

## COMPARING EFFECTS OF WINTER UNIVERSIADE (2011) AND EUROPEAN YOUTH OLYMPIC FESTIVAL (2011) MEGA SPORT EVENTS

Kerem Y. SİMSEK

*Physical Education and Sport Faculty, Department of Recreation, Anadolu University, Eskişehir, Turkey*

### ABSTRACT

*The objective of this study was to compare the views of the local spectators concerning the effects of the Winter Universiade and the European Youth Olympic Festival, two mega sport events held in Turkey in 2011. The participating group was composed of 878 local spectators who watched the games. The Mega Event Impact Scale, developed by Jie and Yan (2010), was used as the data collection tool. Dimensions forming the scale were compared according to the demographic characteristics of the sample group in order to define the views of the local spectators on the effects of mega events. The results revealed significant differences in the sample group in relation to the demographical characteristics of gender, education, occupation and income status regarding the effects of the Winter Universiade and the European Youth Olympic Festival events. The monthly income of the local spectators who attended the events did not influence the effects perceived. Sample group views on both positive and negative effects of these two events have high averages. In other words, positive and negative effects were detected in both the Winter Universiade held in Erzurum and the European Youth Olympic Festival held in Trabzon.*

**Key words:** Mega sport events; Local spectator impressions; Winter Universiade; European Youth Olympic Festival.

### INTRODUCTION

One of the most important activities in the expanding sport industry is undoubtedly mega events. Such events are one of the most exciting and fastest growing examples of economic and tourism activities in several countries and destinations. Mega sport events are associated with notable economic and social benefits, as well as the broad media coverage that covers the city in which those events are held. Mega events are once-off events, and they reveal both favourable and unfavourable long-term effects on the host country (Ritchie & Aitken, 1984; Crompton & McKay, 1994; Mihalik & Cumming, 1995; Gamage & Higgs, 1997; Delpy & Li, 1998; Mihalik & Simonette, 1998; Crompton *et al.*, 2001; Simsek, 2012). Mega sport events are used to introduce the opportunities for promoting countries, creating new lines of business, ensuring economic contributions, providing tourism mobility, carrying society to a healthier future with sport, providing more modern sports arenas, educating a more successful youth and creating a healthier community. As a result, all types of mega sport events to be held are of vital importance in terms of the development and success of the sport industry of the countries (Simsek, 2011).

## LITERATURE

Mega sport events are accepted as economic and developmental catalysers, as they create a new image for the host country or strengthen the current image by attracting spectators, reconstructing the degenerated facilities and attract the attention of media (Hall, 1992; Getz, 1997; Fredline & Faulkner 2000; Austrian & Rosentraub, 2002; Gibson *et al.*, 2003; Santo, 2005; Cornelissen & Swart, 2006). Tourism, which plays a key role among the acquisitions obtained by hosting large sport events, can make great contributions to the country, region and city by ensuring the accommodation, food and beverage, souvenir, ticket, and tour expenses for visitors of the event. Mega sport events have been reported to have an enormous power likely to stimulate the potential of tourism mobility, media participation and international recognition (Burgan & Mules, 1992; Jeong, 1998; Crompton, 2000). One potential is the reinforcement of travel and the city image of the whole country (Gelan, 2003; Kim *et al.*, 2006). Travelling and city image, supported by mega sport events, are considered to be of vital importance both in attracting visitors, as well as raising the ratio of re-visiting such cities (Searle, 2002). Furthermore, media coverage, being closely associated with the event, enhances the media awareness and promotion of the host city as a tourism destination (Ritchie & Smith, 1991; Jago, 2003; Brown *et al.*, 2004).

In the strategic plans, the attraction of the host country as a tourism destination must be strengthened both before and after the event in order to optimise the economic benefits during the event (Bramwell, 1997; Chalip, 2001, 2004). Additionally, the studies analysing the socio-cultural, socio-demographic and cultural effects of mega sport events report not only positive, but also negative effects. It is stated that the negative risks are likely to arise due to the mega sport events, but can be avoided by acting in accordance with the local enterprises and the values of the host society and by taking responsibility (Hall, 1989; Brunt & Courtney, 1999; Williams & Lawson, 2001). Benefits acquired through cultural exchanges are limited, as the visitors stay for a short period of time and communication with the local community is very limited. However, by creating discussion opportunities and making the required statements, the local community would be able to experience the benefits of the event (Besculides *et al.*, 2002).

Setting up the sub-structure of mega sport events and the effects of such events on the facilities and the environment are generally accepted to be the most important benefits that can lead to having permanent effects. The environmental effects on the transportation sub-structure, the stadium, new sport halls and buildings, development of landscape and housing are examples (Ritchie & Lyons, 1987; Witt, 1988). Several scales were developed within the field of sport science to determine the effect of mega sport events, which is considered one of the most important events within the sport industry. Ritchie (1984) developed a classification for the effects required to be assessed before a mega sport event. Within this classification, the six effects include the economy, tourism/trade, physical, socio-culture, psychology and politics, most of which are related to tourism, are defined. Jeong (1998) introduced seven dimensions of visitor perceptions in terms of the effects of EXPO. These dimensions relate to the following effects: positive urban development, positive tourism development, negative socio-economic consequences, and advantageous public relations at a macro level, positive recreational and negative economic-environmental outcomes.

Fredline and Faulkner (2000) investigated the reactions of the host community of the Gold Coast Indy event in Australia and summarised 36 effect statements that benefit society, short-term negative effects, international profile and economic benefits, negative economic impact, disadvantageous physical effects, as well as the effect of facility development. Kim and Petrick (2005) developed five dimensions out of 22 positive effect statements, which are the development of tourism resources and strengthening city life, improving and strengthening city image, economic benefits, attraction of foreign countries or cultures, as well as the development of the tourism sub-structure. Furthermore, three dimensions out of nine negative effects, namely confusion and conflict, negative economic outcomes, together with traffic problems and congestion were defined. Kim *et al.* (2006) defined seven dimensions, which are the benefits of cultural exchange, economic benefits, natural resources and cultural development, social problems, traffic congestion and population, price increases and construction expenses.

The Mega Event Impact Scale developed by Jie and Yan (2010) is the most recent study within the literature of sports events, which was applied to determine the effect of mega sport events. To develop this scale the current study was based on the studies of Kim and Petrick (2005) and Kim *et al.* (2006). The eight-dimension scale is composed of 42 questions together with five positive dimensions, namely the development of tourism sub-structure, improving and strengthening the city image, economic benefits, cultural exchange and environmental and cultural protection. The three negative dimensions include economic expenses, social and environmental problems, as well as cultural problems and conflict. Furthermore, Jie and Yan (2010) state that measuring the perception of the local community can be used to estimate and manage the reactions of the “local community” in the large events to be held in future.

## METHODOLOGY

### Research Model

The general screening model, one of the descriptive research methods was used in this study. The screening model is defined as the research approach intended to define a current situation as it is (Ozmen, 2000; Karasar, 2005).

### Population and sampling

The population of the research was composed of the spectators of mega sport events, namely the *Winter Universiade* and the *European Youth Olympic Festival*, each held in Turkey during 2011. Certain samples were required to be defined within the population since the scope of the population is considerably broad and certain problems with expenses, time, and control were experienced within the population. Eight hundred and seventy-eight (N=878) local spectators of the mega sport events were selected from this population using the convenient sampling method.

### Data collection tool

Related literature was reviewed in order to determine the study model. Upon providing the theoretical basis, the data were collected by means of a questionnaire as the main technique. Techniques, such as interviews, analyses and document reviews were used as auxiliary techniques. The *Mega Event Impact Scale*, developed by Jie and Yan (2010), was used to collect data on the views of the Turkish society regarding the effects of mega sport events, and to determine what positive and negative effects such events offer for the host country or city. The *Mega Event Impact Scale* is an 8-dimension scale composed of 42 questions together with 5 positive dimensions, namely improving and strengthening the city image, development of the tourism sub-structure, economic benefits, cultural exchange, and environmental and cultural protection. The 3 negative dimensions included were economic expenses, social and environmental problems, as well as cultural problems and conflict.

Face validity and scope validity of the scale was ensured upon evaluating the views and recommendations of the experts. A descriptive factor analysis was applied to determine the structure validity of the scale that revealed an 8-factor structure with 38 items. Furthermore, validity of the structure obtained through descriptive factor analysis was cross checked with the confirmatory factor analysis. Based on the results of the confirmatory factor analysis, the following conclusions were drawn:  $\chi^2=375.45$ ,  $df=149$ ,  $p=0.000<0.001$ ;  $\chi^2/df=2.6$ ;  $RMSEA=0.055$  (acceptable);  $NFI=0.93$  (acceptable);  $NNFI=0.96$ (acceptable);  $CFI=0.98$  (harmony);  $GFI=0.94$ ; (acceptable) and  $AGFI=0.89$  (acceptable). The lowest correlation value of the test-re-test reliability of the scale was found to be 0.58, while the highest correlation value is 0.88. Additionally, internal consistency reliability calculated for the whole scale was 0.917. According to the findings, the item-total correlation coefficient of the internal consistency reliability of the factor items was 0.50–0.85. With the data analyses, the *Mega Event Impact Scale* was observed to ensure validity and reliability within the Turkish language and culture.

### Analysis of data

Frequency distributions, arithmetic means and standard deviations of the data obtained were submitted as descriptive statistics. Furthermore, a t-test and one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) were used to determine the gender, educational level, occupation, and income status differences within the sample group to reveal the effect of the mega events. One of the prerequisites for the analyses of variance was to select each group with randomly chosen subjects from the main population that would display a normal distribution. In this regard, the results obtained were between a kurtosis of -0.247 and -1.859 and a skewness of -1.212 and -0.401 that represent a normal distribution. Variance homogeneity assessment for the averages differing in t-test and ANOVA was carried out with Levene's test, and all the data were detected to be homogeneous. Measurement values ensuring variance homogeneity were analysed with Tukey statistics in order to determine the sources of difference according to gender, educational level, occupation and status of household income ( $p<0.05$ ).

### FINDINGS

For the assessment of the effect of mega sport events, the *Winter Universiade* and the *European Youth Olympic Festival*, held in Turkey in 2011, a t-test and ANOVA analyses

were applied in order to determine the differences in the views of local spectators. As a result of the analyses carried out, the spectators evaluated the effects of mega sport events differently according to gender, educational levels, occupations, and levels of household income. A comparison was made for each mega event, taking into account the group with the highest mean value for gender, educational level, occupation and level of household income.

## Gender

Table 1 provides statistics reflecting the differentiation of the dimensions of the *Mega Event Impact Scale* according to the gender of the sample group.

**TABLE 1: DIFFERENTIATION DIMENSIONS OF MEGA EVENT IMPACT SCALE ACCORDING TO GENDER**

Dimensions	Events	Gender	n	M	SD	t-value	p-value
City image enhancement & consolidation	W. Univ.	Female	186	4.34	0.4986	0.121	0.937
	EYOF	Female	196	4.30	0.5356	1.783	0.041*
Tourism infrastructure development	W. Univ.	Male	226	4.28	0.4820	0.778	0.437
	EYOF	Male	265	4.36	0.5841	0.458	0.720
Economic benefits	W. Univ.	Male	226	4.15	0.5601	1.378	0.045*
	EYOF	Female	196	4.12	0.5990	0.581	0.562
Cultural exchange	W. Univ.	Female	186	4.25	0.5736	0.423	0.701
	EYOF	Male	265	4.20	0.6423	0.275	0.783
Environment & culture preservation	W. Univ.	Female	186	4.42	0.5912	1.224	0.032*
	EYOF	Female	196	4.36	0.5527	0.263	0.793
Economic costs	W. Univ.	Male	226	4.56	0.5366	0.051	0.959
	EYOF	Female	196	3.83	0.6576	2.045	0.041*
Social & environmental problems	W. Univ.	Female	186	3.42	0.8529	2.179	0.029*
	EYOF	Female	196	4.34	0.4772	1.487	0.138
Culture conflicts	W. Univ.	Female	186	4.45	0.5442	0.167	0.867
	EYOF	Male	265	3.86	0.8195	0.557	0.577

W. Univ.= Winter Universiade EYOF= European Youth Olympic Festival M= Mean SD= Standard Deviation  
\* p<0.05 \*\* p<0.01

A t-test was applied to determine whether the effects of *Winter Universiade* and *European Youth Olympic Festival* sport events reveal statistically significant differences based on gender in the sample group. According to the results, the effects of both mega sport events revealed significant differences between the genders. More men were positive about the “economic benefits” dimension (Mean=4.15), one of the positive effects of the *Winter Universiade* mega sport event, while more women reported positive views in the “environmental and cultural protection” dimension (Mean=4.42). In the “social and

environmental problems” dimension, one of the negative effects of the *Winter Universiade* mega sport event, women had a higher mean than the men (Mean=3.32)

Women’s views on the “improving the city image” dimension, one of the positive effects of the *European Youth Olympic Festival*, were more positive than that of the men (Mean=4.30). In the “economic expenses” dimension, one of the negative effects of the *European Youth Olympic Festival*, the women scored a higher mean than the men (Mean=3.83). No significant difference was found between men and women in the dimensions “development of the tourism substructure”, “cultural exchange” and “cultural problems and conflict”.

### Education levels

**TABLE 2: DIFFERENTIATION DIMENSIONS OF MEGA EVENT IMPACT SCALE ACCORDING TO EDUCATION LEVELS**

Dimensions	Events	Education	n	M	SD	t-value	p-value
City image enhancement & consolidation	W. Univ.	Graduates	14	4.39	0.4365	4.235	0.001**
	EYOF	Assoc. degree	208	4.33	0.4986	2.615	0.009*
Tourism infrastructure development	W. Univ.	Graduates	14	4.58	0.5345	5.612	0.001**
	EYOF	Assoc. degree	208	4.65	0.4632	4.397	0.010*
Economic benefits	W. Univ.	Graduates	14	4.42	0.4451	5.829	0.001**
	EYOF	Graduates	23	4.28	0.5119	2.321	0.031*
Cultural exchange	W. Univ.	Assoc. degree	204	4.50	0.5879	2.366	0.029*
	EYOF	Graduates	23	4.43	0.4997	4.632	0.001**
Environment & culture preservation	W. Univ.	Graduates	14	4.36	0.5325	5.605	0.001**
	EYOF	Graduates	23	4.30	0.5264	2.112	0.016*
Economic costs	W. Univ.	Graduates	14	3.97	0.5758	2.233	0.001**
	EYOF	Elem. School	55	3.88	0.5884	1.978	0.024*
Social & environmental problems	W. Univ.	Elem. School	57	3.74	0.7835	4.565	0.001**
	EYOF	Graduates	23	4.37	0.5254	3.456	0.001**
Culture conflicts	W. Univ.	Assoc. degree	204	4.51	0.5654	2.425	0.001**
	EYOF	Assoc. degree	208	3.95	0.8213	2.238	0.001**

W. Univ.= Winter Universiade EYOF= European Youth Olympic Festival M= Mean SD= Standard Deviation  
\* p<0.05 \*\* p<0.01

An ANOVA analysis was applied in order to determine whether the effects of the *Winter Universiade* and the *European Youth Olympic Festival* mega sport events revealed statistically significant differences based on the educational levels in the sample group. According to the results of the ANOVA analysis, local spectators of both mega sport events displayed significant differences in all dimensions composing the effect of mega events.

With regard to the positive effects of the *Winter Universiade*, the participants with a Master's degree were more positive about "improving the city image" dimension (Mean=4.39), "economic benefits" dimension (Mean=4.42) and on the "environmental and cultural protection" dimension (Mean=4.36). Those with an associate's degree or certificate were more positive on the "development of tourism sub-structure" dimension (Mean=4.58); and on the "cultural exchange" dimension (Mean=4.50). With regard to the negative effects of the *European Youth Olympic Festival* mega sport event, the participants with a Master's degree revealed more positive views on the "economic expenses" dimension (Mean=3.97), while the "social and environmental problems" dimension (Mean=4.36) was more positive for those participants with a primary education. The participants with an associate's degree or certificate were more positive regarding the "cultural problems and conflict" dimension (Mean=4.51).

With regard to the positive effects of the *European Youth Olympic Festival*, the participants with an associate's degree or certificate revealed more positive views on "improving the city image" (Mean=4.33), and on the "development of tourism substructure" (Mean=4.65), compared to participants with a Master's degree who were more positive about the "economic benefits" dimension (Mean=4.28), the "cultural exchange" dimension (Mean=4.43), and the "environmental and cultural protection" dimension (Mean=4.30).

Concerning the negative effects of the *Winter Universiade*, participants with a primary education were more positive about the "economic expenses" dimension (Mean=3.88), participants with a master's degree about the "social and environmental problems" (Mean=4.37), and those with an associate's degree or certificate about "cultural problems and conflict" (Mean=3.95).

### **Occupation**

An ANOVA analysis was applied in order to determine whether the effects of the *Winter Universiade* and the *European Youth Olympic Festival* mega sport events revealed statistically significant differences based on the occupations of the sample group. According to the results of the ANOVA analysis, the local spectators of both mega sport events displayed significant differences in all dimensions composing the effect of mega events.

With regard to the positive effects of the *Winter Universiade* mega sport event, students revealed more positive views on the "improving the city image" dimension (Mean=4.70); the craftsmen on the "development of tourism substructure" dimension (Mean=4.30) and on the "economic benefits" dimension (Mean=4.30); students on the "cultural exchange" dimension (Mean=4.45); and finally civil servants, on the "environmental and cultural protection" dimension (Mean=4.39).

**TABLE 3: DIFFERENTIATION DIMENSIONS OF MEGA EVENT IMPACT SCALE ACCORDING TO OCCUPATIONS**

Dimensions	Events	Occupation	n	M	SD	t-value	p-value
City image enhancement & consolidation	W. Univ.	Student	157	4.70	0.3245	4.124	0.012*
	EYOF	Workers	32	4.36	0.4834	3.745	0.025*
Tourism infrastructure development	W. Univ.	Artisan	16	4.30	0.5642	3.985	0.001**
	EYOF	Workers	32	4.51	0.4825	4.567	0.001**
Economic benefits	W. Univ.	Artisan	16	4.30	0.5456	5.978	0.001**
	EYOF	Housewives	14	4.28	0.3935	4.687	0.001**
Cultural exchange	W. Univ.	Student	157	4.45	0.6425	6.185	0.015*
	EYOF	Housewives	14	4.33	0.4451	4.821	0.001**
Environment & culture preservation	W. Univ.	Officer	128	4.39	0.4572	3.942	0.031*
	EYOF	Housewives	14	4.50	0.4082	4.983	0.001**
Economic costs	W. Univ.	Officer	128	4.39	0.7452	3.118	0.006*
	EYOF	Housewives	14	3.97	0.4867	4.989	0.001**
Social & environmental problems	W. Univ.	Freelancers	28	4.24	0.8456	4.453	0.011*
	EYOF	Housewives	14	4.38	0.3460	2.367	0.014*
Culture conflicts	W. Univ.	Housewives	8	4.49	0.5421	4.158	0.001**
	EYOF	Workers	32	3.98	0.7689	2.354	0.012*

W. Univ.= Winter Universiade EYOF= European Youth Olympic Festival M= Mean SD= Standard Deviation  
 \* p<0.05 \*\* p<0.01

With regard to the negative effects of the *Winter Universiade* mega sport event, self-employed participants revealed more positive views on the “economic expenses” dimension (Mean=4.24); the housewives on the “social and environmental problems” dimension (Mean=4.49); and workers, on the “cultural problems and conflict” dimension (Mean=3.98). With regard to the positive effects of the *European Youth Olympic Festival* mega sport event, workers revealed more positive views on the “improving the city image” dimension (Mean=4.36) and on the “development of tourism substructure” dimension (Mean=4.51); housewives on the “economic benefits” dimension (Mean=4.28), the “cultural exchange” dimension (Mean=4.33), and on the “environmental and cultural protection” dimension (Mean=4.50). With regard to the negative effects of the *European Youth Olympic Festival*, housewives revealed more positive views on the “economic expenses” dimension (Mean=3.97) and on the “social and environmental problems” dimension (Mean=4.38). Workers were more positive on the “cultural problems and conflict” dimension (Mean=3.98).

### Income status

An ANOVA analysis was applied in order to determine whether the effects of the *Winter Universiade* and the *European Youth Olympic Festival* mega sport events revealed

statistically significant differences according to different monthly incomes in the sample group. According to the ANOVA analysis, the local spectators of the *Winter Universiade* displayed significant differences in the dimensions of “improving the city image”, “cultural exchange”, “social and environmental problems”, and “cultural problems and conflict”, while the local spectators of the *European Youth Olympic Festival* mega sport event displayed significant differences in the dimensions of “improving the city image”, “environmental and cultural protection”, and “social and environmental problems”.

**TABLE 4: DIFFERENTIATION DIMENSIONS OF MEGA EVENT IMPACT SCALE ACCORDING TO INCOME STATUS**

Dimensions	Events	Occupation	n	M	SD	t-value	p-value
City image enhancement & consolidation	W. Univ.	3001-3750	33	40.09	0.5842	30.884	0.002*
	EYOF	3001-3750	88	40.33	0.5372	20.099	0.004*
Tourism infrastructure development	W. Univ.	3751≥	20	40.21	0.5149	0.004	0.075
	EYOF	1501-2250	113	40.37	0.5714	0.212	0.957
Economic benefits	W. Univ.	≤750	85	40.37	0.4754	10.430	0.210
	EYOF	3751≥	97	40.13	0.5815	0.280	0.924
Cultural exchange	W. Univ.	2251-3000	71	40.41	0.6195	20.368	0.038*
	EYOF	1501-2250	113	40.18	0.6338	10.040	0.394
Environment & culture preservation	W. Univ.	3751≥	20	40.38	0.5855	10.146	0.334
	EYOF	3751≥	97	40.44	0.5220	10.878	0.047*
Economic costs	W. Univ.	≤750	85	40.38	0.5931	10.703	0.131
	EYOF	2251-3000	89	30.87	0.6818	0.725	0.605
Social & environmental problems	W. Univ.	3751≥	20	40.24	0.6255	90.445	0.001**
	EYOF	2251-3000	89	40.36	0.5148	20.456	0.040*
Culture conflicts	W. Univ.	3751≥	20	40.61	0.6228	20.614	0.023*
	EYOF	3751≥	97	30.90	0.7715	0.725	0.605

W. Univ.= Winter Universiade EYOF= European Youth Olympic Festival M= Mean SD= Standard Deviation  
\* p<0.05 \*\* p<0.01

Participants of the *Winter Universiade* with a monthly income of 3,001-3,750 Turkish Liras revealed more positive views on the “improving the city image” dimension (Mean=4.09) and on the “cultural exchange” dimension (Mean=4.41) as positive effects compared to the others. With regard to the negative effects, participants with a monthly income of 3751 Turkish Liras or more revealed more positive views on the “social and environmental problems” dimension (Mean=4.24) and on the “cultural problems and conflict” dimension (Mean=4.61) compared to the others.

Concerning the positive effects of the *European Youth Olympic Festival*, participants with a monthly income of 3,001-3,750 Turkish Liras revealed more positive views on “improving the

city image” (Mean=4.33) and on “environmental and cultural protection” (Mean=4.51) compared to the others. A negative effect of the *European Youth Olympic Festival* was viewed more positively by participants with a monthly income of 2,250-3,000 Turkish Liras relating to the “social and environmental problems” dimension (Mean=4.36) compared to the others.

## DISCUSSION

Mega sport events are held one time on an international scale (Jones, 2001; Simsek, 2011). Such events have expectations on a mega scale from the perspective of the participants. It creates a target market (offering an international tourism market), requires financial investment from society, ensures facilities to be built for the event, and furthermore, ensures the potential of tourism, media coverage, international recognition and economic benefits, which come into the picture for the host country (Burgan & Mules, 1992). It cannot be denied that mega sport events have a great power likely to create the potential of tourism mobility, media coverage and international recognition (Chalip, 2007).

Another feature of mega sport events is the fact that they strengthen the travel image of the entire country (Jones, 2001). The travel image accompanying mega sport events is of vital importance in terms of both attracting visitors and enhancing re-visit rates for the host city. The size of mega sport events is gigantic and can provide such significant effects. As a result, the attraction and participation of individuals to these events increases in the same way. Mega sport events are held one time only and they generally create both positive (city image, tourism substructure, economic benefit, cultural exchange and environmental and cultural protection) and negative (economic expenses, social and environmental problems, cultural conflict) profound long-term effects (Simsek, 2011). Mega sport events are the most exciting and fastest growing examples of economic and tourism events in several countries and destinations.

When the perspectives of the local spectators of the *Winter Universiade* held in Erzurum, were analysed, it was observed that the views on the economic benefits, environmental and cultural protection, as well as social and environmental problems created by the event significantly differed according to gender. Men believed that the mega sport events have more economic contributions, while women believed the environmental contribution to be greater. Furthermore, compared to men, women more frequently discussed the presence of problems and cultural conflicts, which is one of the negative effects of a mega event. The opinion that the *European Youth Olympic Festival* held in 2011 in Trabzon contributed to the image of Trabzon was viewed more positively by women than men. The women were in agreement that the economic expense of the *European Youth Olympic Festival* as mega sport event to be excessive.

When the effects of mega sport events were compared based on the educational levels of the participants, a difference was observed in all of the dimensions. When the viewpoints of the local spectators of both mega sport events were analysed, the most striking finding was significant differences among local spectator viewpoints regarding social and environmental problems based on educational level. For both of the events, the differences related to creating social and environmental problems were noteworthy among participants according to

the various educational levels. Participants with a primary school education, who attended the *Winter Universiade* as spectators and participants with a master's degree, who attended the *European Youth Olympic Festival* as spectators, stated that the relevant event created social and environmental problems.

One of the most remarkable viewpoints of the local spectator of the *Winter Universiade* was the fact that a great majority of the local spectators with a primary education stated that the event did not make a contribution to the sub-structural development of tourism, compared to participants with a certificate and those with a master's degree. Accordingly, the local spectators with a high school or equivalent education level, who attended the *European Youth Olympic Festival* mega sport event as spectators stated that the event was not likely to make any contribution to the tourism sub-structure.

Current research reports that mega events cover a fully intensified destination image and have certain effects for the host societies (Gelan, 2003). Events and the subsequent developments in tourism are related to the perceived expense, rather than the perceived benefit of mega sport events (Jeong, 1998; Fredline & Faulkner, 2000). However, mega events have long-term positive benefits for the cities. Such events are reported to develop tourism (Long *et al.*, 1990), offer international recognition and promotion opportunities for the host country (Kim & Petrick, 2005), and improve the standard of living of the society (Etchner & Ritchie, 1993; Gundogdu & Devecioglu, 2008). If the local community perceives the development of tourism as an opportunity for recreational activity or utilisation of modern facilities, then their contribution to and support for the mega events would increase (Allen *et al.*, 1993).

When the effects of mega sport events were compared according to the occupations of the participants, all of the dimensions differed. The viewpoints of the local spectators of both of these mega sport events produced a significant difference in the dimensions of development of the tourism sub-structure and economic benefits. Craftsmen participants in the *Winter Universiade* and worker participants in the *European Youth Olympic Festival* voiced more positive perspectives on the contribution of the event to the tourism sub-structure. Similarly, craftsmen participants in the *Winter Universiade* and homemaker participants in the *European Youth Olympic Festival* revealed more positive perspectives on ensuring economic benefits for city and its people.

Crompton (2000) studied the economic effect of mega events, in terms of individual income and finding jobs. It was revealed that such events can effectively create economic benefits as expected by the host countries (Dyer *et al.*, 2007). Similarly, Jones (2001) studied the social and economic effects of mega events. The researcher attributes the effects of mega sport events on producing social and economic outputs to several factors, stating that these factors include, but are not limited to: the nature of media coverage of the mega sport events; and perceived success and structure of the event. Hence, the results of the real effects may not be positive or negative as presumed by the visitors/consumers.

The effects of the *Winter Universiade* were compared according to the levels of income of the participants, and significant differences were observed in the dimensions of improving and strengthening the city image, cultural exchange, social and environmental problems, as well as the dimension of cultural problems and conflict. The most striking findings were the

perspective of participants with a monthly income of 1,501-2,250 Turkish Liras, stating that the event does not make solid contributions to develop and strengthen the image of the city, while the viewpoint of the participants with a monthly income of 751-2,250 Turkish Liras believed that the event creates social and environmental problems, which is one of the negative effects. The effects of the *European Youth Olympic Festival* event were compared and significant differences were observed in the dimensions of improving the city image, environmental and cultural protection and social and environmental problems. However, the most astonishing finding is the significantly high positive viewpoints, regarding the dimension "improving the city image", held by the participants with a monthly income of 3,001-3,750 Turkish Liras.

The positive and negative effects of mega events can be classified according to their economic, tourism/trade related, physical, socio-cultural, psychological, and political characteristics. Apart from the economic benefits of visitor spending, mega events offer travel and tourism destinations, new opportunities for investors and new trade activities in regulatory society, in terms of creating regional or international dominance (Burgan & Mules, 1992). It also includes the improvement of the quality of life and image of the local society that can be attributed to being an international host (Etchner & Ritchie, 1993; Gundogdu & Devencioglu, 2008). For the host country, mega events may result in acquiring a weak reputation as a result of poor or non-professional organisation and inadequate facilities or it may damage the image of the host society (Searle, 2002). Studies show that the positive perceptions regarding the development in sub-structures and super-structures bear importance, provided that the facilities remaining after mega events are used by the local society (Kendall & Var, 1984; Talimciler, 2002; Tosun, 2002).

## CONCLUSION

Research findings were analysed in general, and the following results were obtained. Significant differences were detected in most of the dimensions of the effects of the mega sport events, the *Winter Universiade* and the *European Youth Olympic Festival*, according to the demographic characteristics of the sample group. The demographic characteristic with the least difference is the monthly income of the local spectators at the events. Averages of the viewpoints of the sample group, regarding both positive and negative effects of each event, were high. In other words, both positive and negative effects were detected not only in the *Winter Universiade* held in Erzurum, but also in the mega sport event, the *European Youth Olympic Festival* held in Trabzon.

## Acknowledgment

The author would like to thank Pollster for their collaboration and support.

## REFERENCES

- ALLEN, L.R.; HAFER, H.R.; LONG, R. & PERDUE, R.R. (1993). Rural residents' attitudes toward recreation and tourism development. *Journal of Travel Research*, 31(4): 27-33.
- AUSTRIAN, Z. & ROSENTRAU, M.S. (2002). Cities, sports, and economic change: A retrospective assessment. *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 24(5): 549-563.

- BESCULIDES, A.; LEE, M.E. & MCCORMICK, P.J. (2002). Residents' perceptions of the cultural benefits of tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 29(2): 303-319.
- BRAMWELL, B. (1997). Strategic planning before and after a mega-event. *Tourism Management*, 18: 167-176.
- BROWN, G.; CHALIP L.; JAGO, L. & MULES, T. (2004). Developing brand Australia: Examining the role of events. In N. Morgan & R.P. Pritchard (Eds.), *Destination branding: Creating the unique destination proposition* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.) (pp.279-305). Oxford (UK): Butterworth-Heinemann.
- BRUNT, P. & COURTNEY, P. (1999). Host perceptions of socio-cultural impacts. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 26(3): 493-515.
- BURGAN, B. & MULES, T. (1992). Economic impact of sporting events. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 19(4): 700-710.
- CHALIP, L. (2001). Sport and tourism: Capitalizing on the linkage. In D. Kluka & D. Schilling (Eds.), *The business of sport* (pp.77-89). Oxford (UK): Meyer and Meyer.
- CHALIP, L. (2004). Beyond impact: A general model for sport event leverage. In B.W. Ritchie & D. Adair (Eds.), *Sport tourism: Interrelationships, impacts and issues* (pp.226-252). Clevedon (UK): Channel View Publications.
- CHALIP, L. (2007). Towards social leverage of sport events. *Journal of Sport and Tourism*, 11(2): 1-19.
- CORNELISSEN, S. & SWART, K. (2006). The 2010 football world cup as a political construct: The challenge of making good on an African promise. *Sociological Review*, 54(s2): 108-123.
- CROMPTON, J.L. (2000). The economic impact of 30 sports tournaments, festivals, and spectator events in seven US cities. *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration*, 18(2): 107-126.
- CROMPTON, J.L.; LEE, S. & SHUSTER, T.S. (2001). A guide for undertaking economic impact studies: The Springfest example. *Journal of Travel Research*, 40: 79-87.
- CROMPTON, J.L. & MCKAY, S. (1994). Measurement of the economic impact of festivals and events: Some myths, misapplications and ethical dilemmas. *Festival Management and Event Tourism*, 2: 33-43.
- DELPY, L. & LI, M. (1998). The art and science of conducting economic impact studies. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 4(3): 230-254.
- DYER, P.; GURSOY, D.; SHARMA, B. & CARTER, J. (2007). Structural modelling of resident perceptions of tourism and associated development on the Sunshine Coast Australia. *Tourism Management*, 28(2): 409-422.
- ETCHNER, C. & RITCHIE, J. (1993). The measurement of destination image: An empirical assessment. *Journal of Travel Research*, 31(4): 3-13.
- FREDLINE, E. & FAULKNER, B. (2000). Host community reactions: A cluster analysis. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 27(3): 763-784.
- GAMAGE, A. & HIGGS, B. (1997). Economics of venue selection for special events: With special reference to the 1996 Melbourne Grand Prix. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, 1(2): 5-26.
- GELAN, A. (2003). Local economic impacts: The British Open. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 30(2): 406-425.
- GETZ, D. (1997). *Event management and event tourism*. New York, NY: Cognizant Communication.
- GIBSON, H.J.; WILLMING, C. & HOLDNAK, A. (2003). Small-scale event sport tourism: Fans as tourists. *Tourism Management*, 24(2): 181-190.
- GUNDOGDU, C. & DEVECIOGLU, S. (2008). View sports services within the framework of general economics. *Journal of Research in the Eastern Anatolia Region* (DAUM), (6)2: 117-124.

- HALL, C.M. (1989). Hallmark tourist events: Analysis, definition, methodology and review. In G.J. Syme, B.J. Shaw, D.M. Fenton & W.S. Mueller (Eds.), *The planning and evaluation of hallmark events* (pp.3-40). Sydney (Australia): Avebury.
- HALL, C.M. (1992). *Hallmark tourist events: Impacts, management and planning*. London (UK): Belhaven Press.
- JAGO, L.; CHALIP, L.; BROWN, G.; MULES, T. & ALI, S. (2003). Building events into destination branding: Insights from experts. *Event Management*, 8(1): 3-4.
- JEONG, G.H. (1998). Residents' perceptions toward the tourism impacts of the '93 EXPO development on the city of Taejon. *Journal of Tourism Studies*, 18: 153-173.
- JIE, Y. & YAN, W. (2010). Developing a Mega Event Impact Scale. *International Conference on Education Technology and Computer (ICETC)*, 3: 305-307.
- JONES, C. (2001). Mega-events and host-region impacts: Determining the true worth of the 1999 Rugby World Cup. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 3: 241-151.
- KARASAR, N. (2005). *Scientifics research methods*, s.25. Ankara (Turkey): Nobel Issues.
- KENDALL, K.W. & VAR, T. (1984). *The perceived impact of tourism: The state of the art*. Vancouver (Canada): Simon Fraser University.
- KIM, H.; GURSOY, D. & LEE, S.B. (2006). The impact of the 2002 World Cup on South Korea: Comparisons of pre- and post-games. *Tourism Management*, 27: 86-96.
- KIM, S.S. & PETRICK, J.F. (2005). Residents' perceptions on impacts of the FIFA 2002 World Cup: The case of Seoul as a host city. *Tourism Management*, 26: 25-38.
- LONG, P.T.; PERDUE, R.R. & ALLEN, L. (1990). Rural resident tourism perceptions and attitudes by community level of tourism. *Journal of Travel Research*, 28(3): 3-9.
- MIHALIK, B.J. & CUMMINGS, P. (1995). Host perceptions of the 1996 Atlanta Olympics: Support, attendance, benefits and liabilities. In Proceedings of the 26th annual Travel and Tourism Research Association (pp.397-400). Acapulco (Mexico): Travel and Tourism Research Association.
- MIHALIK, B.J. & SIMONETTE, L. (1998). Resident perceptions of the 1996 Summer Olympic Games - Year II. *Festival Management and Event Tourism*, 5(1): 9-19.
- OZMEN, A. (2000). *Applied research sampling methods*. Eskişehir (Turkey): Anadolu University Issues.
- SANTO, C. (2005). The economic impact of sports stadiums: Recasting the analysis in context. *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 27(2): 177-191.
- SEARLE, G. (2002). Uncertain Legacy: Sydney's Olympic Stadiums. *European Planning Studies*, 10(7): 845-860.
- SIMSEK, K.Y. (2011). Socio-cultural and economic impact of Erzurum Winter Universiade 2011 on Erzurum City. *Journal of Sport Science*, 13(3): 383-393.
- SIMSEK, K.Y. (2012). Adaptation of "Mega Event Impact Scale": Validity and reliability study (2011 Erzurum 25. Winter Universiade). *Pamukkale Journal of Sport Science*, 3(2): 14-17.
- RITCHIE, J. (1984). Assessing the impact of hallmark events: Conceptual and research issues. *Journal of Travel Research*, 22: 2-11.
- RITCHIE, J. & SMITH, B. (1991). The impact of a mega-event on host region awareness: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Travel Research*, 13(2): 14-20.
- RITCHIE, J.R. & LYONS, B.M. (1987). Olympulse III/Olympulse IV: A mid-term report on resident attitudes concerning the XV Olympic Winter Games. *Journal of Travel Research*, 25(1): 18-26.
- RITCHIE, J.R.B. & AITKEN, C.E. (1984). Assessing the impacts of the 1988 Olympic Winter Games: The research program and initial results. *Journal of Travel Research*, 22(3): 17-25.

- TALIMCILER, A. (2002). The commodification of football. *Social Science Football Special Issue*. October, 16.
- TOSUN, C. (2002). Host perceptions of impacts: A comparative tourism study. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 29(1): 231-245.
- WILLIAMS, J. & LAWSON, R. (2001). Community issues and resident opinions of tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 28(2): 269-290.
- WITT, S.F. (1988). Mega-events and mega-attractions. *Tourism Management*, 9(1): 76-77.