approach, both quantitative and qualitative data are collected concurrently and then compared to determine any similarities or differences. Creswell (2009) noted that this mixed methods technique is

used as “a means to offset the weakness inherent within one method with the strengths of the other (or conversely, the strength of one adds to the strength of the other)” (p. 213).

In this study, each mixed-methods procedure used a different analytical approach to generate results that were intended to explore the embracement-withdrawal continuum and evaluate the social exchange theory. During both procedures, the data collection was concurrent, meaning that both data sets, the quantitative survey data and the qualitative interviews, were collected together during September 7-20, 2011 in Vilnius. Furthermore, in an ideal concurrent triangulation study, the weight is equal between both data sets (Creswell, 2009) however this particular study placed more weight on the qualitative side since more meaningful data was extracted from this data set that explained why these impacts are so important in influencing their perceptions, not just identified them. As such, this study provided the quantitative statistical data first to identify the demographics of the respondents and categorize them based on their responses. This was followed by the qualitative analysis, where quotes from respondents supported and further explained the qualitative results, which were identified as the six factors or themes.

Similar to Zhou and Ap (2009), Zhou (2010), the quantitative analysis of the study utilized a cluster analysis, specifically hierarchical cluster analysis, and produced a two cluster solution, “embracers” (cluster

A) and “tolerators” (cluster B), to categorize respondents based on whether they viewed the event as generally positive or negative. In this embracement – tolerance continuum, the embracers consisted of 97% of the respondents, whereas the tolerators only 3%. This could hold true since respondents 35, 77, 98, and 110 (or the tolerators) showed more disagreement than agreement with the 36 impact item scale. An answer that one of the respondents in Cluster B noted under the activities section was “I watch football (soccer), because I hate basketball. Our government should pay attention to real sport, football and not just basketball.” This was a very interesting quote that could indicate why some respondents might be more hesitant to accept a basketball mega-event, since the government decided on focusing all its efforts and funds on basketball, leaving football fans feeling neglected.

Another part of this quantitative approach used exploratory factor analysis (EFA), which yielded six components and explained approximately 56.3% of the variance among the 36 impact items. The six factors, or impacts, that were recognized to be most influential on resident perceptions were: socioenvironmental impacts, sociocultural impacts, social benefits, social costs, socioeconomic impacts, and sociopolitical impacts. Furthermore each factor was validated using the Cronbach’s alpha reliability test, which yielded high reliability values for each factor.

Whereas the quantitative data analysis followed a predominantly statistical nature, the qualitative data approach utilized an instrumental case-study analysis that allowed the data to be manually transcribed into codes and thematic development. This analysis revealed six important themes, or factors, that were identified to be the most important social impacts that affected residents' perceptions as positive or negative in relation to EuroBasket 2011. These six themes were: sociocultural impacts, socioeconomic impacts, socioenvironmental impacts, sociopolitical impacts, social costs, and social benefits.

Both mixed-methods analyses revealed similar results in relation to what factors affect residents' perceptions toward the impacts associated with EuroBasket 2011, emphasizing the importance of these factors. Therefore the concurrent triangulation strategy was an integral approach to bringing each data set together and further exploration of the underlying constructs of these themes were required by comparing both data sets and results of each different research method within each major factor.

SOCIOCULTURAL IMPACTS

Sociocultural impacts were determined to be an essential factor of both mixed-methods designs. Quantitatively, this theme explained 12.1% of the variance and consisted of seven impact items, all associated with sociocultural features caused by the event. The seven impact items included in this factor were EuroBasket 2011 increases entertainment

opportunities for the locals of Vilnius, the nightlife in Vilnius is more exciting because of EuroBasket 2011, EuroBasket 2011 provides an opportunity to attend an interesting event in Vilnius, EuroBasket 2011 provides the opportunity to meet new people and interact with tourists, EuroBasket 2011 has made Vilnius a more interesting place to live the appearance of the area is improved because of EuroBasket 2011, and the event promotes the better maintenance of public facilities.

Qualitatively, it was discovered that the respondents gave over 20 examples of sociocultural impacts that affected their way of life during the tournament. Amongst both data sets, the biggest sociocultural impacts were the sense of pride the respondents felt during the event and the opportunities to have fun with their friends and families. The majority of respondents claimed that basketball is the national sport of Lithuania, and as such it gave them the perfect platform to compete competitively and unify the residents by sharing the common goal of hoping to win the tournament.

SOCIOECONOMIC IMPACTS

Another important factor that influences resident perceptions of the social impacts associated with EuroBasket 2011 is socioeconomic impacts. In the quantitative analysis, this factor included four impact items and explained approximately 8.2% of the variance. The quantitative analysis included the following four impact items: EuroBasket 2011 is

good for local businesses, there are increased business opportunities because of EuroBasket 2011, EuroBasket 2011 is good for the economy since it creates jobs for the Lithuanian community, and EuroBasket 2011 attracts future businesses to Vilnius.

Qualitatively, there were over eight cases where respondents cited socioeconomic factors as crucial for affecting their overall perceptions of the event. Ultimately the most influential socioeconomic impacts, as perceived by the respondents, were that the event provided more business opportunities as well as an increase in employment opportunities. As noted earlier in the introduction, socioeconomic impacts are usually the most extensively studied impacts due to their economic nature (Andranovich et al., 2001; Graton et al., 2001, 2005; Kasimati, 2003; and Lee et al., 2005).

SOCIOENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

Socioenvironmental impacts were identified as another major factor that influences people's perceptions about the success, or failure, of the event. In the quantitative section, this factor contained 5 impact items and explained 11.5% of the variance. This is most likely due to the fact that these impact items were presented as statements where the event had a negative impact on the environment therefore environmental items had the highest level of disagreement among the respondents with over 60%. This might be the case since damages to the environment could have been

mistaken by the respondents as solely applicable to the natural environment, and not the urban environment. The impact items included in this factor were EuroBasket 2011 has a negative impact on the environment through damages to natural areas, EuroBasket 2011 has a negative impact on the environment through excessive litter and pollution, EuroBasket 2011 causes damage to the environment, EuroBasket 2011 has a negative impact on the environment due to overcrowding, and EuroBasket 2011 creates noise levels which annoy local residents. These findings are reinforced by the qualitative data analysis that the major socioenvironmental impacts experienced by these residents' of Vilnius were issues of accessibility and the development of infrastructure, not actual physical damages to the environment.

SOCIOPOLITICAL IMPACTS

The sociopolitical impacts were the fourth theme that was deemed important as an influential social impact factor. In the quantitative research, this theme consisted of only two impact items, the lowest number of items in any of these six influential social impacts, and also explained 5.2% of the variance. The two impact items in this factor were the money spent on the event could have been spent on other government projects and activities and the government spent too much public money on EuroBasket 2011.

The qualitative analysis indicated that sociopolitical factors had the

highest number of cases, and this was due to the concern of public spending and higher taxes by the government. This result is similar to the study findings of Zhou and Ap (2009) and Zhou (2010), since both studies discovered that perceived government performance was one of the most significant factors for influencing residents' perceptions. It seems the biggest issues with this impact was that some residents felt that the government spent too much money on the event, which led to increased taxes and less spending for other government projects and activities.

SOCIAL COSTS

The social costs refer to the negatively perceived impacts by the respondents and quantitatively, this factor comprised of six items and explained about 9.2% of the variance. The six impact items in this factor were EuroBasket 2011 disrupts the lives of local residents and creates inconvenience, EuroBasket 2011 causes traffic congestion and parking difficulties, EuroBasket 2011 increases crime in Vilnius, visitors to EuroBasket 2011 are inconsiderate of local residents, EuroBasket 2011 brings too many tourists to the area, and the event denies local residents access to public facilities.

Qualitatively, there were approximately five cases where social costs were identified, and the biggest social costs as perceived by the residents were the increase potentials in crime, such as vandalism and alcohol related incidents, as well as prostitution. In order to minimize

these costs, programs need to be implemented by the government to tackle these social costs and reduce their impact on the host community. Other significant social costs were overcrowding at restaurants and bars during the games, where frustrated residents could not sit anywhere to watch the games, especially if Lithuania was playing.

SOCIAL BENEFITS

The sixth and final influential impact was discovered to be social benefits. Qualitatively, the most prevalent positive impact for the respondents was the mass exposure that Vilnius was getting throughout the duration of the tournament. Other major codes that emerged while transcribing were the anticipated and actual interactions between the locals and the tourists. Both sets of people have great opportunities to get to know one another on a more personal basis, practice their second and third languages with tourists, and learn the differences and similarities among their cultures.

Quantitatively, this factor explained 10.1% of the variance among the data and contained four impact items. The impact items included in this factor were EuroBasket 2011 has increased media coverage of Vilnius, EuroBasket 2011 enhances Lithuania's international identity by world media exposure, EuroBasket 2011 showcases the city of Vilnius and the Lithuanian community in a positive light, and EuroBasket 2011 promotes Vilnius as a tourism destination. It is in this factor where the

premise of the social exchange theory steps in. The theory simply argues that if the local residents view the event as beneficial, then they are in the negotiation stage where they can tolerate a few of the negatives since they are aware that the overall benefits will exceed the overall costs.

This study's findings of the most influential impacts that affect local residents' attitudes and perceptions toward sport mega-events are not new constructs and have been identified and consistent throughout the academic literature. For example, Gursoy and Rutherford (2004) stated that the level of support for tourism development was affected by nine determinants. Three of those determinants are the same as the factors that were yielded through the use of mixed-methods analyses. These factors were social costs, social benefits, and economic impacts. Moreover Hritz and Ross (2010) tested the social exchange theory in Indianapolis, Indiana and revealed a four factor structure of social benefits, environmental benefits, economic benefits, and general negative impacts. These factors were similar to this study's findings but the authors decided to break up these impacts into costs and benefits.

All these studies confirmed the social exchange theory and due to the results of the embracement-tolerance continuum established in this study, (97% embracers and 3% tolerators), it is safe to determine that the social exchange theory is therefore supported. The majority of Vilnius residents understand that there are both positive and negative impacts

created by the event, they can distinguish between the two. As a result their social exchange yields positive since the perceived benefits of the event exceeded the perceived costs.

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

The purpose of this study was to examine the local residents' perceptions toward the social impacts of the FIBA EuroBasket tournament in Vilnius. The specific objectives of this study were to investigate and explore Vilnius residents' perceptions and attitudes toward the impacts of the FIBA EuroBasket 2011 tournament held at the Siemens Arena in Vilnius, Lithuania; identify the factors that affect residents' perceptions toward the FIBA EuroBasket 2011 tournament using quantitative and qualitative analyses; and compare, examine, and categorize the different residents' attitudes towards the impacts associated with EuroBasket 2011 in accordance to these mixed methods techniques to explore the embracement-tolerance continuum and evaluate the social exchange theory.

Based on the residents' perceptions towards the social impacts of EuroBasket 2011, this study identified six major impacts (or factors) that affect the residents' perceptions towards this event: sociocultural impacts, socioeconomic impacts, socioenvironmental impacts, sociopolitical impacts, social costs, and social benefits.

It is important to note that all six themes are not mutually exclusive

(Gursoy & Rutherford, 2004) but rather interdependent since positive or negative perceptions of the event are not static and as Waitt (2003) mentions, they are rather negotiated and renegotiated over time to determine if the perceived costs exceed the perceived benefits. For each stakeholder, there is a balance between what they consider a cost or a benefit and depending on that balance, if the benefits exceed the costs, then the event is accepted and the social exchange theory is valid. This is reinforced by the embrace-tolerance continuum, where the embracers constituted 97% of the study's sample and the tolerators only 3%, suggesting that the residents were able to acknowledge that the benefits outweigh the costs and therefore they accept the event as a positive one. This high percentage however indicates there was an implicit bias throughout the study respondents since each respondent was chosen based on their willingness to participate.

Another limitation of this study could be that Lithuania is a very unique culture; they are one of the very few countries whose national sport is Basketball. Soccer (football) tends to dominate in most countries around the world and so it might be more difficult to duplicate this study in another different cultural setting since the support for such an event will not be as high, as confirmed by the embracement-tolerance continuum that was developed through exploratory factor analysis and exploratory cluster analysis. Furthermore the median age in Lithuania is 40, but most

respondents in this study were young (between the age ranges of 18-27). Lastly, there was no form of validation conducted at the end of the quantitative process and the qualitative coding was only conducted by one researcher, which could mean that the data was analyzed with the researcher's pre-existing bias.

This case study research is beneficial as it can lead to a better understanding of the social impacts caused by the FIBA EuroBasket 2011 tournament as well as prove a significant contribution to future development of this event by considering local preferences and adopting appropriate event strategies (Zhou, 2010). Furthermore, the use of a mixed method technique to analyze the data could have important future implications since there are presently no mixed method analyses in the sport tourism literature and this paper could stress the importance of using both analyses to gain a more holistic understanding of why these impacts, not just which of these impacts, affect residents the way they do.

Social media was also an important factor in this study and it is a relatively new way to recruit study participants. The use of social media is another future research criterion that should be explored more in the field of social science. Social media outlets, like Facebook or Twitter, can provide researchers with abundance of useful information through the use of either mixed method technique. Whether the research is by nature quantitative or qualitative, the combination of using both close-ended

questions and open-ended questions on Social Media channels could be the future of participant recruitment since accessibility is not as big of a disparity.

Finally the establishment and implementation of appropriate policies and management strategies by FIBA and the government are central to educating and informing residents, as well as tourists, of the costs and benefits of sport tourism. These efforts, combined with the understanding of these impacts of sport tourism and mega-events, are essential to the development interests of sport tourism destinations and to protect their natural and physical resources from deterioration or unkempt management of new sport infrastructure.

REFERENCES

- Ap, J., & Crompton, J. (1993). Residents' strategies for responding to tourism impacts. *Journal of Travel Research*, 32(1), 47-50.
- Chen, P. (2006). The attributes, consequences, and values associated with event sport tourists' behavior: a means-end chain approach. *Event Management*, 10, 1-22.
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). Mixed-methods procedures. In: Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed-methods approaches. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications
- DeCoster, J. (1998). *Overview of Factor Analysis*. Retrieved <11/3/2011> from <http://www.stat-help.com/notes.html>
- Evans, G. (2005). Measure for measure: evaluating the evidence of culture's contribution to regeneration. *Urban Studies*, 42, 959-983.
- Fredline, E., & Faulkner, B. (2000). Host community reactions: a cluster analysis. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 27(3), 763-784.
- Getz, D. (2008). Event tourism: definition, evolution, and research. *Tourism Management*, 29(3), 403-428.
- Glyptis S.A. (1991). Sport and tourism. In *Progress in Tourism, Recreation and Hospitality Management*, 3, 165-183.
- Gursoy, D., & Kendall, K.W. (2006). Hosting mega events, modeling locals' support. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 33(3), 603-623.
- Gursoy, D., Kim, K., & Uysal, M. (2004). Perceived impacts of festivals and special events by organizers: an extension and validation. *Tourism Management*, 25(2), 171-181.
- Gursoy, D., & Rutherford, D.G. (2004). Host attitudes toward tourism: an improved structural model. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 31(3), 495-516.
- Higham, J. (2005). Introduction to sport tourism impacts and environments. *Sport tourism destinations*, 16, 223-232.
- Hinch, T.D., & Higham, J.E.S. (2001). Sport tourism: a framework for research. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 3, 45-58.
- Horne, J., & Manzenreiter, W. (2006). An introduction to the sociology of sports mega-events. *Sociological Review*, 54, 1-24.

- Hritz, N., & Ross, C. (2010). The perceived impacts of sport tourism: an urban host community perspective. *Journal of Sport Management*, 24, 119-138.
- Hughes, H. (1993). Olympic tourism and urban regeneration. *Festival Management & Event Tourism*, 1, 157-162.
- Morse, J. M. (2008). Confusing categories and themes. *Qualitative Health Res*, 18(6):727-728.
- Padgett, Deborah K. (2008). *Qualitative methods in social work research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Pearce, P.L., Moscardo, G., & Ross, G.F. (1996). *Tourism Community Relationships*. Oxford, England: Pergamon Press.
- Roche, M. (1992). Mega-events and micro-modernization: on the sociology of the new urban tourism. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 43 (4), 563-600.
- Roche, M. (1994). Mega-events and urban policy. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 21, 1-19.
- Waitt, G. (2003). Social Impacts of the Sydney Olympics. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 30(1), 194-215.
- Weed, M.E., & Bull, C.J. (1997) Integrating sport and tourism: a review of regional policies in England. *Progress in Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 3, 129-148.
- Zhou, J. (2010). Resident Perceptions toward the Impacts of the Macao Grand Prix. *Journal of Convention & Event Tourism*, 11(2), 138-153.
- Zhou, Y., & Ap, J. (2009). Residents' perceptions towards the impacts of the Beijing 2008 Olympic Games. *Journal of Travel Research*, 48(1), 78-91.

APPENDIX A

IRB APPROVAL

To: Rhonda Phillips
UCENT

From: Mark Roosa, Chair
Soc Beh IRB

Date: 08/18/2011

Committee Action: **Exemption Granted**

IRB Action Date: 08/18/2011

IRB Protocol #: 1108006740

Study Title: Resident Perceptions toward the Social Impacts of a Mega Sport Event
- the case of FIBA EuroBasket 2011 in Vilnius, Lithuania

The above-referenced protocol is considered exempt after review by the Institutional Review Board pursuant to Federal regulations, 45 CFR Part 46.101(b)(2) .

This part of the federal regulations requires that the information be recorded by investigators in such a manner that subjects cannot be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects. It is necessary that the information obtained not be such that if disclosed outside the research, it could reasonably place the subjects at risk of criminal or civil liability, or be damaging to the subjects' financial standing, employability, or reputation.

You should retain a copy of this letter for your records.