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Beijing Residents' perceptions and attitudes towards the 2008 Olympic Games and future tourism development

By Vicky Hsiao-Yu LIN

The aim of this research is to investigate Beijing residents’ perceptions of the impacts of the 2008 Beijing Olympic Games and their attitudes toward future tourism development in Beijing.

This research was conducted in Beijing over the months of November and December 2008, three months after the end of the Olympic Games. It employed a quantitative research methodology of an interviewer-completed intercept survey conducted with 300 respondents in Jinger Community, Weishengbu Community, and Jiaodajiayun Community of the Haidian District.

Academic literature and information from sources such as government reports and local and international media reports regarding the Beijing Olympic Games was gathered and analysed by the researcher. Respondents’ perceptions of the impacts of the Beijing Olympic Games were compared with the impacts stated in previous studies and the reports of government and media in this study. Social exchange theory (1992) and Zhou and Ap’s (2009) typology of Chinese residents of a mega event host community were applied in this research to analyse and to explain the differences among respondents’ attitudes towards the impacts of the Beijing Olympic Games.

The results of this research found that respondents perceived the Olympic Games had brought both positive and negative economic, socio-cultural, and environmental impacts to them and to the host community. In particular, they perceived stronger positive and negative socio-cultural impacts of the Olympic Games than other impacts. Respondents’ perceptions of the impacts of the Olympic Games were influenced by their socio-demographic and other characteristics, such as age, highest educational level, involvement in the Olympic Games,
community attachment and their proximity to the Birds Nest Stadium. For example, senior respondents, respondents with lower education level and respondents with a longer residence in Beijing tended to hold more positive perceptions of the Games. In addition, respondents who were involved in the Games tended to perceive more negative socio-cultural and environmental impacts of the event; while respondents who lived close to the Birds Nest Stadium tended to perceive more positive economic benefits but also a rise of cost of living by hosting the Olympic Games.

This research fits with social exchange theory. Respondents were supportive for future tourism development in general as their attitudes towards the impacts of the Olympic Games were positive overall. In addition, this study found that respondents who perceived more positive impacts of the Games, such as senior respondents and respondents with a longer residence in Beijing, were more supportive for future tourism development in the city.

Although this research found that respondents tended to hold positive attitudes towards the impacts of the Olympic Games in general, these respondents perceived fewer positive impacts and more negative impacts of the Olympic Games than those perceived impacts by respondents interviewed in Zhou and Ap’s (2009) research, which examined Beijing residents’ perceptions of the impacts of the Olympic Games two years before the event was held. The difference suggests that the actual Olympic Games impacts might not match the expectation of the local residents. In addition, this research found that 46 per cent of the respondents in this study agreed that the Olympic Games had caused resentments among some group of residents. This implies that local residents might still have negative perceptions of the impacts of the Games but chose not to express their opinions or to express those perceived negative impacts in a more moderate manner within the Chinese Communist society.

This research has contributed both theoretical and practical benefits and insights to the literature. It supplements the deficiency of the literature of community-based mega event impacts in China, where residents’ opinions are rarely investigated.
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Chapter One: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

Event tourism, particularly mega-event tourism, has become a popular phenomenon in the contemporary world (Gibson, Willming & Holdnak, 2003). With their ability to drive economic development, urban regeneration, and destination repositioning in the host community (Quinn, 2009), many countries are interested in bidding for hosting a mega-event, such as the Olympic Games. In China, the government has been increasingly interested in hosting meetings and conventions, expositions, festivals and sport events; they are viewed as means to drive the development of urban tourism and social economy, and are gradually playing an important part of the country’s urban/local development strategies (Dai and Bao, 2008). Beijing started competing to bid for the Olympic Games in 1993 and won the bid in 2001, which entitled Beijing to host the 29th Summer Olympic Games in 2008 (International Olympic Committee, 2008).

Although the Olympic Games are short-term, one-off events, they can result in significant short-term and long-term impacts on host communities (Roche, 1994, cited in Gibson, 2008). For example, in order to be fully prepared for hosting this mega-event, Beijing underwent a series of changes, including infrastructure construction, city construction, and environmental improvement. Many of these changes or impacts were permanent and continue to influence the local residents and the city after the end of the Olympic Games. Previous studies have suggested that Olympic Games can bring a lot of positive and negative impacts on the host community’s economy, society, and environment (see Chapter Two). In this way, Olympics-induced impacts might result in changes to Beijing residents’ lives. In line with social exchange theory (Ap, 1992), residents’ perceptions of the impacts of mega-events could shape their attitudes towards the event and future tourism development in the host community. Therefore, the purpose of this research is to examine what kinds of impacts of Olympic Games were perceived by Beijing residents in the immediate aftermath of the Games, and to investigate the roles of respondents’ socio-demographic and other characteristics in shaping these perceptions. In addition, this research also aims to find out the relationship between Beijing residents’ evaluation of those Games-induced impacts and their attitudes towards future tourism development in Beijing.
1.2 Significance of the Research

Zhou and Ap (2009) indicated that developing events for tourism in developing countries is a relatively new phenomenon. Thus, there are relatively few academic studies on (mega) event tourism impacts in developing countries compared to those that exist for developed countries. It is noted that the 2008 Olympic Games were the first Olympic Games to be hosted in China, and only the third time such events have been hosted by an Asian country (Polumbatim, 2009). This fact adds value to this research, which could enrich the current academic research on the Olympic tourism impacts in a Chinese or Asian context.

Zhou and Ap (2009) examined Beijing residents’ perceptions of the impacts of the Olympic Games and their support towards the upcoming Olympic Games in 2006, two years prior the Beijing Games. Their research showed that the sample respondents were very optimistic about the Games and the Games’ impacts (See Chapter Three). However, Simonetta and Mihalik (1999) suggested that the high level of residents’ support for the mega-event would gradually decline with the approach or the end of the mega event as the perceived negative event impacts would gradually increase. Therefore, this research is valuable as it provides the chance to see whether there has been a change in Beijing residents’ perceptions and attitudes towards the Olympic Games and their impacts since the time of Zhou and Ap’s (2009) research.

Community-based tourism planning has been promoted in many Western countries for years, but it has rarely, if ever, been adopted in China (Wang & Wall, 2007). In developing countries, operational, cultural, and structural issues have limited residents’ opportunities to participate in community tourism planning; this is especially true under the centralised Chinese context (Chen, 2011). Lack of opportunities for local residents to be involved in tourism planning processes can be one of the major factors contributing to Gu and Ryan’s (2008) assertion that there is a lack of empirical research on community impacts of tourism in China. However, as discussed previously, mega-events could generate significant impacts on the host community. Studying local residents’ perceptions towards mega events can provide a chance to better understand the impacts of the event perceived by the residents. Although the Chinese social context did not allow the Beijing residents to participate in the event planning process, this research provides value to reflect local residents’ opinions on the impacts of the Olympic Games. It can be a reference for the Chinese government and policymakers to understand the impact of the Games on the residents. Relevant policies can be set up to
magnify the positive impacts and to remedy the costs of the Games on the community. The research can also be a reference for the Chinese authorities and other event organisers and assist planning for future events and tourism development through offering an understanding of different stakeholders’ needs and to work on strategies to maximise the benefits and to minimise the costs brought by the event (Zhou & Ap, 2009; Jacksin, 2008). Lastly, this research could also provide value by extending the current literature of community-based research on the impacts of mega event in China.

1.3 Research Objectives

The aims of this research were to identify what kind of impacts were induced by the 2008 Olympic Games as perceived by Beijing residents, and to examine the relationship between those perceived impacts and the level of residents’ support for future tourism development in Beijing. Thus, this research will answer the following questions:

1. What kind of Games-induced impacts are perceived by Beijing residents?
2. What kind of Games-induced impacts are stated by the academic scholars, the government, and the media?
3. Are those publicly identified impacts consistent with the impacts evaluated by the residents?
4. Are there differences among different groups of residents, distinguished by their characteristics, regarding their evaluations of the impacts induced by the Olympic Games?
5. Is there any relationship between residents’ perceived impacts and their support for future tourism development in Beijing?

In order to answer the research questions, the researcher formed five research objectives.
1. To explore the impacts caused by the 2008 Olympic Games from the perspective of Beijing residents.

2. To explore academic literature, government publications, and news from the media regarding the Games-induced impacts.

3. To identify the differences between residents’ perceived Olympic Games’ impacts and those impacts stated in previous studies, in the government’s publications, and in the media.

4. To identify any difference in Olympic Games’ impact perceptions amongst different Beijing residents groups.

5. To analyse the correlation between Beijing residents’ evaluation of impacts of the Olympic Games and their further support/opposition for tourism development.

1.4 Statement of Approach

In order to understand Beijing residents’ perceptions of the impacts of the Olympic Games, empirical research has been carried out. This research used both primary and secondary research techniques. Secondary research included analysing existing academic studies on mega event tourism, particularly on residents’ perceptions of the impacts of the Olympic Games, and residents’ attitudes to those impacts. Primary research was conducted by using a structured convenience survey to examine Beijing residents’ perceptions of Olympics impacts and their attitudes towards tourism development over a six weeks period in Beijing from November to December 2008.

1.5 Structure of Thesis

This thesis consists of seven chapters. Chapter One is this Introduction, which introduces the research topic, the values of this research, and list the research objectives. Chapter Two, Literature Review, provides a theoretical background for the researcher to assist in designing the research and analysing the findings. Chapter Three presents a contextual background on tourism development in China, the history of the Olympic Games, information about Beijing
and its preparation for hosting the Olympic Games, and Beijing residents’ perceptions of the impacts of the Olympic Games based on Zhou and Ap’s (2009) research. Chapter Four outlines the methodology used in this research, including site selection, the process of data collection and data analysis, and the limitations of this study. Chapter Five outlines the results of the survey conducted in Beijing in late 2008. Chapter Six discusses the significant findings of this research and compares these research findings with previous studies and theoretical concepts. The final chapter, Chapter Seven, summarises the results and the significant findings of this research.
Chapter 2: Literature Review

2.1 Introduction

This chapter gives an overview of existing studies that have provided a theoretical framework to assist the researcher in conducting this research. The chapter begins with an introduction to the evolution of event tourism study. The chapter will then move on to the discussion of research on the impacts of mega-event tourism on communities, with a focus on the Olympic Games’ impacts on the host community. The impacts cover three aspects: economic impacts, socio-cultural impacts, and environmental impacts. Studies on the impacts of different Olympic Games on the host community will be discussed as examples. The chapter will then discuss how those impacts could influence local residents’ attitude towards tourism development by illustrating Social Exchange theory. Typologies of residents in event host communities are discussed also. The importance of community involvement in event tourism planning to mitigate negative event impacts and to achieve sustainable tourism development will then be discussed.

2.2 Development of Event Tourism Study

With the popularity of events during the past few decades, travelling to participate in or to watch a particular event and to indulge oneself in the festive atmosphere surrounding an event has become a popular form of travel (Gibson, Willming & Holdnak, 2003). This comparatively new type of tourism, especially its ability to drive development of the host community in terms of economic restructuring and revitalisation, destination repositioning, inward investment and tourism revenue generation, has gradually drawn the attention of many scholars (Quinn, 2009). In terms of the evolution of the event tourism study, there were only a few articles associated with events management or tourism published in the 1960s and 1970s, with most of the pioneering published research offering event economic impact assessments (Getz, 2008), and the strategic and operational management of events (Quinn, 2009). In the 1980s, event tourism research expanded dramatically, which included research on mega event tourism (Getz, 2008). The rise of academic interest in events in the 1980s was closely linked to events’ role in place-marketing or civic boosterism (Quinn, 2009).
Researchers tended to view mega events positively at the time as they could foster local
development, motivate tourism, and enhance or change the host destination’s image (Quinn,
2009). However, the dominance in previous research on the economic perspective of events
had drawn critiques from some scholars. For example, Jafari (1988, p. 272-273) indicated
that:

The economics of mega-events constituted the general orientation of the
Congress [of the Association Internationale d’Experts Scientifiques du
Tourisme], with limited attention to the sociocultural dimensions and
consequences of mega-events. One cannot help but wonder when tourism
research will graduate from the bounds of economics and marketing to
amplify the subject in its fullest dimensions.

There were some scholars also who started to recognise the importance of social and cultural
impacts of mega events after several studies on residents’ perceptions of mega or hallmark
events were published during the 1980s (Getz, 2008). The International Centre for Olympic
Studies, at the University of Western Ontario, has since 1989 particularly focused on the
socio-cultural study of the Olympic Games and the Olympic Movement (Williams, Bradley
& Zervas, 2008).

The 1990s was an important time for the launch of event management education (Getz, 1993
& 2008). Scholarship was provided on event tourism and event studies. The journal of Event
Tourism (formerly named Festival Management and Event Tourism) started publishing in
1993, providing a platform for advanced event tourism research and theory (Getz, 1993 &
2008). From 2000 shows a boom in event tourism research that Getz (2008) described as
reaching a “maturity” stage. Particularly, the Olympics have attracted a lot of research
covering a broad range of subjects, including Olympics’ economic costs and impacts (Gratton
et al, 2005; Porter & Fletcher, 2008; Kasimati, 2008), Olympic tourism marketing (Singh &
Hu, 2008), Olympic sponsorship (Soderman & Dolles, 2010), tourism and urban regeneration
generated by the Olympics (Tian & Johnston, 2009; Weed, 2008b), the Olympics’ tourism
impacts (Minnaert, 2011; Okuda et al, 2011; Shipway, 2007), and host population perceptions
of the Olympic Games (Gursoy et al, 2011; Zhou & Ap, 2009). In terms of the mega event
impacts research, more systematic and theoretic methods were used by scholars, including
using resident attitude scales to examine host community’s perceptions in order to obtain
more balanced and comprehensive (mega) event impact research (Getz, 2008). Resident
attitude scales were also employed in the current research to help the researcher to identify survey participants’ perception of the impacts brought by the Beijing Olympic Games.

2.3 Rationale for Hosting Mega Events

Grix (2013) indicated that the rationale behind states bidding for and hosting a mega event, such as the Olympic Games, includes political considerations and the desire for positive legacies derived from the event. From the political perspective, hosting the Olympic Games could help the host city/nation to build up its international relations and to obtain global recognition (Grix, 2013; Hiller, 2012; Quinn, 2009). Opposed to the traditional military forms of “hard power”, states are able to make more use of “soft power”, using culture, ideology, institutions, and image building to improve their international standing and to attract other nations’ cooperation (Grix, 2013, p. 17). Hosting the Olympic Games becomes part of soft power strategy, which allows the nation to improve its image and to showcase themselves on the international stage, particularly in the Opening Ceremonies and the Closing Ceremonies (Toohey & Veal, 2007; Grix, 2013). For example, China had demonstrated its power to a global audience through a mix of performances illustrating ancient tradition and the new modern and high tech nation of China in the Opening Ceremony of the Beijing Olympic Games (Zhang & Zhao, 2009; Luo, Leonardo, Han, Liu, Yu & Chris, 2010; Grix, 2013). By rebranding China to be a nation of modernization and economic success, China had signalled to the rest of the world that “it had arrived on the world stage and now strived to get ahead” (Broudehoux, 2007, cited in Bennett, Bennett & Alexander, 2008, p.3). Therefore, hosting the Olympic Games became a strategy for China to boost its national prestige to enhance its international standing and to emphasize its global power (Askew, 2009).

Hoped-for legacies are another reason for states to compete in bidding for and hosting the Olympic Games. There are a complex range of meanings of legacies in the discourse of the sports mega event (MacRury & Poynter, 2009; Grix, 2013). According to Grix (2013, p. 20), a legacy is “what we get in return for our investment”. MacRury and Poynter (2009, p.5) indicated that legacies cover not only the direct Games-related income and costs, but also short-term and long-term indirect contribution to infrastructural, environmental, cultural, educational, economic, and social development. Host cities are seeking sustainable and positive legacies from a mega event, but a mega event could also leave significant negative
impacts to the host community. According to the International Olympic Committee (2013, p.4), the term “legacy” is more often applied when referring to positive effects, while the term “impact” is more often used when referring to a negative effect or a damaging or destructive result. In the current study, the researcher used the term “positive impacts” to replace the term “legacy” to provide a clearer identification of the positive effects of the Olympic Games. In the next section, the researcher will discuss those potential positive (legacies) and negative impacts of the Olympic Games in more detail.

2.4 Impacts Brought by Mega Event Tourism

Unlike general tourism development, which has a longer tourist season and residents have longer time to adjust the influx and outflow of tourists, destinations which host mega events usually experience a mass influx of visitors in a very short period. Thus, residents of these destinations have to cope with the sudden mass influx of visitors, and may experience more intense impacts of the mega event (Jackson, 2008). Roche (1994, cited in Gibson, 2008, p. 31) described mega-events as “short-term events with long-term consequences”. Like other forms of tourism, a mega event and its induced-tourism could bring significant positive and negative impacts on the host community (Higham, 2005). Those impacts can be categorized as economic, social-cultural, and environmental impacts.

2.4.1 Economic impacts

Mega event tourism can bring significant economic impacts to the host destination. Preuss (2008) indicated that many cities and regions are willing to invest billions of dollars to host mega sport events, such as the Olympic Games, for the perceived economic benefit derived from visitors’ consumption during the event and increased tourism post-event. In 1984, the Los Angeles Olympic Games created approximate $311 million surplus to the area (Singh & Hu, 2008; Gratton, Shibli & Coleman, 2005). This was the first time people recognised the possibility for the Olympic Games to bring economic profits to the host community (Singh & Hu, 2008; Gratton et al, 2005). However, there are many factors, such as the host community’s conditions or abilities, which can influence the costs and revenues from hosting a mega event (Solberg & Preuss, 2007). In fact, there are many host communities in which it
is found little or no economic benefits, but substantial debts after the mega-event ended (Porter & Fletcher, 2008; Gibson, Willming & Holdnak, 2003). The 2004 Athens Olympic Games is one such example. The Athens Olympic Games has been criticised for over-budgeting and poor resource allocation that left considerable debts for the country in the aftermath of the Games (Weed, 2008b; Porter & Fletcher, 2008).

There are many economic benefits which could be generated by mega event tourism. At the level of destination impacts, many studies have shown that residents of mega event host communities perceived that the event would generate more tourism (Kim & Petrick, 2005; Zhou & Ap, 2009; Kaplanidou, 2012; Simonetta & Mihalik, 1999), a better image of the host destination (Kim & Petrick, 2005; Zhou & Ap, 2009; Kaplanidou, 2012; Gursoy, Chi, Ai & Chen, 2011; Simonetta & Mihalik, 1999) and more foreign investment and trade opportunities in their destination (Kim & Petrick, 2005; Gursoy et al, 2011). Studying on residents’ perceptions of the 2006 Torino Winter Olympic Games, Guala and Turco (2009) found that approximate 90 per cent of interviewees of their study agreed the Games had increased the visibility of the city at the national and international level, and strengthened local cultural and tourism services. A mega-event could promote a more attractive image of the host destination through increased awareness through media coverage, new and upgraded infrastructure, and additional tourist products, together with better trained staff (such as language ability and skills) and better service quality (Morgan & Condliffe, 2006). This enhanced image could potentially increase the host community’s tourism and business investments on a long-term basis (Solberg & Preuss, 2007; Morgan & Condliffe, 2006; Singh & Hu, 2008; Preuss, 2008; Gratton et al, 2005). However, mega-events could also damage the image and reputation of the host community if inadequate facilities, improper practices, or terrorism occur and are publicised during the event (Kim, Gursoy & Lee, 2006).

Research has shown that residents of mega event host destinations often perceived the mega event could benefit the host countries’ economy (Waitt, 2003; Kim & Petrick, 2005; Zhou & Ap, 2009; Kaplanidou, 2012; Gursoy, Chi, Ai & Chen, 2011; Simonetta & Mihalik, 1999). Guala & Turco (2009, p. 22) indicated that “Olympic Games are “sold” to residents on the basis of anticipated economic gain......”. However, those anticipated economic gains were usually overstated (Kim, Gursoy & Lee, 2006; Porter & Fletcher, 2008; Jones, 2001) Crompton (2011, cited in Gratton et al, 2005) argued that in many cases, consultants would deliberately overestimate the economic benefits brought by a new stadium holding major
sports events in order to provide advocacy for investing in the new facility. Hudson (2008) also indicated that using gross rather than net impacts and using inflated multipliers could overstate sports events’ impact to a community’s economy. For example, during the Sydney Olympic Games period, other regional areas of Australia suffered a 10 to 15 per cent drop in normal visitation levels (Weed, 2008b). Ignoring these kinds of opportunity costs by only looking at the gross benefits would lead to an exaggeration of the economic benefits generated by hosting an event (Wood, 2005; Song, 2010). In addition, switching cost, such as avoiders and switchers who would decide not to come to the host city during the events to avoid possible crowds and inconvenience, needs to be included in evaluating the benefits-costs of hosting an event (Weed, 2008b; Wood, 2005). The overestimated economic benefits of the Games used by the organizer of the Olympic Games (government of the host countries) are usually intensively broadcasted in local media. According to Ritchie, Shipway and Chien (2010), the media play an important role in shaping residents’ perceptions of the impacts of events. Thus, it may mislead the local residents to form a perception of greater economic benefits gained by hosting the Olympic Games than eventuates in reality.

In terms of individual economic impacts of mega-events, previous studies examining residents’ perceptions of mega event impacts suggest that hosting a mega event is anticipated as creating job opportunities and business opportunities for them (Kasimati, 2008; Okech, 2011; Kim & Petrick, 2005; Zhou & Ap, 2009; Kaplanidou, 2012; Gursoy et al, 2011). New constructions of infrastructure and stadia for mega events often create employment opportunities since a lot of labour is required during the construction phrase and many long-term or short-term employees are required for operating the new constructions (Morgan & Condliffe, 2006). Job creation is usually greatly emphasised by the officials of the host destination as a kind of economic benefits brought by a mega event (Guala & Turco, 2009). Thus, residents are led to perceive more job opportunities created by the mega event, although in fact the jobs created (such as construction workers) are usually short-term, and may not be the jobs desired by the residents.

Hosting the Olympic Games could bring economic opportunities, but could also bring substantial economic costs. Although the Olympic Games may generate more jobs for the hosting destination, those jobs are usually temporary short-term jobs (Jasmand & Maennig, 2008). The costly hotels, transportation and other infrastructure and facilities which have been built to meet the requirements of the International Olympic Committee, would face the
challenges of sustainable long-term usage and maintenance after the end of the event, although future activities in established facilities could generate additional tourist expenditure in the community (Kasimati, 2008; Porter & Fletcher, 2008; Gratton et al, 2005). Residents may react negatively to the significant amount of the tax revenue invested in the Olympic Games, when those funds could have been used in local health infrastructure, education, or other welfare facilities (Kaplanidou, 2012; Waitt, 2003). Additional tax or increased tax is a possible economic cost residents may need to bear from hosting a mega event due to the need for government to get extra funding to make up its huge spending on a mega event (Kim et al, 2006; Gibson, Willming & Holdnak, 2003; Kaplanidou, 2012). Moreover, rising prices and cost of living are common economic costs perceived by residents of mega event host communities (Kim et al, 2006; Ntloko & Swart, 2008; Chen, 2011, Waitt, 2003). For example, a survey conducted by Waitt (2003) in 1998 shows that perceived personal economic burdens brought by the Sydney Olympic Games, in terms of increased taxes or higher general costs of living, were a key source of survey respondent concern.

2.4.2 Socio-cultural impacts

Hosting a mega event may bring several positive cultural impacts to the host community, such as a better appreciation and respect for different cultures and ethnicities, promoting cultural exchange and learning through host and visitor encounters and performance of local arts at the event, restoration of historical sites, and stimulating cultural development and preservation (Fredline, 2008; Schlenkorf, 2009; Chen, 2011; Jackson, 2008; Kim et al, 2006). For example, the announcement of Seoul as the 1988 Olympic host destination stimulated a group of local resident’s interests in making the “world biggest Korean drum” by using traditional techniques to be played in the opening ceremony of the Olympic Games. This project generated wide discussion among the locals and helped in the revival of traditional skills in drum making (Kang, 2003). The opening and closing ceremonies also provide opportunities to portray the history and culture of the host country, which could be watched by billions of people through the television coverage (Toohey & Veal, 2007).

Hosting an event can bring many social benefits to the local residents also. Gratton et al (2005) indicated that hosting a big sports event could bring in urban regeneration legacy benefits, which would improve general living conditions in the local community. For
example, a very important benefit brought by mega events addressed in much research is improved infrastructure and public facilities, which can still be available for local residents to use after the event (Kasimati, 2008; Solberg & Preuss, 2007; Kim et al, 2006; Jones, 2001; Fairley, Tyler, Kellett & D’Elia, 2011). The improved infrastructure and public facilities could further contribute to the improvement of residents’ quality of life (Chen, 2011). For example, the improved recreational facilities could increase local residents’ opportunities to participate in recreational activities (Kim et al, 2006) and could create more opportunities for entertainment and family togetherness (Ntloko & Swart, 2008). London Health Commission and the London Development Agency (2004) indicated that local residents could get more physical activity opportunities through inspiring individuals and more constructed sports and recreational facilities and green lands for the Olympic Games. This could help the promotion of sports activity in the host community and to engage more people of all ages in sport, which may have long-term implications for fitness levels and the health of the nation (Shipway, 2007; Jones, 2001).

Mega events may raise a sense of pride and patriotism amongst local residents also (Chen, 2011; Kim et al, 2006; Fairley et al, 2011; Ntloko & Swart, 2008; Jones, 2001). Mega events can strengthen the local community through improved personal relationships coming from extensive volunteer efforts associated with the event (Shipway, 2007). Waitt (2003) indicated that the Sydney Olympic Games had helped to strengthen community identity among local residents that even non-Anglo Celtic respondents in his research also expressed a feeling of inclusion and being part of an Olympics inspired community. He argued that this community and national spirit could be the most powerful psychological reward for many Sydney residents from the Olympic Games.

Mega events can bring negative social-cultural impacts to the host community as well. The demand for accommodation for sports teams, spectators, visitors, sponsors and journalists and the demand for purchasing holiday homes may bring stress on the local housing and property markets (Jones, 2001; Ntloko & Swart, 2008). Residents, especially those socially excluded people or poorer people, may suffer from forced displacement, and be removed or arrested to avoid portraying a negative image of the city (Minnaert, 2011; Jones, 2001; Fairley et al, 2011). The events may disrupt local residents’ daily routines also, and disrupt local businesses’ operations (Chen, 2011; Ntloko & Swart, 2008; Fredline, 2008; Fairley et al, 2011). Waitt (2003) indicated that many Sydney residents had undergone a series of
widespread disruptions to daily routines because of the Olympic Games, such as the road closure for construction, changing public transport timetables, changing school terms, and inability to access certain roads. Moreover, the surge of visitors during a mega event can also cause problems of overcrowding and traffic congestion (Kim et al, 2006; Ntloko & Swart, 2008; Fairley et al, 2011; Simonetta & Mihalik, 1999). The rowdy sport fans can cause problems of crime and detrimental demonstration effect (Jamieson & Orr, 2009). Finally, mega events, such as the Olympic Games, involve competition, which could result in negative intercultural interaction, especially when international teams are in competition and nationalism/patriotism is strong.

Many authors have suggested that crimes, such as gambling, violence, racism, fraud, hazing, ticket scalping, drugs, alcohol, sex scandals and prostitution, and terrorism, are often associated with mega events (Fields, 2010; Kim et al, 2006; Barker, Page, & Meyer, 2002; Taylor, Wamsler, Sanchez, & Arellano, 2010; Crabbe, 2000; Toohey & Taylor, 2008; Ntloko & Swart, 2008; Jones, 2001; Jamieson & Orr, 2009; Jackson, 2008; Appelbaum, Adeland & Harris, 2005). Decker, Greene and Varano (2007) indicated that there were 340 offenses recorded by the Sydney Olympic Intelligence Centre during the Sydney Olympic Games in the main Olympic venue, with 79 per cent being theft-related infringement. In Simonetta and Mihalik’s (1999) research on the perceptions of residents of Georgia regarding the 1996 Atlanta Olympic Games, they found that “increased crime” was one of the major concerns worrying the local residents before the Games took place. However, Andresen and Tong (2012) suggested that the substantial increase in the number of security personnel during the mega event period could mitigate the potential increase in crime in the host community. Risk of terrorist attacks also brings significant safety concerns for countries holding mega-sport event. According to Toohey and Taylor (2008), from 1972 to 2004, there had been 168 terrorist attacks associated with sport. The tragedy during the 1972 Munich Summer Olympic Games, when members of the Palestinian group Black September killed many Israeli athletes and coaches was one of the first examples of terrorists targeting a major sporting event. The events of September 11, 2001 also urged the strengthening of the risk management at mega-sport-event planning, implementing a series of new security checks for sport participants and spectators and tougher safety standards for organizers (Toohey & Taylor, 2008; Appelbaum et al, 2005), resulting in the need for more personnel deployed in police and fire departments to assist with the safety of those events (Jackson, 2008).
2.4.3 Environmental Impacts

Olympic Games events take place in natural environments (such as scull competition), in human built structures (such as track and field in sport stadiums), or at heritage sites (such as cycling on the Great Wall of China). As such, it brings impacts on these environments. Mega events are short-term and one-off events, in many cases, they could only cause temporary impacts on nature as the powerful natural ecosystems could be able to bounce back from these negative human disturbances (Orams, 2005). Thus, it is the human construction that would bring most of the impacts.

Mega event tourism may contribute to positive environmental impacts on the host community in a number of ways. It can promote natural conservation and raise residents’ awareness of environmental protection since many activities are held in natural environments (Correia, Videira, Alves, Ramires, Subtil & Martins, 2006; Orams, 2005; Kim et al, 2006). Mega event tourism has helped many host communities to promote an improved local environment also by using technologies and adopting sustainable procedures and actions (Collins et al, 2009). For example, hosting the 1988 Seoul Olympic Games improved the local water supply, roads and sanitation system, and helped local natural environment conservation (Jeong, 1999, cited in Orams, 2005). The London Organising Committee for the Olympic and Paralympics Games has endeavoured to build an excellent eco-rated Olympic Village and to use hydrogen fuel-cell vehicles for transportation between venues (Collins et al, 2009). Furthermore, mega events may contribute to the cleanliness and sustainability of local environment via air and water pollution control, littering control, reduction of carbon emissions, recycling excess materials, waste management, and environmental aesthetics improvement (Dickson & Arcodia, 2010; Kim, et al., 2006; Correia et al, 2006; Collins, Jones & Munday, 2009, Orams, 2005; Fredline, 2008). For example, a waste-water reclamation plant was utilised during the Sydney Olympic Games to recycle sewage and rainwater. The recycled water was utilised for irrigation and toilet flushing at the Olympic Games Village and the Homebush Bay Olympic Games facilities (Membrane Technology, 2000). Sydney also encouraged utilisation of public transport and utilisation of solar photovoltaic electricity and natural gas co-generation for power to achieve good air quality during the Olympic Games (Tian & Brimblecombe, 2008).

The relationship between mega event tourism and the environment can be negative as well. Kim et al (2006) found that residents could change their attitudes negatively after a mega event, when the negative environmental impacts of the event were discovered in terms of
pollution and the deterioration of cultural, historical, and natural constructions. Construction for a mega sport event could cause dust and noise, which could bring inconvenience to tenants and homeowners living close to the construction sites (Jones, 2001; Collins et al, 2009; Fairley et al, 2011). Other negative environmental problems such as pollution, litter, sewage, and increase in gas emissions are associated also with a mega event. For example, burning firecrackers and sparklers during the events could cause air pollution, contributing significant amount of metals in the air (Dickson & Arcodia, 2010). It was estimated that the 2006 FIFA World Cup produced 100,000 tonnes of carbon emissions in the host community (Collins et al, 2009). According to Radio National Earthbeat (2000), the Sydney Olympic Games had produced 5,000 tonnes of rubbish every week during the Games.

Existing research has indicated also that mega event tourism could result in change of land use, increase in energy and water consumption, disruption of the ecosystem, vandalism, and degradation of physical landscapes. (Fairley et al, 2011; Kim, Gursoy & Lee, 2006; Dickson & Arcodia, 2010; Mallen & Chard, 2011; Gursoy, & Kendall, 2006; Collins et al, 2009; Jamieson & Orr, 2009; Ministry for the Environment, 2010; Jackson, 2008) Mega events can cause environmental damage in particular when it has been undertaken in a sensitive natural area. For example, a cycling competition in pristine natural environment may result in soil erosion, pollution, and loss in flora and fauna (Fredline, 2008).

To sum up, a short-term mega-sport event may bring strong impacts on the host community economically, socio-culturally and environmentally. Residents may gain benefits or costs from these impacts differently. Their experience of impacts will likely affect their attitude towards the event, towards visitors and future tourism development. The next section will look at some theories discussing how residents might respond to the mega events and future tourism based on their perceived mega events impacts, and the factors contributing to the development of perceptions.

2.5 Residents’ Attitudes and Responses to Mega-Events

The previous section illustrates the economic, socio-cultural, and environmental impacts residents and their community could face from hosting mega events. As the researcher already indicated, residents’ perceived impacts of a mega event have a critical influence on their attitudes towards the event and future tourism. This section provided an overview of
some theories, which can be utilised in explaining the relationship between host residents’ perceptions of mega event impacts and their attitude towards the event and future tourism development. These theories will be applied later in this research to assist the researcher in analysing Beijing residents’ attitudes and responses to the Beijing Olympic Games.

2.5.1 Social Exchange Theory

Faulkner and Tideswell (1997) indicate that Ap’s (1992) adaptation of social exchange theory has contributed a lot to the development of a theoretical analysis of different responses to tourism within communities. Social exchange theory examines the relationship of residents to tourism in terms of a trade-off between costs and benefits. According to the theory, local residents will be more supportive of tourism development and be tolerant to some inconvenience in exchange for tourism benefits that they perceive are greater than the costs they have to pay; the reverse is also true.

In applying social exchange theory to mega events, Waitt (2003) suggests that residents’ evaluations of mega event tourism are reliant upon the relationship formed between host residents and the mega event’s organizers. He indicates that residents’ positive or negative evaluations are theorized in terms of the presence or absence of “rationality, satisficing of benefits, reciprocity and the justice principle” (Waitt, 2003, p. 196). “Rationality” refers to residents’ behaviour being based on reward seeking; if residents perceive rewards of either maintenance or improvement of their social and economic well-being, they will be overall likely to evaluate the mega event positively. “Satisficing of benefits” suggests that residents may well be aware of the negative impacts of the mega event but still accept tourism because they perceive the benefits of the event as outweighing the costs of the event. Waitt (2003) indicates that based on the social exchange relationship, residents are seeking to obtain a satisfactory, reasonable, and acceptable level of benefits rather than maximization of benefits. However, residents have a threshold of tolerance of mega event tourism; once the threshold is exceeded, residents’ attitude will change to be negative. “Reciprocity” suggests that if resources exchanged between the host residents and the industry are equivalent, the effects are perceived positively by all parties. This means that the perceived rewards (such as improved infrastructure and living environment) should equal residents’ willingness to give
for the event (such as paying additional tax and tolerating inconveniences). The final “justice principle” ensures that the returns received by residents for their support and participation are fair and equitable. This could be achieved through public participation in the event planning process. Residents are more likely to have positive perceptions if they have a sense of involvement in event planning and trust in the event organisers.

In a similar application of social exchange theory, Kim et al. (2006) have found that residents who are likely to receive the greatest benefits from hosting the event would be more supportive for the event and for future events. If residents hold positive evaluation of socio-cultural impacts of the event, they will be more supportive for future events. In addition, residents who consider the event has damaged the environment will be likely to oppose hosting future events while residents who think the event has helped to preserve and protect the environment will be likely to support hosting future events. Waitt (2003) also found that residents of Sydney who had perceived greater personal economic costs, such as increased taxes and/or higher costs of living associated with the Olympic Games were generally more negative about the Sydney Olympic Games.

The exchange relations between residents and mega-events are not temporally static since residents will constantly re-evaluate the perceived outcomes of the exchange transaction within a dynamic social setting (Waitt, 2003). Simonetta and Mihalik (1999) suggested that the level of residents’ support of the mega-event would be high initially because of the relatively greater valuation of gains predicted by residents. This high level of resident support would then decline with the approach or the end of the mega event as the reality shows a significant increase of perceived liabilities and decrease of perceived benefits, such as failure of perceived economic benefits to eventuate, realization of costs of construction for the Games and the consequent financial debts post the Games, traffic congestion, price gouging, and increased crime.

In this research, the researcher has applied social exchange theory to examine and to explain the relationship between residents’ perceived Olympic Games’ impacts and the level of their support/opposition for future tourism development in Beijing. The detailed discussion will be presented in Chapter Six.
2.5.2 Factors Influencing Residents’ Perceptions of Mega Events’ Impacts

Fredline and Faulkner (2000) used Moscovici’s (1983) concept of social representations to explain their role in the formation of residents’ perceptions of an event’s impacts (cited in Fredline and Faulkner, 2000, p. 767). Social representations are “systems of preconceptions, images and values which have their own cultural meaning and persist independently of individual experience” (Moscovici, 1983, cited in Fredline & Faulkner, 2000, p. 767). Social representations come from three sources. The first source is direct experience; residents’ direct experience of an event plays a dominant role in forming their perceptions. If their previous perceptions based on prevailing social representations (source two and three below) is different from their actual observations, they may alter their previous perceptions of the event according to their actual experience. However, if direct experience is limited, other sources of social representations will become more important in the formation of residents’ perceptions. The second source of social representations comes from social interaction, including interaction with family members, friends, colleagues, acquaintances, and strangers. Through social interaction, individuals are prone to adopt similar representations to those of other group members with whom they interact. However, conflicts may exist if individuals are simultaneously associated with different groups with different representations. If group members also have limited direct experience, they will borrow a social representation from the third source, such as the media, political figures, and other important individuals and groups to form their perceptions. The media play an important role in influencing individuals’ perceptions through the content of stories, and through their decision whether to report particular issues. This is particularly important to this study; under the centralised Chinese context, the media are highly controlled by the Chinese government. Thus, the media in China have a tendency to only report, or to report more extensively, issues illustrating the positive side of the government and its works (such as the Beijing Olympic Games).

As suggested by Dogan (1989), residents’ personal attributes, such as economic dependency on the tourism industry, community attachment (such as residents’ length of residence and place of birth), residents’ proximity to where mega events are occurring, and residents’ demographic attributes (e.g. gender, age, educational levels, income levels), may influence their perceptions of the tourism impacts (Andereck, Valentine, Knopf & Vogt, 2005; Jackson, 2008). For example, as suggested by the social exchange theory, residents who are dependent on the industry, or who obtain a greater level of economic or personal benefit from tourism,
tend to have more positive perceptions of tourism impact (Ap, 1992). Waitt (2003) also found that residents living close to Homebush, where Sydney Olympic Park was located, had a more positive reaction to the Olympic Games. These concepts are applied in this research, whereby the relationship between Beijing residents’ attributes and their perceptions of the impacts of the Olympic Games is examined (see Chapter Five and Six).

2.5.3 Typology of Residents of Mega Event Host Communities

As outlined above, different social representations will lead to different perceptions among local residents of the impacts of a mega-event. Residents with different perceptions can be grouped into different types. One way to categorise residents of an event host community as “lovers-tolerators-haters” according to their attitudes to the event’s impacts (Zhou & Ap, 2009). Lovers are those residents who perceive greater positive impacts of the event/tourism and are very supportive for the growth of tourism. By contrast, haters are those residents who perceive greater negative event/tourism impacts and are strongly opposed to the development of tourism (Davis, Allen & Cosenza, 1988; Madrigal, 1995; Fredline & Faulkner, 2000). Tolerators, like “realists” classified in the research of Madrigal (1995), are those residents who perceive both positive and negative impacts of the event/tourism and have more moderate opinions towards the growth of tourism. They can be further classified into different tiers, such as “cautious romantics”, “in-betweeners”, and “love’em for a reason”, as in Davis et al’s research (1988), and “ambivalent supporters”, “realists”, and “concerned for a reason” in Fredline and Faulkner’s research (2000), according to residents’ different degree of reactions to the positive and negative event/tourism impacts and their different level of support for tourism development.

In the context of Chinese society, Zhou and Ap (2009) suggest that higher-order principles or values were more influential determinants of Beijing residents’ perceptions of anticipated Olympic Games impacts than residents’ socio-demographic attributes, which had little or no effect on residents’ perceptions in their research. Zhou and Ap (2009) argue that the Chinese cultural tendency would result in residents’ perceptions being more positive. The collective and consensual nature of Chinese society would make respondents tend to provide an answer reflecting what they perceive most people will think rather than their own opinions. Zhou and Ap (2009) argue that the influence of the government and Communist Party ideology, as well
as vigorous promotion of the 2008 Olympic Games, could also contribute to the residents’ positive perceptions of the impacts of the Games. Therefore, unlike the common typology of “lovers-tolerators-haters”, Zhou and Ap (2009) suggest that it is more reasonable to classify Beijing residents as either “embracers (lovers)”, who viewed the overall Olympic Games’ impacts more positively and were more supportive for the Games, or “tolerators”, who were still positive overall towards the Games’ impacts but to a lower degree, and who had some concerns about the Games’ negative impacts on residents’ social life. This assertion was supported by Chen (2011), who found that there were no “haters” in his research examining local residents’ perceptions of a series of events’ impacts in Macao, China.

2.6 Community Involvement in the Development and Production of Mega Events

The hosting of mega-events clearly influences residents’ lives. Local residents’ acceptance of a sport (mega) event could be greatly influenced by their perceptions of how those positive and negative impacts are distributed (Gursoy & Kendall, 2006; Jones, 2001; Jackson, 2008). Ntloko and Swart (2008) indicate that proper and effective planning, with residents’ participation, can maximise events’ positive impacts, and the benefits obtained from an event can be distributed not only to select stakeholders, but to all residents of the host community. However, Gursoy and Kendall (2006) point out that planning for mega events is traditionally controlled by governments. Local residents’ opinions are seldom examined in planning and managing the mega event. Because the achievement of goals to indicate the success of events, especially mega events, is seen to be too important to be left to amateurs, event is usually only planned by professionals and entrepreneurs (Getz, 2008).

This is especially true under the Chinese context. Xiao (2006) and Zhang et al (1999) indicated that in developing countries, especially in socialist countries where the private sector is small or non-existent, tourism development strategies and operation are usually guided by government officials.

China is a highly centralised country; the powerful governmental authority dominates policy-making and planning matters. Generally, local Chinese residents do not have opportunities to participate in tourism planning processes, as “the public still lacks the knowledge and capacity to participate in policy formulation and decision making” (Tan, Wong & Lau, 2007, cited in Ryan et al, 2009a, p. 21). Therefore, most tourism planning in China, including
planning for mega events is top down and is lacking stakeholder consultation policies (Ryan et al., 2009a). Wang and Wall (2007) argue that without consultation in tourism planning, the local community may have been disadvantaged; this is the case in the context of mega-events also. The lack of consultation with residents could also “turn the planning process into a highly charged political and social exercise” (Gursoy and Kendall, 2006, p. 605).

Collaborative tourism planning provides the opportunities for negotiation, shared decision making, and consensus decision making that can help to promote sustainable tourism development through increasing efficiency, equity and harmony (Fallon & Kriwoken, 2003). Fallon and Kriwoken (2003) and Schulenkorf (2009) indicate that community participation in the planning, development and implementation process of tourism development can also enhance trust and confidence in organisations, local attachment and produce a stronger sense of that place. Ntloko and Swart (2008) report that to understand residents’ perceptions of event impacts and their attitudes towards these impacts through residents’ participation in planning could encourage a balance between social and economic development in the host community and could reduce unwanted disruption of local community life. Thus, one of the objectives of this research is to investigate local residents’ opinions on the impacts of the Beijing Olympic Games and their attitudes towards tourism development, which might assist local tourism planners in identifying optimal tourism development in Beijing, which reflects local residents’ aspirations.

2.7 Summary

Unlike general tourism development, mega events are usually short-term and one-off events, however they can still result in very significant economic, socio-cultural, and environmental positive and negative impacts on the host community. The impacts of hosting a sport event may influence residents’ attitudes towards visitors and future tourism development in their community. Theories such as social exchange theory (Ap, 1992) have been developed to help researchers analyse local residents’ attitudes and reactions to tourism impacts. The social exchange theory suggests that local residents would be more supportive of tourism development and be tolerant of some inconvenience if they perceive tourism will result in more benefits than costs, and vice versa.
Residents’ perceptions of an event’s impacts come from their personal experience, through social interaction with others, and through the media and the reports of opinions of other important individuals and groups (Fredline & Faulkner, 2000). Residents’ attributes, such as economic dependency on tourism, residents’ length of residence and place of birth, proximity to the event, and residents’ demographic attributes, will influence also the formation of perceptions of event impacts. Residents with different perceptions can be grouped into three different types: lovers, tolerators, and haters of the event. However, the general positive attitudes of Beijing residents towards the Olympic Games’ impacts, which could be influenced by the Chinese cultural tendency and the government and Communist Party ideology, saw Zhou and Ap (2009) argue that it is better to classified Beijing residents to be either “embracers” or “tolerators”.

Traditionally, planning for the hosting of a mega sport event is usually dominated by the government. Residents have little or no opportunity to be involved in the planning. This is especially true in the centralised China. However, residents are those who suffer most from the costs of the event. Resident resentment could result in a lack of community support and for future events or further tourism development. Thus, it is very important to involve residents in the planning to minimise the negative impacts of the event and to make all the stakeholders share the benefits of the event. This adds the value to the current research, which could reflect Beijing residents’ opinions on the Olympic Games impacts and provide a reference for local authority in managing impacts and in planning future events.
Chapter Three: CONTEXT

3.1 Introduction

The aim of this chapter is to provide background information on tourism development in China and in particular, the 2008 Beijing Olympic Games. The first section describes the growth of tourism in China. It enables the readers to understand the strong influence and involvement of the Chinese government in planning and managing tourism, and the tourism impacts on the local community in the context of China. The second section provides background to the Olympic Games. It introduces the history of the Olympic Games and the relationship between politics and the Olympic Games. It also provides background information to describe China’s roles in participating in the Olympic Games, in bidding the Games, and in hosting the Games. The third section introduces some background information about Beijing, where the current research took place. The fourth section discusses impacts of the Olympic Games on the community during the preparation of the Olympic Games and for the duration of the Olympic Games. It enables the readers to form a preliminary concept of what changes Beijing residents might have experienced by hosting the Olympic Games. The final section illustrates Beijing residents’ perceptions of those impacts of the Olympic Games based on Zhou and Ap’s (2009) research. It helps the researcher to discover the temporal changes of the Beijing residents’ perceptions of the Olympic Games by comparing the results of the current research to the findings of Zhou and Ap’s (2009) research (see Chapter Six).

3.2 Tourism development in China

Tourism has been growing rapidly in China during the past decades, with international tourist numbers increasing sharply from 1.8 million in 1978 to 130 million in 2008 (Liang, Guo & Wang, 2003; National Tourism Administration of the People’s Republic of China, 2009). Today, China is not only a major tourist generating country in the world but also a major tourism receiving destination, although much of the tourism flows are intraregional (Ryan & Huimin, 2009a).
Sun, Han and Yu (2008) suggest that China’s inbound tourism development is strongly influenced by its “Foreign Openness Degree/Level”, a complicated system covering politics, economy, science, education, history and culture. The following discussion outlines the changes that have occurred leading to this tourism growth.

Prior to 1978

Before the economic reform, known as the “Open Door” policy, in 1978, there was limited inbound tourism to China and no tourism planning was undertaken.

Travel services were only provided for visiting overseas Chinese nationals and for foreigners with special permission to visit China. Domestic tourism was supressed and outbound travel was limited exclusively to diplomats and government officials (Zhang, Ray & Zhang, 2000). “Under Mao Zedong’s (Chairman Mao) regime…a near total ban on inbound travel for any purpose was enforced between 1949 and 1976” (Lim & Pan, 2005, p. 500). The Cultural Revolution, which started in 1966 and ended in 1976, further made China shut her doors and entirely stop tourism activities. During this early phase, tourism mainly served a political purpose (political visits) rather than working for economic goals (Ryan, Huimin & Meng, 2009a, Lim & Pan, 2005; Xiao, 2006; Zhang et al, 2000).

From 1978 to 1985

The aftermath of the Cultural Revolution saw China suffer from economic backwardness and capital shortages. As a result, the Chinese government needed foreign exchange to finance further economic development, and tourism was viewed as an avenue to achieve the needed capital (Zhang, Chong & Ap, 1999). After the implementation of the Open Door policy, tourism began to develop very quickly. In 1979, Deng Xiaoping, the Chinese president, first suggested Anhui Province, which had spectacular mountainous scenery, to work on a tourism plan. In the same year, the Chinese government held its first National Tourism Conference, with an outline plan drafted focusing on international tourists’ arrivals and foreign exchange (Ryan et al, 2009a). During the years from 1978 to 1982, tourism to China largely took the form of educational visits, but highly intertwined with a political purpose (Lim & Pan, 2005). For example, the visit of National Geographic photographers and writers in the early 1980s was described by Zhang et al. (1999) as a political tool to promote China to the world. It was not until 1982 that tourism was recognised as primarily an economic activity, and became a major strategy to foster economic development (Lim & Pan, 2005; Xiao, 2006). From 1981
to 1985, a few local tourism bureaux were established and overseas hotels were allowed to be operated in China with local partnerships (Liang, Guo & Wang, 2003). However, the tourism infrastructure and facilities at this stage were still insufficient and could not cope with the development of tourism (Zhang et al., 1999).

**From 1986 to 1991**

During this stage, tourism started to be considered as part of a national development plan. In 1986, tourism was for the first time included in the National Plan for Social and Economic Development (Breda, 2001). Tourism planning at this stage was dominated by the economic role of tourism with a purpose of earning foreign exchange for China’s modernisation (Zhang et al., 1999). Planning covered the development of aviation infrastructure and attractions, tourism education and training, improvements to service quality, and the operation, promotion, and coordination of tourism development (Zhang et al., 1999). However, planning lacked a theoretical basis (Ryan et al., 2009a), and the possible socio-cultural impacts, residents’ perceptions of tourism, and community involvement in tourism planning, which have been recognised as critical elements in tourism planning by academic scholars, were absent from regulatory documents (Xiao, 2006). This suggests that a comparatively low volume of community-based tourism impact research was being conducted in the Chinese context at this time.

**From 1992 to 2001**

During this phase, the Chinese government gradually loosened its central control of the tourism industry to encourage decentralization and the development of the private sector, which had to adhere to the constraints imposed by regulations (Ryan et al., 2009a). For example, setting up tourism pricing was decentralized from the government to individual tourism corporations (Zhang et al., 1999). The government also implemented tax concessions and loosened the regulations to encourage both domestic private investments and foreign investments, which compensated for a lack of local funding and experience (Ryan et al., 2009a). In 1996, non-state hotels, which numbered 1482 hotels, including 802 hotels with foreign investment constituted approximately one third of total hotel capacity in China (Xu, 2009).

At the same time, the government also loosened the regulations imposed on outbound Chinese tourism to cater to the growing demand of the emergent Chinese middle class for
overseas travel (Ryan et al., 2009a). With an increase in the Chinese people’s annual income and improvements in infrastructure during the 1990s, domestic and outbound tourism in China increased significantly. The introduction of the “Golden Weeks” holiday in 1999, which extended three major public holidays in China - the Spring Festival, International Labour Day, and National Day to be a week long each, further introduced the idea of “vacation” to the mass of Chinese residents and resulted in a domestic travel boom (Ding & Scott, 2009). The number of domestic tourists in 1999 reached to 719 million compared to 300 million in 1991 (National Bureau of Statistics of China, 2000; Ding & Scott, 2009). Chinese outbound tourist number also rose from 3.7 million in 1993 to 9.2 million in 1999 (National Bureau of Statistics of China, 1998 & 2000).

China’s inbound international tourism has grown dramatically also since 1990. The significant growth of China’s inbound tourism industry was influenced by China’s trade relationship with other countries, which brought the China’s tourism industry to a new era of market orientation (Liang et al., 2003, Lim & Pan, 2005; Zhang et al., 1999). According to Sun, Han and Yu (2008), since 1995, China has rebranded itself to be not only a tourist destination but also a business destination. By the end of this period, tourism had become a significant economic contributor to China. In 2000, China’s international tourist number reached to 83.48 million, 46 times more than the 1.8 million tourists recorded in 1978. In addition, the foreign exchange earnings from international tourists were USD16.2 billion in 2000 compared to only USD263 million in 1978 (Liang et al., 2003, pp. 2-3). The growth saw China ranked fifth in international tourist arrivals and seventh in international tourism receipts by the World Tourism Organization in 2000 (Lim & Pan, 2005).

**From 2002 to the Present**

While the previous policies had helped to generate greater economic benefits, concern about the negative impacts of tourism has become more of an issue since 2002 (Ryan et al., 2009a). The effect of tourism on pollution, acid rain, deforestation, soil erosion, desertification, and so on, on heritage sites and the degradation of the natural environment has been shown in many cases (Sofield & Li, 1998; Ding & Scott, 2009; Ryan et al., 2009a; Zhong, Deng, Song & Ding, 2011). For example, the surge of tourists during the Golden Weeks at the Dunhuang Caves, a United Nations World Cultural Heritage site in China, produced excessive carbon dioxide and water vapour in the cave (from visitors’ breathe), which had resulted in the fading of the caves’ centuries-old murals (Ding & Scott, 2009). In addition, soil erosion was
discovered in Huangshan Mountain Scenic Area covering an area of about 15 metres away from a trail (Zhong et al., 2011). Recognising the negative environmental impacts caused by tourism, the Chinese government has put more efforts on protecting natural and human environments in terms of new agendas, discourse and means to minimise these impacts (Ryan et al., 2009a).

These efforts were shown in the preparation for hosting the Beijing Olympic Games. The Chinese government implemented several strategies to achieve a “Green Olympics”, which will be discussed in detail later in this chapter. Although the Chinese government has recognised tourism can bring costs to the local community, local community involvement in tourism planning is still rare in China (Xiao, 2006; Zhang et al., 1999; Ryan et al., 2009a). In Chapter Two, the importance of community involvement in tourism planning was discussed. Although many local residents may not have enough knowledge and ability to make policies and decisions on tourism planning, they are still able to express what they have experienced or have expected to receive from tourism development. Thus, research like the present study can be beneficial to reveal local residents’ needs. It is especially useful under the context of a top-down planning system, where local residents are not able to participate in decision making. If the Chinese tourism planners can understand local residents’ needs, they are able to make more compatible tourism strategies, which can better reflect local aspirations and minimise the negative impacts experienced by residents.

3.3 Background of the Olympic Games

According to Longe (2007) and Keylor (2009), the Olympic Games were initiated in ancient Greece as part of a religious festival. The earliest record of the Olympic Games can be traced back to 776 B.C. They were held every four years for more than a thousand years until A.D. 261, when no further records of Olympic winners have been found. The Olympics was totally abandoned in A.D. 393, when the Christian emperor Theodosius I shut down all the pagan centres. In 1894, a Frenchman Baron Pierre de Coubertin, who believed that sports were important for the mental and physical development of young people, and that international sporting competition could built friendship between people from different countries, proposed to revive the games. Thus, the International Olympic Committee was founded in 1894. In 1896, the first modern Olympic Games were held in Athens, Greece. Since then, the
Olympic Games have been held every four years, except for the cancellation of the Games during war time in 1916, 1940, and 1944.

The modern Games have evolved from a curiosity in the late nineteenth century, with only 245 male athletes from 14 nations competing in 43 events in 1896, to an event of truly global magnitude this century. For example, 11438 male and female athletes from 204 countries competed in 302 events in the 2008 Beijing Olympic Games (Segrave, 2007; Chinese Olympic Committee, 2012). Difficulty in travelling was one of the major limits to many worldwide athletes attending the Olympic Games during the early stage of the modern Games (Longe, 2007). Gender discrimination also prevented women from participating in the first modern Olympic Games, while in 1900, women were allowed to participate in the Paris Olympic Games in two sports (three events), and 19 out of a total of 1330 athletes were female. Since then, women have struggled to break the barriers and to fight for equal participation in the Olympic Games; however, the number of female athletes keeps growing and today approximately 40 per cent of the total numbers of Olympic athletes are female (Toohey & Veal, 2007).

The relationship between China and the Olympic Games can be traced back to the early 1900s. In 1907, a Chinese educator and the first Chinese advocator of the Olympic Games, Boling Zhang, introduced the concept and the details of the Olympic Games movement to China in a speech (Xu, 2008). In 1928, China sent an official observer to attend the Amsterdam Olympic Games, which was the earliest Chinese representation at the Olympic Games (Polumbaum, 2009). It was not until 1932, however, that China’s first athlete competed in the Los Angeles Olympic Games (Polumbaum, 2009). China’s participation in the Olympics was interrupted by World War II and the “Two-China” conflict (both Taiwan and the newly established People’s Republic of China (PRC) claimed that they were the legitimate government of China) (Hong, 2009). In 1958, the PRC withdrew its membership from the International Olympic Committee (IOC) and stopped participating in the Olympic Games due to its disappointment with the IOC’s ambiguous attitude towards the “two Chinas” conflict. In 1977, the president of the IOC at the time, Lord Killanin, who felt that the IOC should not ignore the PRC and exclude one-fourth of the world’s population from the Olympic Games, visited Beijing. This visit, which coincided with the Chinese “Open Door Policy” saw China renew its membership in the IOC in 1979, after Taiwan was forced to change the name of its Olympic committee from the “Chinese Olympic Committee” to
“Chinese Taipei Olympic Committee” (Polumbaum, 2009 & Hong, 2009). In 1984 at Los Angeles, PRC athletes competed at the Olympic Games after an absence of thirty-two years (Hong, 2009).

Hosting the Olympic Games is costly, especially as the scale of the Games has expanded rapidly over time. In this context, the IOC recognised the possibility of gaining extra income from the media and in 1960, it sold the broadcast rights of the Rome Olympics to the USA media for US$4 million. The fees increased dramatically after the advent of satellite broadcasting. In 2008, the Beijing Olympic Games’ broadcast rights sold for US$1700 million globally (Toohey & Veal, 2007). Selling the broadcast rights and selling sponsorship rights (the Olympic Partners Programme), which allows sponsors to use the Olympic logo in their worldwide advertisements and promotion for the period of an Olympiad, have become a major source of income for the Olympic Games movement (Toohey & Veal, 2007).

Although the Olympic Games are a well-known sports mega-event, the Games have been criticised for being too intertwined with politics (Longe, 2007). On the positive side, the Olympic Games could help to promote the host country and its political system. For example, the Chinese leaders had demonstrated their commitment to greater openness through hosting the Beijing Olympic Games (Green, 2007). However, the Olympic Games are often seen as an arena for competition between countries and have sometimes been interrupted by international political tensions. For example, Germany, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Turkey were not invited to the Antwerp Olympic Games in 1920 because of their part in starting World War I. The Nazi propaganda at the Berlin Olympic Games in 1936, the murder of 11 Israeli athletes by terrorists at the Munich Olympic Games in 1972, and the boycott of the 1980 Moscow Olympic Games by many countries because of the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan all confirmed that the Olympic Games are highly influenced by political issues (Longe, 2007). Beijing also suffered from the political judgement during the selection of the host country of the 2000 Olympic Games in 1993. Beijing failed in the selection process because of the issue of human rights abuses in China (Keylor, 2009; Gao, 2009).

Beijing has participated in bidding for hosting the Olympic Games since 1993, but it was not until 13 July 2001 that Beijing defeated four other candidate cities (Istanbul, Osaka, Paris and Toronto) and won the right to host the 29th Olympic Games commencing on 8 August, 2008 (See Figure 1) (International Olympic Committee, 2008). While these games were seen as the
“Beijing Olympics”, the actual event was coordinated with other cities, including Qinhuangdao, Shanghai, Shenyang, Tianjin, Qindao, and Hong Kong.

Figure 1: Beijing celebrated its success to win the bid of 2008 Olympic Games on 13 July 2001.


According to the Beijing Organization Committee for the 29th Olympic Games (BOCOG), 94 per cent of Beijing residents supported the bid to host the Olympic Games in Beijing (Zhou & Ap, 2009). Askew (2009) states that China wanted to host the Olympic Games in order to promote an image of a powerful new China to the world; with a growing economy, prosperity, modernization, and rising global power. In China, sport and politics are closely intertwined. Sport in China has been used to construct narratives of national identity for a long time. Chinese athletes are seen as equivalent to soldiers representing socialism, the homeland, and national identity to fight for prestige and national glory on the world sporting stage (Gao, 2009a). This ideology has shifted the Chinese spirit of participation in international sport events from “Friendship First, Competition Second” during the Chairman Mao era to pursuing champions in the current Chinese society where all the citizens are spectators (Gao, 2009a). The Olympic Games, thus, have become a stage to celebrate Chinese athletic ability and national competitiveness. The Beijing Olympic Games have particularly evoked widespread nationalistic emotion and pride (Askew, 2009). This context of the Chinese national ideology is a very important background to this study, as this national ideology may influence residents’ perceptions of the Olympic impacts to be more positive if...
they regard hosting the Olympic Games as an event of national significance which could promote and benefit their country a great deal.

3.4 Background Information on Beijing

Beijing is the capital of China, located in the north of the North China Plain (See Figure 2). Its territory covers around 17,000 square kilometers. Beijing is divided into 16 urban districts and two rural counties. The registered population of Beijing was about 17 million in 2008, which included a floating/migrant-worker population of around 4.7 million. The population density was 1033/square kilometer (Beijing Municipal Government, 2009). However, the housing situation for residents living in the central city or Old city, which includes a large quantity of central and municipal government institutions, was more crowded (often less than six square metres of housing per capita) and problematic, with many houses old and dilapidated (Yu & Liu, 2011).

China’s 56 ethnic groups are all represented in Beijing, with the majority of residents being of the Han ethnic group (Invest Beijing, 2012a). The Gross Domestic Product (GDP) of Beijing per capita in 2008 was US$9075 (Beijing Municipal Government, 2009), compared to US$3268 of the whole country in the same year (National Bureau of Statistics of China, 2009c). Wholesale and retail industry, leasing and business service industry, and manufacturing industry were the top three industries of Beijing in 2008, employing 58.4% of the city’s labour force (Beijing Statistical Information Net, 2010f). The average disposable income per capita in the urban areas of Beijing in 2008 was about US$3560, while the average net income per capita in the rural areas of Beijing was about US$1547 in 2008 (Beijing Municipal Government, 2009). Beijing’s imports outweighed exports; the total amount of export in Beijing in 2008 was about US$57.5 billion (increased 17.4 per cent from 2007), while the total amount of imports to Beijing in the same year reached US$ 214.4 billion (an increase of 48.8 per cent from 2007) (Beijing Municipal Government, 2009). Foreign investments are encouraged in Beijing; the total amount of foreign investment was about US$6 billion in 2008, predominantly in the manufacturing industry (24.7 per cent), leasing and business service industry (21.8 per cent), information and computing industry (17.3 per cent), and real estate industry (13 per cent).
The environmental prospect of Beijing is not optimistic. Beijing is one of the driest cities in the world, which impacts on its quality of water supply. Coal is still one of the main sources for Beijing’s energy supply and Beijing has a poor reputation for its air quality (Tian & Johnston, 2008).

Beijing is one of the major tourist destinations in China. It was first designated as China’s capital in 1153 during the Jin Dynasty. Thus, there are many historically significant sites and relics in Beijing, including six UNESCO World Heritage List sites, 40 historical protection zones, and 3,553 other heritage sites under the government’s protection (Invest Beijing, 2012). Hosting the Olympic Games has further strengthened the municipality’s heritage protection programme so that about US$14.46 million was planned to be spent on heritage protection each year from 2003 to 2008 (Invest Beijing, 2012b). These critical cultural assets have attracted many tourists to visit Beijing every year. In 2008, the number of international tourist arrivals was 130 million, which brought US$40.8 billion to the city (National Tourism Administration of the People’s Republic of China, 2009). The tourism sector makes up 7 per cent of Beijing’s GDP (XCF, 2009), making tourism one of the more important tools of economic development in Beijing. The next section introduces the change brought to Beijing through the preparation for the Olympic Games. This marked an important transition for Beijing and for its residents.
3.5 Beijing Olympic Games’ Impacts

Hosting the Olympic Games was an important opportunity to the Chinese government, since it was seen as one crucial step to promote China to the whole world. Through the Olympic Games slogan: “One World, One Dream” (See Figure 3), China hoped to deliver a clear message that they intended to open their doors to the whole world through the Games (British Olympic Association, 2008). The Chinese Premier, Wen Jiabao, also indicated that the Olympic Games provided an opportunity to show the world how “democratic, open, civilized, friendly, and harmonious” China has become (Gursoy, Chi, Ai & Chen, 2011, p. 300).

Figure 3: The Games slogan at the site of the Great Wall, a popular tourist attraction

In order to successfully host the Games and to cater to both visitors’ and local residents’ needs, the Chinese government had implemented many development plans and strategies. These strategies had caused a series impacts on the host community, which are discussed below.

3.5.1 Economic Impacts

Preparation Period

Hosting the Beijing Olympic Games has been costly; the cost of these Games is higher than any previous Olympics, leading a lot of international media to question the cost-efficiency of the Beijing Olympic Games (BOCOG, 2008t). In particular, the Chinese government invested a lot in improving the infrastructure in Beijing - about US$40 billion was spent on
infrastructure alone between 2002 and 2006 (Gursoy, Chi, Ai & Chen, 2011). The investment covered a wide range of infrastructural areas, such as transportation including subway, light railway highway and airport construction (US$26.2 billion), energy (US$10 billion), water resources (US$2.37 billion), and urban environment investment (US$2.53 billion). In order to be capable to serve the number of visitors coming for the Games, the Beijing Capital International Airport constructed a new terminal (Terminal 3), which has been operating since March 2008. The new terminal, costing US$3.5 billion, was the largest airport in the world, with land size of approximately 986,000 square metres and the world's largest capacity to serve 82 million people per year (Beijing Municipal Government, 2008k). In an effort to ease traffic congestion, three new subway lines, costing US$3.2 billion, were constructed. It increased the number of subway lines in Beijing to eight, with the total length of track being extended from 142 kilometers to 200 kilometers. In addition, the Beijing Government slashed the prices of public transport to encourage its usage by residents (Beijing Municipal Government, 2008h). More bus routes were created, including three bus rapid transit routes introduced in 2008 to ease traffic congestion between downtown Beijing and the suburbs during rush hours (BOCOG, 2008f). The investments also contributed to two new Ring Roads, 142 miles of new automotive infrastructure, 40 kilometers of cleaned rivers, one million new trees planted and 83 kilometers of planted greenbelt (Yu & Liu, 2011). Liu Zhi, the spokesman for the Olympics and the municipal government, indicated that this infrastructural investment was already part of the city’s Five-Year Plan but they had been completed ahead of the planned time of 2010 because of the Games. Thus, he argued that the cost of the infrastructure development should not be counted in the budget for the Games (BOCOG, 2008t).

Apart from the infrastructure investment, about US$1.91 billion (half from the government and half from social financing – sponsoring and donations) was spent for the Games in constructing 12 new Olympic venues (including the National Stadium/Bird’s Nest and the Aqua Stadium/the Water Cube, see Figure 4), renovating 11 existing venues, building eight temporary venues, and renovating 45 training sites. Taking into consideration post-Games utilization, six venues were set up on university campuses in Beijing. Some venues were sold to organisations and enterprises for better usage post-Games and to cover the cost (BOCOG, 2008t).
Accommodation was one of the Chinese government’s concerns when millions of visitors were expected to crowd into the city during the Games. New accommodation, such as the Olympic Village, Media Village, and hotels, were constructed to accommodate athletes, journalists, and tourists. China had reduced hotel ownership restrictions after winning its Olympic bid. Foreign investors were permitted to own a majority share in hotels from 2002, and were further allowed to completely own hotels from 2006 (The China Business Review, 2008). The number of star-rated hotels in Beijing doubled from 422 in 2001 to 824 in 2008 (China Investment Consulting Ltd, 2010). At the same time, the numbers of unrated hotels and other accommodation increased from 4023 in 2006 to 4978 in mid 2008 (Beijing Tourism Administration, 2008b). According to Tian and Johnston (2009) training schemes were provided for staff and recruitments were held across the tourism-related services, such as the hotel industry.

Apart from hotel accommodation, a homestay scheme was organized in Beijing by the municipal tourism bureau, whereby 598 households located near major Olympic stadiums, arterial roads, cultural sites and hutong were selected to provide visitors with a different and affordable accommodation style to experience traditional Beijing life (Beijing Municipal Government, 2008o). One homestay host indicated that the homestay scheme provided a great platform for cultural exchange and that she was proud to be part of the drive (Beijing Tourism Administration, 2008a).

The rise in Beijing property prices before the Olympic Games prompted the Chinese government to change housing policies to stabilize the property price (Chinadaily, 2006). A survey conducted by US-based Pew Research Center in March and April 2008 showed that rising property prices in China was the top worry of most local residents (Beijing Municipal Government, 2008o).
Government, 2008n). The average house price in Beijing increased 15 per cent in 2005-2006 and 11 per cent in 2006-2007 (Chan, 2011). In the year of the Olympic Games, the average brand new property price in Beijing also increased by 11.9 percent (Beijing Statistical Information Net, 2009c). Tang and Yao’s (2012) research confirmed that the Olympic Games had a significant impact on the selling price for houses in Beijing during the preparation period of the Olympic Games, especially in 2004. They suggested, however, that the rise in house prices in the four Olympic Games host cities (Beijing, Tianjin, Shenyang, and Qingdao) was due not only to the Olympic Games but due also to the macroeconomic cycle. Chan (2011) reports that the rise in housing price had a strong impact on new mortgage buyers and rent-paying households who might not be able to afford the increases.

Although hosting the Olympic Games was costly, the preparation for the Games resulted also in financial injections to China to offset the operational costs of the Games, which was estimated to be over USD2 billion (BOCOG, 2008t). China received revenue from the sales of broadcasting rights, sponsorship income, income from ticketing, and income from disposal of properties (BOCOG, 2008t). The Beijing Olympic Marketing Programme was launched on 1 September 2003, which included a sponsorship programme, licensing programme and a ticketing programme. In addition to the worldwide “The Top Olympic Partners” (12 sponsors), the domestic sponsorship programme had three tiers, composed of "Beijing 2008 Partners” (11 firms), "Beijing 2008 Sponsors” (ten firms), and "Beijing 2008 Suppliers” (exclusive suppliers: 15 firms; co-exclusive suppliers: 17 firms) (Beijing Municipal Government, 2008r; Soderman & Dolles, 2010). Chan (2011) reports that although the domestic partners were non-governmental, they had strong relationships with the government or to the Communist Party, implying that they may have been easily influenced by the government. In regard to the Olympic licensed products, over 6,000 different items were developed for sale. More than 3,000 retail stores were set up across the country (See Figure 5) (BOCOG, 2008i). The Olympics tickets were sold in four rounds and the Beijing authority claimed that all the 6.8 million tickets were sold out by 26 July 2008 (BOCOG, 2008e).
Economic development was one of the major concerns to the Chinese government while hosting the Olympic Games. The anticipated opportunity generated by the Olympic Games and the returns on city construction and development resulted in the Beijing local government producing a positive forecast on the city’s economic development (BOCOG, 2007a). Beijing had forecast correctly that its gross domestic product (GDP) in 2008 could exceed $1 trillion yuan, strongly influenced by the hosting of the Games (The actual figure of Beijing’s GDP in 2008 was $1.05 trillion yuan; Beijing Municipal Government, 2008d). According to the Beijing Statistic Bureau, from 2004 to 2008 Games-related economic activities generated a combined GDP of $105.5 billion yuan (US$15.4 billion) for Beijing (Beijing Municipal Government, 2008). For example, Beijing’s sports related retail and wholesale sales rose sharply in 2008 with a growth of 74.8 per cent to $4 billion yuan under the promotion of the Olympic Games (The Central People’s Government of the People’s Republic of China, 2009).

The Games also created job opportunities for the local community. From 2004, over 430,000 jobs were created in constructing for the Olympic Games. In addition, 130,000 new jobs were created in the retail and wholesale sector (BOCOG, 2008u). Overall, it was reported that the Olympic Games created 1.8 million new jobs across all industries, with more than 370,000 jobs created in 2008 (BOCOG, 2008u). However, Chan (2011) suggests that the figure of 1.8 million new jobs created is controversial; he argued that these Chinese government figures were over-optimistic.
**During and Post the Games**

The Beijing Administration of Tourism had estimated that tourism revenue during the Beijing Olympics could reach US$400 million (Beijing Tourism Administration, 2008c). However, the international tourist arrivals during the Olympic Games did not meet the expectations of the Chinese government, due in part to the restrictions on foreign visas to avoid potential activists disturbing the Games (CBRE Hotels Newsletter, 2009). According to the statistics released on 26 August 2008, Beijing received 6.52 million tourists, including 382,000 international tourists, during the Olympic Games (Beijing Municipal Government, 2008e). In fact, the number of domestic tourists visiting Beijing in 2008 actually decreased 0.7 per cent from 2007 to 141.8 million (see Table 2). However, domestic tourism revenue in Beijing in 2008 rose 8.7 per cent from the previous year reached to US$30 billion, despite the drop in domestic tourist numbers (see Table 2).

In the aftermath of the Games, the number of international tourist arrivals and international tourism income in China dropped, due in part to the global recession and the outbreak of H1N1 influenza, and did not reach 2008 figures again until 2010 (see Table 1). Although the Chinese government was optimistic about the tourism growth generated by the improved image of Beijing during the Olympic Games, as suggested by Solberg and Preuss (2007), the sociopolitical environment, such as wars, economic crisis, and pandemics, seems to have had a stronger impact on the host destination’s post-event tourism numbers, at least in the short term.

**Table 1:** Number of international tourist arrival and international tourism income in China from 2008 to 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>international tourist arrival</strong></td>
<td>130 million (1.4% drop from 2007)</td>
<td>126 million (2.7% drop from 2008)</td>
<td>134 million (5.8% increase from 2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>International tourism income</strong></td>
<td>USD40.8 billion (2.6% drop from 2007)</td>
<td>USD39.7 billion (2.9% drop from 2008)</td>
<td>USD45.8 billion (15.5% increase from 2009)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: National Tourism Administration of the People’s Republic of China, 2009, 2010, and 2011*
Table 2: Number of domestic tourist visit Beijing and domestic tourism income in Beijing from 2008 to 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of domestic</td>
<td>141.8 million</td>
<td>162.6 million</td>
<td>179 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tourist visit Beijing</td>
<td>(0.7% drop from 2007)</td>
<td>(14.6% increase from 2008)</td>
<td>(10.1% increase from 2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic tourism</td>
<td>USD30 billion</td>
<td>USD33.7 billion</td>
<td>USD38.2 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>income in Beijing</td>
<td>(8.7% increase from 2007)</td>
<td>(12.5% increase from 2008)</td>
<td>(13.1% increase from 2009)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Beijing Statistical Information Net, 2011b

Coupled with the somewhat disappointing visitor numbers during the Beijing Olympic Games, hotel occupancy rates also were not as high as anticipated. According to the municipal tourism administration’s statistics, Beijing had 5,794 Olympics contracted hotels, offering 336,000 rooms/660,000 beds, for the Olympic Games (Beijing Municipal Government, 2008o). Among those hotels, 81.5 percent of five-star hotel rooms, 60 percent of four-star hotel rooms, and 30 to 50 percent three-star and below three-star hotel rooms were occupied during the Games from 8 August to 24 August 2008 (Beijing Tourism Administration, 2008b).

Although Beijing officials claimed that all the Olympic Games’ tickets were sold out, thousands of empty seats during the Games - some venues were only 60 per cent full during the Games (The Australian, 2008) - had raised suspicions amongst foreign media about the claim (SkyNews, 2008; CTV, 2008). According to the explanation of a ticketing officer for the Beijing Organising Committee for the Olympic Games, fewer than 60 per cent of the 6.8 million seats were sold to the public with the remaining 2.7 million seats given to sponsors, International Olympic Committee members, and government and communist party officials. This ticketing officer said the ratio of tickets available to the public was laid down by the International Olympic Committee, and was the same as at previous Olympics (The Australian, 2008). Regarding the turnout rate, the Chinese Olympic officials blamed the hot and humid weather for the poor turnout. They admitted that they had arranged some volunteers to fill
empty seats at the Games to improve the atmosphere at some of the venues (SkyNews, 2008; CTV, 2008).

Although the official BOCOG claimed that the Olympic Games had made a profit of USD170 million (Revenue: USD2.99 billion; Cost: USD2.82 billion), Chan (2011) argued that the real benefit of the Olympics investment was still unclear, because the expense claimed only covered the costs directly related to the Olympics such as the stadium construction and facilities fees, but did not cover the costs of projects such as the urban gentrification and infrastructure construction, which was about USD40 billion. This raises questions about whether hosting the Olympic Games has been economically profitable or not for Beijing. There are, of course, other ways to measure the benefits of the Games.

3.5.2 Socio-cultural Impacts

**Preparation Period**

In order to create a positive image of Beijing, the Chinese government put a lot of effort into reconstructing the city and educating its people. Civilized behaviour was advocated by the Beijing government through propaganda and slogans (Beijing Municipal Government, 2008a; Chan, 2011). The slogans evoked also a sense of patriotism among citizens (Chan, 2011). Fines were set up to limit behaviour considered uncivilized, such as spitting in public areas, and the government provided guidelines for dress rules and educated residents on the proper courtesy when interacting with foreign visitors (Nownews, 2008). Taxi drivers were forced to wear a uniform and a tie, with failure to comply resulting in a fine. This requirement caused some complaints among taxi drivers in Beijing (Worldjournal, 2008).

As indicated above, Beijing has got many significant historical relics, which are popular attractions to tourists; however, many of these attractions have been worn down by the years. An extensive renovation and revitalization programme for ancient buildings and monuments took place in and around Beijing after its successful bid for the Games to prepare these sites for the surge of athletes, journalists, and visitors for the Games. In total, more than US$140 million was spent on heritage repair and refurbishment (International Olympic Committee, 2008b). Renovations of several UNESCO World Heritage List sites, including the Forbidden City, Summer Palace, Temple of Heaven, Peking Man Site and the Ming Tombs, were
embraced in the restoration programme and monitored by UNESCO. UNESCO undertook consultation in May 2007 with Chinese authorities, Chinese conservation experts, experts from the United Nations agency, and international advisory bodies to discuss conservation methods at the Forbidden City to ensure that the display of this Chinese imperial palace would be authentic (International Olympic Committee, 2008b).

Restoration took place also in imperial parks, religious buildings and traditional hutong alleyways. More than 600 ancient city alleyways, 400 old residential areas and over 100 main streets were renovated and painted in Beijing (Chan, 2011 & Beijing Municipal Government, 2008t). The guideline for the city gentrification was to combine the old tradition with modern-looking architecture (Chan, 2011). However, many other old buildings and hutong were demolished, and some residents faced forced displacement in this ‘restoration’ project.

The local government indicated that those renovations improved local residents’ living conditions, especially for those low-income residents who lived in old alleyways, or hutong (Beijing Municipal Government, 2008t). However, some foreign media and researchers criticised the gentrification efforts. For example, Yu and Liu (2011) indicated that public appeals were organized to protect the Old City and Hutong, and there were residents who were dissatisfied with the demolition or compensation and refused to move house. Chan (2011) indicated that forced housing eviction was one of the most controversial social externalities during the Olympic Games. It is estimated that more than 1.5 million people were displaced due to construction for the Olympic Games (Chang, 2011). One U.S. journalist, Paul Mooney (2008, paragraph 9 [electronic article]), argued that:

Hundreds of thousands of Beijing residents have been displaced as large swaths of the city—many historically significant neighborhoods—have been razed to make way for Olympic venues and related development projects.

Mooney criticized also the Beijing government for compelling all beggars to leave the city. He argued that it was inhumane treatment to the disadvantaged and socially-excluded people in Beijing to be sacrificed due to the government’s desire to present an image of strong, wealthy and leading city of Beijing (Minnaert, 2011 & Mooney, 2008).
Human rights issues have been a crux in tensions between China and Western countries. The Tibet issue\(^1\), Sudan issue\(^2\) and Chinese human rights meant the Beijing Olympic Games would always be highly political. For example, the 2008 Games were labeled as the 'Genocide Games' because of China's involvement with Sudan (Askew, 2009). Protests occurred during the torch relay in Western countries in the pre-Games period, and also in China during the Games. Many Western leaders even threatened not to attend the Olympics opening ceremony in Beijing before the Games. This resulted in anger in China among the citizens (Brownell, 2012; The China Business Review, 2008). In addition, in fear of demonstrations during the Games, the Chinese government tightened the visa application requirements and shortened some visa duration, which might in the short-term affect foreign business in China (The China Business Review, 2008).

**During and Post the Olympic Games**

Under the threat of terrorism, Beijing dispersed approximately 110,000 personnel, including police, army troops and Olympic security volunteers, and organised the public to ensure the security of the Olympic Games (Beijing Municipal Government, 2008l; Yu & Liu, 2011). Community patrols were strengthened and police forces were posted everywhere to remove unfavorable individuals (Chan, 2011). Airport, railway stations, subways, and buses were monitored and protected by armed police and security guards, with frequent security checks and X-ray screening carried out in these places after a series of terrorist activities occurred in the southwest of China (BOCOG, 2008g & 2008q; Yu & Liu, 2011; Beijing Municipal Government, 2008f). Curfews were imposed for downtown bars and restaurants to close before two o’clock in the morning during the Games (Chan, 2011); meaning local businesses were interrupted by the Olympic Games.

During the Olympic Games period, the crime rate dropped significantly (72.2 percent lower than the same period of the previous year), and it was the lowest since 2000 (China Daily, 2008). The crime rate for foreigners (40 foreigners were seized) was also low in the Olympic

---

\(^1\) China repressed on Tibetans and their independent movement. In particular, the riots and protests occurred in March 2008 resulted in dozens Tibetans, Han civilians, and police officers been killed, hundreds been injured, and thousands of Tibetans been arrested.

\(^2\) China refused to pressure Sudan to stop genocide in Darfur due to its trade relationship with Sudan: import oil from Sudan and export weapons to Sudan.
history (China Daily, 2008). However, there was still a deadly attack on foreign visitors; an American volleyball coach’s parents-in-law and their female Chinese tour guide were stabbed by a Chinese resident on 9 August 2008. Two males, including the attacker, were killed, and the two females were seriously injured (CNN, 2008a).

Three “protest zones” which were set up by the Chinese government during the Olympic Games received widespread criticism by foreign media, such as CNN (2008c) and BBC (2008). Those media argued that the zones were always empty and residents who applied for permission to protest were arrested by the authorities for disturbing social order. Chan (2011) indicated that local citizens were unlikely to get approval to protests because Chinese law prohibits protests which are considered harmful to national unity and social stability. This human rights issue in China implies the possibility that local residents who suffered from inhuman treatment, such as forced displacement and/or demolishment of their house, might just choose to accept them without opposition due to their fear of being arrested by the government.

Beijing is a cultural hearth, which attracts many cultural workers and artists as residents. However, under the infiltration of global popular culture, traditional Chinese culture is on the wane and the skills to perform Chinese cultural arts are gradually being lost. Hosting the Olympic Games was seen as something of a turning point that brought the traditional Chinese culture back to the stage to be appreciated by the whole world. Twenty seven Chinese folk artists were selected to perform the traditional Chinese folk arts, such as the ladle mask-making, shadow plays, embroidery, clay sculpture and kite-making, in the Olympic Village every day. The deputy chief of the Chinese Traditional Arts and Crafts Show Centre, Yu Zhihai, stated that the Olympics Games had created a great chance for overseas visitors to know the Chinese culture and arts. It was a great opportunity for the fading Chinese traditions to be revitalized.

The Olympics also provided an opportunity for cultural sharing among people from all over the world (BOCOG, 2008l). The Opening and Closing Ceremonies, for example, provide visitors with an overview of the host city’s culture, customs, history, and the way of life. The Ceremonies also enable the local residents to celebrate and embrace their culture, and to generate national pride and a sense of belonging (International Olympic Committee, 2012). The Opening Ceremony of Beijing Olympic Games allowed China to showcase elements of its unique cultural identity, such as Confucianism, Chinese writing, Peking Opera, Tai-ji, the
Great Wall, and porcelain, and to present its 5,000 year history in front of other nations as a way of image building and cultural sharing (Ding, 2010). In addition to the presentation of traditional image of China, China invited many foreign experts to participate in designing the ceremonies to make sure China would be promoted in a modern way (Luo, 2010). This is important as China aimed to project a different image from its traditional one to the outside world and to its citizens to show the transformation of China to be a powerful, wealthy and modern society through the Olympic Games (Luo, 2010).

Luo, Leonardo, Han, Liu, Yu & Chris (2010) indicated that the opening and closing ceremonies of the Beijing Olympic Games created opportunities for intercultural exchange among the host, athletes and visitors through the parade of nations, the host’s communication, the athletes’ party, the flag handover and presentation of the next host city, and the cultural performance in the ceremonies. The Olympic Games gather visitors and athletes from different nations in the host destination. They meet and interact with each other, which can contribute to friendship building and intercultural exchange. As the director of the Humanistic Olympic Studies Center, Jin Yuanpu, stated (cited in Leibold, 2010, p. 22):

The Olympics is a gigantic carnival for the common people of the world which transcends race, culture, class and place—a genuine platform for the mutually beneficial melding of the world’s national cultures.

### 3.5.3 Environmental Aspect

#### Preparation Period

The Beijing Organizing Committee for the Games of the XXIX Olympics Olympiad (BOCOG, 2005) themed their Games the “Green Olympics” in 2005 to promote good environment for the Olympic Games. In fitting with this theme, all the venues and constructions were constructed in accordance with guidelines of being environmental friendly and energy saving (BOCOG, 2008s; Cheung, 2010). In order to relieve any potential negative environmental impacts and to meet the requirements of offering a good environment for athletes and visitors, Beijing implemented several strategies to save energy, to reduce emissions, and to diminish pollution. During the preparation period of the Olympic Games, five waste water plants and six recycling water plants were constructed in Beijing. Everyday
about 2.54 million cubic meters of water produced by these plants was used for industry, farming, sightseeing lakes, and forestry needs (BOCOG, 2008s). In addition, nine sewage treatment works were constructed, which could treat 92% of the city’s sewage (BOCOG, 2008s). Waste collection and recycling were implemented in all Olympic venues from two weeks before the opening of the Games. It was expected that the total 31 venues would produce about 14,000 tonnes of rubbish during the Games; Beijing authorities asserted that they would make half of this waste useful after recycling (BOCOG, 2008b). In order to cut emissions of carbon dioxide and to save coal, geothermal resources were encouraged and utilized in Beijing. A wind plant was constructed and operated to make 20 percent of power supply to Olympic venues wind-generated (Beijing Municipal Government, 2008b; Cheung, 2010).

Improving the air quality of Beijing was a big challenge due to the high levels of sulphur dioxide and nitrogen oxide resulting from Beijing’s dependence on coal use and increasing number of vehicles (Beyer, 2006). To ensure the quality of air during the Games was improved, the Chinese government enforced some factories in Beijing, Tianjing, and Hebei province, which produced heavy pollution, to stop operating for the two months around the Olympics and Paralympics (BOCOG, 2008s). One of China’s leading steel makers and Beijing’s major polluter, Shougang Group, was relocated to Hebei province, and had reduced its output and pollution by 70 percent for the Games (BOCOG, 2008h). Most construction activity was halted before and during the Games. However, the Financial Post (2008) indicated that shutting down industrial plants could hurt China's productivity for years to come. According to Cheung (2010), Beijing’s industrial value-added output dropped down by 9.1 per cent due to factory closures.

**During and Post the Olympic Games**

To improve the city’s air quality during the Games, Beijing authorities also imposed a traffic restriction from 20 July to 20 September, which allowed private vehicles running on the road only on alternative days according to even and odd registration numbers of the vehicle. This took half of the 3.3 million private vehicles in Beijing off the roads to reduce emissions and to solve the problem of traffic congestion during the Games (BOCOG, 2008c). Qiao, Zhang, Huang and Piper (2011) conducted research to test street dust from 21 sites along roads around the Olympic Park and to test topsoil from three sites in the forest park over a 12-month span between 2007 November and 2008 October. Their research found that traffic was
the major source of anthropogenic magnetic particle-induced enhancement of magnetic compositions in street dust. Due to the traffic-limit policy and emission control measures implemented during the Olympic Games, magnetic compositions in their sett dust samples decreased significantly during the Olympic Games period. However, after the traffic controls were withdrawn at the end of the Games, their samples collected in September 2008 showed that the pollution levels of the samples had rapidly returned to pre-Olympic levels. In a similar study, Wang, Westerdahl, Chen, Wu, Hao, Pan, Guo, and Zhang’s (2009) found also that the Black Carbon concentration on the Olympic days was dramatically lower than the value on non-traffic-control days. These studies suggested that the traffic control regulations had effectively improved Beijing’s air quality. It was felt that this strategy had so successfully relieved the traffic congestion and air pollution in Beijing during the Games that the local government decided to impose an amended traffic restriction permanently to take at least one-tenth of vehicles (according to the last digit of registration number) out of the road on weekdays. However, some experts have argued that the traffic limit policy could merely alleviate the traffic and environmental problems temporary, and could not perform a radical cure because of the rapid growth rate in car ownership in China (People, 2008).

Daily monitoring for sulfur dioxide, carbon monoxide, nitrogen dioxide, and inhalable particles were carried out to examine Beijing’s air quality. Experts of Beijing claimed that according to the scientific data, the city’s major air pollutants, such as carbon monoxide, carbon dioxide and particulates from vehicles has decreased by 20 percent during the Olympic Games compared to the same period of the previous year (BOCOG, 2008s). However, foreign media, such as CNN (2008b), argued that the air of Beijing was still not clear and athletes and fans were worried about the heavy smog covering the city. CNN (2008b) also questioned the reliability of the scientific data provided by the Chinese government. It argued that “at least one American-based environmental consultant believes that China has purposely manipulated its own pollution statistics to give a false impression that more progress has been made” (CNN, 2008b, paragraph 23). By investigating the difference in the concentrations of air pollutants between the period of Beijing Olympic Games and the same periods from 2005 to 2007, Okuda et al found that during the Olympic Games period, larger particles (PM$_{10}$), Black Carbon, SO$_2$ and NO$_2$ were reduced, but the much smaller particles (PM$_{2.5}$) did not effectively reduce and was at a similar level to the previous three years.
3.6 Beijing Residents’ Perceptions of the Olympic Games Impacts (Zhou and Ap, 2009)

In this section, local residents’ attitudes towards the Beijing Olympic Games impacts (see previous sections) identified in Zhou and Ap’s (2009) research will be discussed. Zhou and Ap (2009) undertook a study to examine Beijing residents’ perceptions of the Olympic Games before the Games took place. Their research showed that a very high percentage of respondents (96 per cent) indicated support for the Olympic Games (See Figure 6).

**Figure 6: Beijing Residents’ Perceptions towards the 2008 Olympic Games (Zhou & Ap, 2009)**

Respondents perceived the Games could bring some positive social-psychological impacts (such as enhancing the togetherness of the community, increasing the pride of local residents, showing the capability of Beijing to the world, promoting tourism in Beijing, offering a greater chance to meet new people and encouraging cultural exchange), better urban development (such as better city appearance, more public facilities available, improving road
condition, and enhancing Beijing’s international identity in the world), and economic development benefits (such as more business and employment opportunities). They had neutral opinions on some potential negative impacts of the Olympic Games, such as increasing traffic congestion, overcrowding, and higher price levels. Other negative impacts associated with Olympic Games stated in previous studies, such as noise, crime, and environmental damage, were not a concern of their respondents. Zhou and Ap (2009) suggested possible explanations were that residents may not associate these impacts as a result of the Olympic Games. In addition, living in a large-scale metropolitan city, Beijing residents might perceive that the interference of the Games to their daily lives would be limited. Thus, they could tolerate these negative impacts.

Comparison between Zhou and Ap’s (2009) research and the current study will be discussed in Chapter Six to investigate any change in local residents’ attitudes towards the Olympic Games from the pre-Games period to post-Games period.

3.7 Chapter Summary

This chapter has outlined the historical evolution of tourism in China and the strong role of central government in controlling tourism development. General information about the Olympic Games and about Beijing was presented, as was the Chinese government’s economic, socio-cultural and environmental strategies in rebuilding Beijing as an Olympic Games host city. The preparation for the Olympic Games brought had many economic benefits (such as increased employment and business opportunities, increased GDP, better image to attract future tourism and foreign investments, and revenues from visitors’ direct spending and from marketing programme) but also economic costs (such as huge spending on infrastructure and the Olympic Games’ facilities and rise in property prices). Socio-cultural benefits were identified (including better security, modernization of Beijing, promotion of civilized behavior among residents, evoking patriotism, revitalization of historical relics), alongside socio-cultural costs (such as the demolition of old and historical buildings, forced displacement of residents, and human rights disputes). Environmental impacts were seen to be largely positive to the host community (better energy saving, waste control and recycling, air quality control through relocation or temporary termination of factories and through implementation of traffic restriction). Zhou and Ap (2009) found that during the pre-Games
period, Beijing residents had a very high level of support for the Olympic Games. They perceived the Games would bring positive social-psychological benefits, better urban development in Beijing, and economic benefits to the city. They tended to have neutral opinions or tended to disagree that there would be potential negative impacts brought by the Olympic Games.

The next chapter will discuss the selection of research methodology of this research. Limitations to this study will be included as well.
Chapter Four: METHODOLOGY

4.1 Introduction

The aim of this chapter is to provide an introduction to the method the researcher has chosen to conduct this research and how and where the field research was conducted. Firstly, the chapter begins with a discussion of different research methods and the selection of the method applied in this research, a survey method, and the design of the survey. Secondly, the chapter outlines how the research sites were selected, and some background information about the research sites. Thirdly, the process of data collection will be discussed. This is followed by a detailed description of how the data were analysed. Finally, the limitations which could affect this research and its findings are discussed.

4.2 Research Method Selection

In order to carry out holistic research, the researcher used both primary and secondary research techniques to analyse existing studies and first-hand information. Secondary research included collecting and researching on subject-related academic studies, and conducting content analysis exploring Olympic Games related information from websites and media. Subject-related academic studies have acted as a blueprint for the researcher to define key research questions. Information regarding the impacts or potential impacts of the 2008 Olympic Games helped to assist in the design of the questionnaire and in the analysis of the Games-induced impacts from the standpoint of the scholars, local government and media.

Primary research was conducted to supplement and to enrich existing studies on community perceptions of mega sport event impacts in China. Primary research includes two different research methodologies: quantitative and qualitative research methodologies. Quantitative research methods (such as surveys, experiments, and quantitative content analysis) use statistical techniques to describe, to explain and to predict generalized social and behavioural phenomena. By contrast, qualitative research methods (such as observations and interviews) use interpretive and explorative techniques to explain events and occurrences which
acknowledges a subjective social reality (Onwuegbuzie & Leech, 2005; Salehi & Golafshani, 2010 & Thomas, 2003).

Both quantitative and qualitative research methods have their own strengths and weaknesses. Quantitative research can help researchers to obtain a considerable amount and wide range of responses from a large number of respondents. It is a relatively quick and economical way to conduct research. In addition, the quantitative research results can be less prejudiced because the statistics are aggregated from large samples (Amaratunga, Baldry, Sarshar & Newton, 2002 & Thomas, 2003). There are also some weaknesses associated with quantitative research methods. For example, the methods used in the research tend to be inflexible and the researcher cannot obtain deep and detailed answers from respondents. Thus, researchers may not be able to discover the different reasons leading to a particular response (Amaratunga et al, 2002 & Thomas, 2003).

Qualitative research methods are a more flexible and natural way to conduct research. They are flexible to adjust to emerging new ideas and issues, and help to develop empirically supported new ideas and theories. Respondents are able to provide a detailed explanation and in-depth information in a particular response, which may make understanding the respondents’ meaning and perspective easier. The researcher, at the same time, can develop a broader and deeper understanding of how the different respondents view the issue (Amaratunga, Baldry, Sarshar & Newton, 2002; Ospina, 2004; Thomas, 2003; Guion, Diehl & McDonald, 2002). However, qualitative research methods have weaknesses as well. For example, they tend to be time consuming and relatively more expensive. In addition, the abundant information and various opinions of respondents may make data analysis and interpretation become more difficult (Amaratunga et al, 2002 & Thomas, 2003). The subjective nature of the data, where respondents’ biases may exist, may make people give low credibility to results from qualitative research (Amaratunga et al, 2002; Maxwell, 2010; Thomas, 2003). Finally, because the data obtained from qualitative research cannot be measured and statistically analysed, the researcher cannot make generalised conclusions from qualitative research (Maxwell, 2010).

To choose a suitable research method for this study, the researcher did a comparison between different research methods, taking into account the objectives of this research and the researcher’s personal circumstance. This research required local residents to recall the impacts they experienced during the Olympic Games period. Thus, research methods such as
observation did not suit this research as the field survey was conducted three months after the Olympic Games. In order to get an overall picture of residents’ perceptions of impacts, a large number of respondents was required to provide sufficient information for analysis. Therefore, methods like focus group interviews would be less suitable for this research. As a student researcher, who had limited time and budget, it was decided to conduct a convenience survey. Convenience surveys have advantages of being relatively quick to administer and less costly, enabling the researcher to obtain a greater number of responses, saving data collecting time, and allowing the researcher to interact with the respondents (Cooper & Schindler, 2006; Dwivedi, 2008). However, a survey methodology also has disadvantages, such as the cost of data collection (such as the cost of printing, and travelling to multiple sites to survey), the possibility of inaccurate, incomplete or mischievous responses, and the comparatively low response rates (Grimmer & Bialocerkowski, 2005; Dwivedi, 2008).

The researcher chose to use an interviewer-completed intercept survey as the data collecting method because it is convenient and anonymity could be assured. In addition, because the questionnaire of this research contained open-ended as well as closed questions, it was considered useful for the researcher to see the respondents face-to-face to guide the survey and to answer the inquiries from respondents in person (Cooper & Schindler, 2006; Dwivedi, 2008). Furthermore, a face-to-face intercept survey could also help to maximise the response rates compared to remotely delivered surveys, such as an online survey or mail survey (Grimmer & Bialocerkowski, 2005). However, there are also limitations associated with intercept surveys. For example, the constraint of responding time could keep some potential participants who were busy at the moment from participating in the survey, while remotely delivered surveys provide flexibility of responding time for respondents to complete the survey (Dwivedi, 2008). In addition, respondents often feel uncomfortable answering sensitive questions in the survey in a face-to-face interview (Dwivedi, 2008). Thus, it is possible that some respondents gave inaccurate responses to some sensitive questions, which might include questions about the negative impacts of the Olympic Games.

4.3 Convenience Survey

The design of survey aimed at to get quick but also in-depth answers from respondents. Thus, the researcher designed a structured questionnaire including both close-ended questions and
open-ended questions (See Appendix 1). The first part of the questionnaire was a series of close-ended Likert scale questions. The researcher used prewritten response categories, which could reduce the respondents’ response time and facilitate the researcher in data-coding. Respondents were asked to rate their opinions on a set of pre-determined potential impact statements from 1 to 5, where 1 equals strongly disagree and 5 equals strongly agree. These impact statements were designed by referring to the impacts studied in previous studies (see Chapter Two), and also the impacts asserted by the Chinese government and the foreign media (see Chapter Three). The statements covered three broad topic areas: economic impacts, socio-cultural impacts, and environmental impacts that may be experienced by the local residents and their households and communities due to the hosting the 2008 Olympic Games. There was also a statement asking respondents to rate their level of supportive for future tourism development in Beijing. Using Likert Scales has some advantages; they are easy to understand, simple to complete, and easy to interpret and code. However, it is also associated with some disadvantages. For example, the pre-set categories might not be sufficient to describe respondents’ feeling as respondents may have different ideas other than the pre-set answers (Hasson & Arnetz, 2005; Tubergen, Debats, Ryser, Londono, Burgos-Vargas, Cardiel, Landewe, Stucki & Heijde, 2002). It is also hard for respondents to form uniformly equal intervals on the attitude scale, as different respondents may have different standards/measurements for the attitudes of “strongly disagree, disagree, agree, and strongly agree” (Tubergen et al, 2002; Davies, 2008). The sum of the scores could be a result of combination of different ratings (i.e. the same score could be a combination of several discrepant attitudinal ratings, or a combination of several neutral attitudinal ratings), which could lead to inappropriate conclusions (Hasson & Arnetz, 2005; Davies, 2008). In addition, the problematic midpoint, which was labelled “neutral” in this research, could possibly combine other attitudes of “don’t know” and “no opinion”. This could result in measurement error (Davies, 2008). Furthermore, in many cases, respondents would avoid “extreme” answers by not using “strongly agree” or “strongly disagree” categories (Hasson & Arnetz, 2005).

The second part of the questionnaire, involved a series of open-ended questions, asking respondents to state any benefits and costs they perceived that they and their city had got from hosting the Olympic Games in their own words. These open-ended questions provided some flexibility for the researcher to obtain more in-depth information from the respondents.
This in-depth information helped the researcher to further explain and to analyse their ratings on the previous impact statements.

The last part of the questionnaire aimed to obtain respondents’ personal information. This personal information helped in conducting group analysis, allowing the identification of differences by attributes grouping in terms of perceptions of Olympic impacts.

4.4 Site Selection

In consideration of time and budget constraints, the field research was conducted in Haidian District of Beijing (see Figure 7), where the researcher had accommodation available, in November and December 2008. Haidian District is located in the northwest of Beijing, covering an area of 430.77 square kilometers with a population of around three million people (Beijing Haidian, 2012a). It is a mixed center of politics, science and technology, education, human resources, and cultural and natural significance. Haidian District covers a lot of famous educational institutes, hi-tech industries, and tourist spots. These include Peking University, Tsinghua University, the Zhongguancun Science Park, and over 700 historical sites and attractions, such as the Summer Palace, the Yuanmingyuan Ruins Park, the Fragrant Hills Park, the Temple of Great Awakening, the Temple of the Sleeping Buddha, the Beijing Botanical Gardens, the CCTV Tower and the China Millennium Monument (Beijing Haidian, 2012c). The headquarters of the Beijing Organizing Committee for the Games of the XXIX Olympiad (BOCOG) is located in Haidian District. There were total of eight venues and 22 training fields located in Haidian District as well, making it one of the key areas for the 2008 Games (Beijing Haidian, 2012b).

Because the researcher has got a family member working in a local community board, with her help, the researcher obtained permission from officers of three local community boards, as a requirement of Lincoln University Human Ethics Committee, to conduct an intercept survey in the three local community areas (Jinger Community, Weishengbu Community, and Jiaodajiayun Community). Getting approval from the communities before research data collection process can assure that human-subjects research is ethical and appropriate and can enhance the communities’ role in research to minimize adverse impacts of research in terms of minimizing potential harms and maximizing potential benefits to individuals and the community (Grignon, Wong & Seifer, 2008). The researcher chose to do the intercept survey
on several sites within the three communities. These sites were Jiaoda East Road, Jiaotong University Road, and three community playgrounds (see Figure 7).

Jiaoda East Road is a busy road which is close to Beijing subway station, Beijing railway station, and a famous shopping mall. Thus, the researcher was able to catch a good volume of potential participants on this road. Furthermore, because this location is close to a railway station and a subway station, the researcher was able to catch people living in other districts there.

The researcher also conducted the survey on Jiaotong University Road. Jiaotong University Road is very close to Jiaotong University, one of the famous universities in Beijing. There are many good restaurants, shops and local markets on this road, and people heading to these venues are usually on their leisure time and it was felt they might have more free time to complete a short survey. Moreover, the nearby Jiaotong University also offered a good source of younger participants, which could assist group analysis in terms of age.

Lastly, the researcher also conducted the survey in three local community playgrounds. In Beijing, many senior people liked to do exercises, to play cards or chess or to have a chat with each other in the local community playgrounds. They usually have more free time to be interviewed. The researcher was also able to get more elder participants involved in the survey in the community playgrounds to enrich the data in terms of different age categories.
4.5 Data Collection

The survey participants were selected on the basis of convenience sampling, while working to a quota, to ensure a good representation based on gender and to avoid potential gender response and coverage bias. Because of the time constraint, the researcher was unable to work to a quota to control other variables, such as age, to get a better representative sampling. The researcher used systematic sampling strategy to enhance a better random distribution and to avoid preferential treatment in selection (Ahmed, 2009). When selecting participants, the researcher approached every fifth person walking past in the interview locations (except community playgrounds) initially and became more selective once a quota was full (i.e. approaching males, once the quota of females was filled), selecting the first appropriate respondent once the fifth person had passed. While in community playgrounds, since people were not always walking around, the researcher decided to approach every third person closest to her, and to select the next person if the third person refused to participate in the survey.
After approaching the potential participant, the researcher introduced herself, described the general purpose of the research and checked whether the potential participants were Beijing residents and were 18 years old or over. Non-Beijing residents and those who were under 18 years old were excluded from participation. Potential respondents were informed that participation was completely voluntarily and all responses would be anonymous. The time and budget constraints limited the researcher’s ability to get a large sample size to better represent the perceptions of the whole Beijing population. The sample size of this research was 300, which is a good volume to enable statistical tests to be performed, but is still not large enough for this research to make the generalisations about the total 17 million Beijing residents. Thus, the results of this research could be biased. The response rate was estimated to be 15 per cent. This includes people who were not eligible for the study, such as non-local residents and people who were under 18 years old. The reasons given by people who were eligible for the study but refused to participate in the survey included being not interested in participation, having no time to participate, and having limited knowledge about the research subject. During the interview process, the researcher was turned down more often by potential respondents who were middle aged and seniors. Some senior people told the researcher that they knew nothing about the research topic. Lack of knowledge on the Olympic Games and their influences (many middle aged people and senior people in China have only little education or no education) could result in their perceived incompetency in participating in the survey. In addition, despite the gradual opening up of China, the long-term suppression of free speech in public could also discourage some older people from participating in the survey.

4.6 Data Analysis

The researcher used SPSS software to analyse the close-ended questions. To simplify the analysis, the quantitative responses were recoded from five categories into three categories, where 1 equals disagree (combining strongly disagree and disagree), and 3 equals to agree (combining strongly agree and agree). A correlation and Chi Square test was run to identify any significant differences among the different demographic groups where p-value is lower than 0.05. However, other interesting results, which were not systematically significant, are also discussed in the results chapter.
Content analysis was applied in analysing all the open-ended questions. The researcher has put all the responses of the open-ended questions into a Word file and regrouped them into several impact categories. By doing this, it was possible to identify perceived Olympic impacts, which had not been included in the close-ended questions, and also to provide more detail or specifics of impacts that had been included in the Likert scale questions. These findings were used to support the results derived from SPSS analysis and to extend this study.

4.7 Limitations

Every research project has its own limitations; this research is not excluded from such limitations. Territory constraint is one of the limits of this research. Having a size of 16,801.25km², Beijing is approximate 12 times bigger than Christchurch in land mass. Due to time and budget constraints, the researcher was unable to conduct the survey in every district and county of Beijing. Conducting the survey only in the Haidian district could cause geographic bias. Although the characteristics of our interview spots (near university, restaurants, shopping mall, major transportation stations) could possibly assist to reach people from other districts or counties, the geographic distribution of respondents was still very uneven; as the findings show that nearly 40 per cent of respondents of this research lived 6 to 15 kilometres away from the Bird’s Nest Stadium. Thus, the results of this study may be more representative to this group of residents’ opinions than of Beijing residents as a whole.

Some of the interview sites were very close to the Jiaotong University. Thus, a high proportion of the flow of people around the area was young people. This has resulted in an over-representation of younger respondents (aged 35 and under) in the sample. The over-representation of the younger group in the sampling could cause bias in favouring younger people’s opinions.

The results of this research (see Chapter Five) reveal that respondents were very optimistic towards Olympic impacts. When interviewing local residents, some respondents told the researcher that answering questions on the negative impacts of the Olympic Games was a bit sensitive, and they were unwilling to say something negative about their country’s efforts in an international mega-event, especially in facing an interviewer who was conducting research for a foreign (New Zealand) institution. Thus, the researcher’s foreign identity, despite common language, became a limitation of this research. This would cause the outcomes of
this research become over-optimistic. This will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter Six.

4.8 Conclusion

In this chapter, the process of selecting the research methodology and the selecting of research sites for the research has been discussed. The process of data collection and analysis has been outlined also, and the limitations of the research have been acknowledged. The next chapter will present the results obtained from the field survey of this research to understand Beijing residents’ perceptions of the impacts of the Olympic Games after the Games had finished.
Chapter 5: RESULTS

5.1 Introduction

This chapter outlines the results of this research. The chapter begins with the general description of the survey respondents. This is followed by an overall presentation of residents’ perceptions of the impacts caused by the Olympic Games. The analysis combines both respondents’ quantitative and qualitative responses on the perceived economic, socio-cultural, and environmental impacts. The following section has scrutinized those impacts in detail to explore any correlation between respondents’ personal characteristics and their perceptions of impacts. Finally, the chapter ends with a discussion of respondents’ level of supportiveness for further tourism development in Beijing.

5.2 The profile of the survey respondents

There were 300 Beijing residents aged 18 years and above who participated in the survey for this study. The gender of the respondents is evenly distributed due to the researcher’s strategic selection in sampling, with 150 male respondents and 150 female respondents sampled.

The age distribution of the respondents showed that 60.3 per cent of them were 35 or under and 23.7 per cent of respondents were between 36 and 55 (See Table 3). Only 16 per cent of respondents were older than 55. This distribution shows that younger respondents were over-represented when compared to the 2005 Beijing Census figures (see Table 3).

Table 3: Age Distribution of Research Respondents and of Beijing Residents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Survey Participants</th>
<th>2008 Beijing Census</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>15-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td>25-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>35-44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>45-54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-65</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>55-64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66 and above</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>65 and above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Beijing Census sauce: Beijing Statistical Information Net (2011b)*
The highest achieved education level of the respondents tended to be very high compared to the education levels of Beijing residents as a whole (see Table 4). Of the 300 respondents, 73.9 per cent had a tertiary qualification. The other 26.1 per cent had a comparatively lower education level of no formal qualification, a primary school qualification, a high school qualification or a trade certificate or equivalent. This high education level could be a reflection of the younger tendency of the sample since the younger generation has had better opportunities to access education than the older generation. In addition, it could be a result of a survey site location near a university as well.

**Table 4: Education Level of Research Respondents and of Beijing Residents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Survey Participants</th>
<th>2010 Beijing Census</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No formal qualification</td>
<td>1.7 %</td>
<td>1.7%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary school qualification</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school qualification</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate degree/ diploma</td>
<td>60.7%</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate qualification</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade certificate or equivalent</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Illiterates aged above 15

**Beijing Census sauce: Beijing Statistical Information Net (2011b)**

Among the 300 respondents, 16 of them (5.4 per cent) indicated that they were working in a tourism-related industry, including the tourism industry, hotel industry, catering industry, and retail which have tourists as one of their main customers, at the time of the interview (See Table 5). The remaining 279 respondents (94.6 per cent) were either working in a non-tourism-related industry or they were not working at the time of the interview. These respondents were students (20.2 per cent), professionals (27 per cent), salespersons/clerks (28.6 per cent), retirees (18.7 per cent), and others such as manual workers, freelance workers, singers, and job-seekers (5.6 per cent). Due to the researcher not being able to find a similar occupation composition of total Beijing population in the census, a comparison cannot be made.
Table 5: Occupation of Research Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents’ Occupation</th>
<th>No of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tourism-Related</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Tourism Industry</td>
<td>16 (5.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Hotel Industry</td>
<td>5 (1.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Catering Industry</td>
<td>3 (1.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Retail (tourists as one of their main source of revenue)</td>
<td>5 (1.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Tourism-Related</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Student</td>
<td>51 (20.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Professional</td>
<td>68 (27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Salesperson/Clerk</td>
<td>72 (28.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Retiree</td>
<td>47 (18.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Others</td>
<td>14 (5.6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents were asked to indicate their birthplace, which was one of the measurements of their attachment to Beijing. There were 41.5 per cent of respondents born in Beijing. The other 58.5 per cent of respondents were born outside of Beijing (see Table 6). The result suggested that Beijing has a complex composition of population from everywhere across the country.

Table 6: Birthplace of Research Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents’ Birthplace</th>
<th>No of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beijing</td>
<td>124 (41.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern China</td>
<td>70 (23.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central China</td>
<td>48 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern China</td>
<td>12 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern China</td>
<td>16 (5.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western China</td>
<td>9 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>20 (6.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Another measurement of respondents’ attachment to Beijing is to analyse their length of residence. A large proportion of respondents have been living in Beijing for a long period, with 44.3 per cent (n=132) living in Beijing for 26 years or more, and a further 27.2 per cent living in Beijing for 6 to 25 years. About a quarter of respondents (28.5 %) were relatively new in Beijing with a shorter residence of 5 years or less (see Table 7).

Table 7: Research Respondents’ Length of Residence in Beijing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents’ Length of Residence in Beijing</th>
<th>No of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within 5 years</td>
<td>85 (28.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-25 years</td>
<td>81 (27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 years and above</td>
<td>132 (44%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents were asked if they had been personally involved in the Olympic Games, and 52.2 per cent (n=155) indicated that they had been as either a spectator (n=101) or a volunteer, who might be a spectator simultaneously, (n=54). Among these volunteers, about half of them (48.1 per cent) were senior respondents who were aged 56 years and above, and about one-third of them (33.3 per cent) were younger respondents aged 35 years and under (See Table 8). Senior respondents were actively volunteering in the Olympic Games since more than half of all senior respondents (54%) interviewed had worked as volunteers, compared to about 10 per cent in the other age groups.

Table 8: Age Distribution of Volunteers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>No. and % of All Volunteers</th>
<th>No. and % of Volunteers in Each Age Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>8 (14.8%)</td>
<td>8/78 (10.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>10 (18.5%)</td>
<td>10/103 (9.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>5 (9.3%)</td>
<td>5/41 (12.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>5 (9.3%)</td>
<td>5/30 (16.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 and above</td>
<td>26 (48.1%)</td>
<td>26/48 (54.2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To measure whether residents who lived closer to a central location of the Olympic Games would experience more intense impacts of the Olympic Games, respondents were asked the distance between their home and the National Stadium (the Birds Nest Stadium) where a lot of visitors gathered during the Games and where a lot of activity was centred. The results (see Table 9) showed that only 10.3 per cent of respondents interviewed lived within 5 kilometres
of the Birds Nest Stadium, while 38.7 per cent of respondents lived between 6 to 15 kilometres from the stadium. A further 25% lived more than 25 kilometres from the stadium.

**Table 9: Research Respondents’ Home Distance from the Birds Nest Stadium**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents’ Home Distance from the Birds Nest Stadium</th>
<th>No of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within 5 km</td>
<td>31 (10.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-15 km</td>
<td>116 (38.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-25 km</td>
<td>74 (24.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 km and above</td>
<td>75 (25%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To sum up, the respondents of this survey tended to be young and more highly educated. They came from everywhere across the country, with only 41.3 per cent being born in Beijing. However, a large proportion of the respondents had been living in Beijing for a long time, with only 28.3 per cent living in the city for less than 5 years. In terms of occupation, only a few respondents worked in a tourism-related industry. Most respondents were salespersons/clerks, professionals, students, and retirees. Respondents were moderately involved in the Olympic Games; slightly more than half of the respondents indicated that they were either a spectator or a volunteer; while approximate half of the volunteers in this survey were senior respondents. The proximity of the respondents’ home distance to the Birds Nest Stadium showed that most of the respondents lived some distance away from the stadium, with only about 10 per cent living in close proximity (within 5 kilometers).

5.3 Residents’ perceptions of impacts caused by the 2008 Olympic Games

This section presents respondents’ opinions on the impacts of the Olympic Games based on their ratings (1 strongly disagree to 5 strongly agree) on the set of pre-determined potential impact statements and their answers to open-ended questions.

The analysis of respondents’ rating on the statements shows that residents’ perceptions of the impacts of the Olympic Games tended to be positive overall. On average, they gave higher scores on positive impacts of the Games, and gave lower scores on questions relating to negative impacts.
Economic Impacts

Respondents tended to agree that the Games had brought positive economic impacts to Beijing in terms of economic benefits, job opportunities, and business opportunities, but were less positive about the economic impacts for themselves, or their own families (See Table 10).

While 69.3 per cent of respondents agreed that the Games had brought economic benefits to Beijing, only 11.7 per cent disagreed (See Table 10). Respondents indicated that these economic benefits included more foreign exchange earnings, more (part-time) jobs and more business opportunities. Some respondents said that the exposure of China to the world through the Olympics had promoted more international business co-operation and investments between China and other countries. One male retiree said that “the improved infrastructure and business environment also facilitated the development of the local economy and made local enterprises become more competent”. Respondents also indicated that the positive image of China delivered through the Games could promote Beijing’s tourism development. One young female university student said that “more people are planning to travel to and to consume in Beijing. This would promote the further growth of tourism in Beijing”.

Table 10: Respondents’ Perceptions of Economic Olympic Games’ Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beijing Community</th>
<th>Beijing Residents (N=300)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic Aspects</strong></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Positive Impacts</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosting the Olympic Games has brought economic benefits to Beijing</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosting the Olympic Games has created more job opportunities in Beijing</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosting the Olympic Games has created more business opportunities for Beijing</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosting the Olympic Games has brought economic benefits to me/my family</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosting the Olympic Games has created more job opportunities for me</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosting the Olympic Games has created more business opportunities for me</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative Impacts</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosting the Olympic Games has resulted in a rise in Beijing’s property values</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympics-induced tourism raised the cost of living in Beijing</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The government has invested too much capital in constructing facilities for the Olympic Games</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although respondents tended to agree that the Games have brought economic benefits to Beijing, not many respondents or their family had actually personally received those positive economic impacts, in terms of economic benefits (14.4% agreed and 53% disagreed), job opportunities (20.3% agreed and 49.4% disagreed), and business opportunities (20.7% agreed and 43.7% disagreed) (See Table 10). Some respondents said that they were disappointed that the Games failed to provide more job opportunities for them. One young female graduate who was unemployed said that “I thought I could get an Olympics-related job, but I couldn’t”.
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Even though the Games had created job opportunities for some residents, many of those jobs were transitory; as a couple of respondents working in the hotel or catering industry indicated, a series of layoffs had occurred in the industries post the Games and they were facing the possibility of losing their jobs soon. Although many respondents felt that the Olympic Games did not help them to increase their personal income, a few senior respondents indicated that they had received economic benefits, such as exemption from the charge at many tourist spots, and a rise in their pension because of the Games.

The Olympic Games brought some economic costs also to the host community according to more than half of the respondents, who agreed that Beijing has suffered from some negative economic impacts. The biggest concern related to the rise in property values (56.3% agreed and 14.6% disagreed), followed by concern that too much capital had been invested in constructing facilities for the Games (54.3% agreed and 18.3% disagreed) and the rise in the cost of living (50.6% agreed and 15% disagreed) (see Table 10). Although the rise in property values could be good for property sellers, the researcher has regarded it as a negative economic impact of the Games because Beijing’s property prices have surged too high compared to local residents’ income level. According to the Department of Beijing Human Resource and Social Security (2010), the average annual salary in Beijing in 2008 is CNY44715 (USD7097). The average house selling price in Beijing was CNY11648 (USD1847) per square metre in 2008. According to the regulations implemented in early 2008, the average size of new constructed residential houses in Beijing for each project had to be 60m² (state house), 100m², and 200m², according to the type of land (Beijing Municipal Commission of Urban Planning, 2008). Figure 8 shows that the housing price had raised sharply in 2007, a year before the Olympic Games. Statements from respondents also indicated property price rises was their biggest concern in terms of Olympic Games’ impacts. A middle aged female software developer indicated that “the Games had led the housing price to surge to an unrealistic level”. There were also several respondents who indicated that the surging property prices had made it impossible for them to buy a house.
A small majority of respondents agreed that construction for the Olympic Games had cost too much money. One middle-aged female civil service worker said that “the Olympics have wasted a lot in resource and construction”. Another young (aged 26-35) male accountant also said “the costs on infrastructure construction may need several years to make up. It may increase the government’s financial burden”. However, there were also some respondents who thought the money invested in the Olympics was acceptable since they were not affected by the spending. One young (aged 26-35) female clerk said that “I thought the huge investment spent for the Games may cause an increasing load on residents, but the government did not transfer the cost on to us”. The utilisation of the Olympic venues subsequent to the Games has drawn some respondents’ attention. They thought there would be problems in managing and utilising the venues after the Games and a few respondents worried the venues might lay idle. There were also some respondents worried the high maintenance fee of the venues and sports facilities could cause financial burdens for operators of the venues in the years ahead.

Table 10 shows that half of the respondents agreed that the Games had caused a rise in cost of living in Beijing. A male retiree indicated that “the prices of goods, water, power, and gas have all gone up”. Respondents pointed out that the increased prices have made their net household revenue drop. One female odd-jobs worker, aged between 46 and 55, indicated that “the Olympic Games have caused a rise in prices and the problem of inflation together with the recession and the high unemployment rate, residents have experienced a hard time”.

A further economic impact identified in open-ended responses was that some respondents argued that the Games had delayed the progress of many construction projects and factories,
which were terminated during the Games in favour of providing good air quality in Beijing. In addition, respondents argued that the cancellation of large recruitment sessions due to the government’s restrictions on public gatherings (for security reasons) had increased the difficulties for them to find a job in any industry during the Games period. This could be one of the reasons to explain why nearly half of the respondents disagreed that the Games had created job opportunities for them.

It was felt by respondents that restrictions on the business trading hours and restrictions on foreign visas had made some local shops lose the chance to get more revenue during the Games. As one female respondent, aged between 26 and 35, working in a catering industry said:

Because a lot of Beijing’s floating population came back to their home cities during the Games period, plus the Governments’ restrictions to limit the number of people coming to Beijing, a lot of Beijing’s local restaurants and shops had a drop in revenue during the Games.

Another retired female respondent also indicated that “the reduction of trading hours during the Games has caused an impact on retail businesses’ sales figures”. These assertions were different from the general respondents’ perception that 70 per cent of respondents agreed that the Olympic Games had created more business opportunities for Beijing.

Although 70 per cent of respondents in this study agreed the Olympic Games had brought economic benefits to Beijing, there were some respondents who argued the Olympic Games had caused a drop in the country’s economy. They indicated that Beijing had faced an economic downturn, collapse in the stock market, and high unemployment rate since the Games. However, it is probable that the drop in Chinese economy since the Olympic Games is due more to the influence of the global recession than the Games themselves.

Socio-cultural Impacts

The results of this research show that the socio-cultural benefits brought by the Olympic Games were perceived by respondents to have had more positive impacts on the respondents than the economic benefits. Respondents agreed that the Games had brought several positive socio-cultural impacts for local residents (see Table 11), particularly the improvement in Beijing’s infrastructure (82.7 per cent agreed) and more public facilities available (91.3 per
cent agreed). They also agreed that the Olympic Games had improved the quality of Beijing residents lives (58.7 per cent agreed), had promoted civilized behaviour among residents (70 per cent agreed), had facilitated modernisation of Beijing (68.3 per cent agreed), had strengthened security in Beijing (75.7 per cent agreed), had promoted cultural exchange between residents and visitors (77.4 per cent agreed), and had encouraged preservation of local culture and tradition (68.4 per cent agreed).

Table 11: Respondents’ Perceptions of Socio-Cultural Olympic Games’ Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beijing Community</th>
<th>Beijing Residents (N=300)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Socio-Cultural Aspects</strong></td>
<td><strong>Strongly Disagree</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Positive Impacts</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beijing’s infrastructure has improved as a result of the Olympic Games</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are more public facilities available as a result of the Olympics</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Olympics has improved the quality of Beijing residents’ life</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympics-induced tourism promoted civilized behaviour among residents</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympics-induced tourism facilitated modernization of Beijing</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympics-induced tourism strengthened security in Beijing</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Olympics has promoted cultural exchange between residents and visitors</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosting the Olympics encouraged preservation of local culture and tradition</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative Impacts</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympics-induced tourism has resulted in pressure on resources and infrastructure</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympics-induced tourism has resulted in problems of overcrowding</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosting the Olympics has caused resentment for some groups of residents</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Olympics-induced tourism increased the crime rate in Beijing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>36%</th>
<th>37.7%</th>
<th>9.7%</th>
<th>4.3%</th>
<th>2.58</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traffic limit policy caused inconvenience to me personally</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>3.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic limit policy caused inconvenience to all residents</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Olympics increased conflicts between residents</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>2.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Olympics increased conflicts between residents and visitors</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As stated above, improvements in Beijing’s infrastructure were highly praised by respondents. Respondents said that there were more subways and buses available that had made travel and shopping in Beijing more convenient. Some respondents also supported the traffic-limit policy and said the policy has effectively eased the problem of traffic jams (about 30 per cent of respondents disagreed that the traffic-limit policy had caused inconvenience to them and to all residents). In addition, the slashing of public transportation fares by 60 per cent was mentioned by many respondents as an unexpected benefit they had gained from the Olympic Games.

Respondents also gained a personal benefit from the improvement in public facilities (91.3 per cent agreed). They indicated that there were more parks, sports facilities, fitness facilities, and public facilities available for both residents and tourists. There were 68.3 per cent of respondents who agreed that the Olympic Games had accelerated the modernization of Beijing. Respondents said that there was more modern city construction in Beijing because of the Games. One middle-aged male clerk said that he was surprised in seeing some old residential areas becoming so tidy and comfortable after old hutongs and old traditional Chinese houses were re-constructed by the government. There were also some residents who indicated that their housing quality and living conditions were improved through these reconstructions. One middle-aged (aged 36-45) female teacher said that “receiving the compensation for demolition from the government made me and my family able to live in a larger house with better conditions.” Another male tour guide (aged 36-45) also indicated that:

Although I could only afford to buy a house far from the city centre, the size and the living condition of my new house are much better than my old one. I could also use the compensation from the government to buy a car, which would solve the problem of commuting.
Although their responses were very positive, this study also shows that there were 46.3 per cent of respondents agreed that the Olympic Games had caused resentment for some groups of residents; this issue will be discussed further below.

There were 77.4 per cent of respondents who agreed that the Olympics had promoted cultural exchange between residents and visitors. Some respondents indicated that they have made foreign friends through the Games. Respondents said that many foreigners have learnt about the Chinese culture, and local residents also learned something of a foreign language and foreign culture. One middle-aged (aged 46-55) retired female respondent said “everyone was very active in preparing for the Games. We were happy to learn English to increase our language ability in order to host foreign visitors”.

Respondents (70 per cent agreed) said that the Games had made them become more cultured and behave in a more civilized manner. They felt they were more polite and presented the traditional Chinese virtues of courtesy and hospitality well. Respondents said that people cared more about others, followed the traffic orders, and automatically formed a queue while waiting during the Games period.

Respondents agreed that the Games had resulted in tightened security in Beijing; with 75.7 per cent of respondents agreeing (5.3% disagreeing) that Olympic Games had strengthened security in Beijing. One young (aged 18-25) female student said “I feel much safer living in Beijing now”. A few respondents said they were happy that terrorist attacks did not occur because of the tightened security.

It was felt by 68.4 per cent of respondents that the Olympic Games had helped to preserve traditional Chinese culture and relics. Respondents appreciated that many historically significant sites in Beijing had been restored and protected. For example, a young female clerk said that “the highlighting of Chinese culture during the Olympic Games, especially the performances in the opening ceremony, would make more local residents cherish our own culture.” However, there was a young male student who expressed an opposing idea; he said:

The Games have caused the commodification of the traditional Chinese culture, since many Chinese artists and craft makers were organised to perform their skills to entertain foreign visitors. These folk arts are precious skills, and should not become entertainment products to please tourists.
Further insights into the socio-cultural impacts of the Olympic Games were apparent in the qualitative responses from respondents. For example, many took “being a spectator or a volunteer” as a benefit of the Games. Respondents were excited to be able to see the athletes from a close-distance and to experience the aura of the Olympics in person. One senior retired female respondent was proud to participate in a performance of folk dance in the Olympic Games. A few respondents also indicated that they were inspired by the spirit of the athletes while watching the Games.

Another interesting finding apparent from the qualitative responses that was not identified in the quantitative findings is that the Olympic Games have strengthened Beijing residents’ interests in sports, as both spectators and participants. Respondents indicated that they have gained more knowledge on the Olympic Games and the Olympic spirit. They were clearer about sports, and have learnt more about sport development in different countries. One middle-aged female clerk said that “I used not to care about sports. However, because of the Games, now I am more interested in sports and matches. It has enriched my life”. Consequently, some respondents also disclosed an increase in their interests in personal fitness training and sports participation as a personal benefit gained from the Olympics. Respondents said that they have recognised how important sport is, and have formed a habit of regular exercise for the sake of health.

The Olympic Games did not only create physical benefits to residents, but also brought psychological benefits, such as the arousal of patriotism. Respondents felt that they had become more confident and been more proud of their country. There were several quotations from the respondents which showed this patriotism:

The Games have evoked my patriotism. I feel my great country is so powerful and unbeatable. (Middle-aged female retiree)

When I saw Beijing was selected as the host city for the 29th Olympic Games in 2001, I was very excited, so were all the people in China. After seven years, I still couldn’t believe that I was here when it happened. This is the moment I will treasure all my life. (Young female marketing developer)

I feel proud to be a Chinese, and now I can smile with confidence because I am a Chinese. (Young female student)

The national pride and the patriotism have made Beijing residents care more about how other people look at their country. Respondents indicated that the Olympic Games have provided a good chance to present a better China to the world, as one young female student said:
Foreigners used to have an incorrect stereotyping about China and its people, such as poor, uncivilised, and old-fashioned. The Olympics has provided a visual impact to them to correct their wrong stereotyping.

In addition, some respondents thought the Olympic Games had raised the international status of China through the exposure of its positive images, its strong economic ability, and the enhanced competitiveness in the global market.

In terms of negative socio-cultural impacts, Table 8 shows that about half of the respondents agreed that the Games had caused problems such as pressure on resources and infrastructure (50.6 per cent agreed and 17.7 per cent disagreed), overcrowding (53.3 per cent agreed and 16.3 per cent disagreed), and resentment for some groups of residents (46.3 per cent agreed and 19.3 per cent disagreed). However, respondents tended to reject the idea that the Olympic Games had caused problems such as an increase in crime rate in Beijing (14 per cent agreed and 48.3 per cent disagreed), an increase in conflicts between residents (7 per cent agreed and 58.7 per cent disagreed), and an increase in conflicts between residents and visitors (11 per cent agreed and 54 per cent disagreed). Respondents had different ideas on the statements of the inconvenience of the traffic-limit policy to them personally (39.6 per cent agreed and 31.7 per cent disagreed) and to all residents (29.3 per cent agreed and 33 per cent disagreed). Respondents’ way of transportation (such as using a private car or taking public transportation) could be a factor causing this difference.

Overcrowding (53.3 per cent agreed) is one of the main negative socio-cultural impacts acknowledged by respondents. Respondents pointed out that the problem of overcrowding had shown on the public transportation and in public areas, including the tourist spots. Some people found that it was hard to book tickets or accommodation while travelling, and traffic jams appeared more often during rush hour (although there were also some respondents indicating the traffic jams had been relieved because of the traffic-limit policy). The crowd also added pressure on Beijing’s housing. One young non-Beijing-born female computer engineer said that the influx of people had made it difficult for her to rent a house. Another young male student, whose house was within 5 kilometres from the Birds Nest Stadium, said the crowd coming to the Stadium had caused serious traffic jams around his home.

Restriction on road usage was another Games-induced negative impact mentioned by respondents. One young female student said that “I was late on the university’s enrolment day because that the highway was closed for the Olympic Games”. Some respondents said that
they thought the traffic-limited policy would be just a temporary policy for the Games, but the government had made it a permanent policy post-Games. Thus, they thought their affliction had been extended. However, there were also some respondents who had found those restrictions were not intolerable and they could accept them even if the traffic-limit policy had become permanent post-Games.

Although many respondents indicated that the Olympic Games had made Beijing become safer and more secure, interestingly, there were also comments from respondents indicating that the tightened security has itself become a problem for some of them, so that increased security cannot necessarily be viewed as a positive impact. A number of respondents thought the security was too strict and the restrictions and numerous security checks had caused inconvenience to them. One young male student indicated that he was annoyed with the ID card checking every time he entered the university during the Games period. Another senior female retiree said that “a large portion of food from other cities could not enter Beijing during the Olympics, which has caused some inconvenience to the residents”. There was also one middle-aged male retiree who complained that restrictions meant people and vehicles from outside Beijing could not enter Beijing easily, which could harm the local economy. The strengthened security could be a key factor resulting in a drop in the crime rate during the Olympics. About half of respondents disagreed that the Games had caused a rise in crime, however, there were a few respondents who said that the Games had caused an increase in petty crimes, such as an increase in the number of scalpers and frauds. There were also unethical merchants selling fake Olympic products on streets, especially after the Games.

Although some of the respondents were happy that many old buildings and streets (hutong) had been reconstructed to be more pretty and presentable, there were also a couple of respondents unhappy to see the demolition of old buildings because of the Games. One young female student said that she was sad to see many old buildings demolished for the reconstruction of a new Beijing. Another young male teacher thought the new construction had caused a loss in traditional culture; in favour of development and modernization, many things of the old were being sacrificed. During her time in Beijing, the researcher noticed that many new hutongs in Beijing have deliberately preserved the traditional architectural design; however, the modern materials used in the new constructions had already made them lose their historical values to a certain degree.

This study found that there were 46.3 per cent of respondents agreed that Olympic Games
had caused resentment for some groups of residents. This is an important discovery. While the majority of these respondents expressed positive opinions about the impacts of the Olympic Games, nearly half of respondents felt that there were residents who were resentful. Although respondents might know someone who was resentful about the impacts of the Olympic Games through personal contact or through media coverage, there is also a possibility that under the strict control of expressing opinions in public in China, respondents may feel it safer and easier to express their opinions by referring to them as other people’s experience. Many respondents’ avoidance of giving opinions on the negative Olympic Games impacts also shows in the statistics; as when asking about respondents’ opinions on the negative socio-cultural impacts (see Table 11) and the negative environmental impacts (see Table 12), the number of respondents who held “neutral” opinions increased a lot, reflecting the responses of 30 to 40 per cent of total respondents.

**Environmental Impacts**

In terms of the environmental impacts (see Table 12), more than 70 percent of respondents agreed that the Olympic Games had helped to improve Beijing’s air quality (70.7 per cent agreed and 11 per cent disagreed), to promote environmental conservation (73 per cent agreed and 4.7 per cent disagreed), and to improve the cleanliness of Beijing (74.4 per cent agreed and 6 per cent disagreed). It shows that, in general, respondents believed the Olympic Games had brought positive environmental impacts to the hosting community. When asked about the negative environmental impacts, respondents tended to disagree that the Olympic Games had caused the deterioration of Beijing’s natural areas (23.3 per cent agreed and 42.7 per cent disagreed), but there was a split response on whether the Olympic Games had caused more littering in Beijing (34 per cent agreed and 31.4 per cent disagreed).
Table 12: Respondents’ Perceptions of Environmental Olympic Games’ Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beijing Community</th>
<th>Beijing Residents (N=300)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental Aspects</strong></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Positive Impacts</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosting the Olympic Games has improved Beijing’s air quality</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosting the Olympic Games has promoted environmental conservation</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Olympics has improved the cleanliness of Beijing</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative Impacts</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is more littering in Beijing because of the Olympics</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympics-induced tourism deteriorated the natural areas of Beijing</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents reported that improvement in environment and the air quality were two of the major personal benefits they gained from the Games. Respondents indicated that Beijing was greener and cleaner; the air was fresh and the sky was blue. They indicated that they had paid more attention to environmental conservation. However, there were also a few respondents who complained that Beijing’s air quality was back to normal post-Games by the time this survey was conducted (three months after the Games). This suggests that the Olympic Games may have only had short-term positive environmental impacts on Beijing’s air quality, as polluting factories were back to operation post-Games, although the adjusted traffic-limit policy had been implemented permanently.

In terms of negative environmental impacts of the Games, some respondents asserted that the Games had made Beijing more dirty and messy. They mentioned that the rubbish volume increased a lot and could not be cleaned on time. A few respondents claimed that the crowds had caused deterioration in Beijing’s environment. Moreover, there were also some respondents living close to an Olympic venue who said that the Olympics produced too much noise, which had disturbed their life. However, some other respondents claimed that those
environmental costs did not occur. A young female job seeker said that “I thought the Games would bring pollution to Beijing, but the air quality and environment were still good during the Games”. Another middle-aged female automobile quality controller said that “I thought it would be hard to maintain a good environment when many people crowded into Beijing, but we have achieved it”.

Conclusion on Impacts

To sum up, respondents of this study tended to perceive that the Olympic Games had created many economic benefits to Beijing, but not to themselves. They also tended to agree that the Games had brought some economic costs, such as a rise in property price, cost of living, and government’s financial burden due to huge investment in the Games. The findings suggested that respondents perceived strong socio-cultural impacts caused by the Olympic Games. Respondents recognised significant socio-cultural benefits as well as significant socio-cultural costs, such as pressure on resources and infrastructure and overcrowding. However, some potential socio-cultural costs identified in previous studies, such as a rise in crime rate and a rise in conflicts between residents or residents and visitors, were not revealed in this study. Finally, respondents’ perceptions towards Olympic Games’ environmental impacts tended to be positive. A lot of respondents agreed that Beijing’s air quality and environment had been improved because of the Games; although there were still some respondents who indicated that the Games had brought some pollution, in terms of rubbish and noise.

5.4 Analysis of Respondents’ perceived Olympic impacts Based on Their Personal Characters

The following sections will explore some significant findings (based on recoded data in SPSS) in more detail, focusing on the differences in perceptions amongst different demographic groups of residents.
5.4.1 Respondents Perceived Olympic Games’ impacts vs Respondents’ Gender and Age

Although gender is often a key factor in altering people’s viewpoints in many studies, this study found that there were no significant differences in perceptions based on the gender of the respondents. It is an interesting discovery since China has traditionally been viewed as a male-dominated society, where males and females could have different ways of thinking.

Another variable, respondents’ age, apparently showed significant differences in respondents’ opinions about some issues.

Age influenced respondents’ opinions on positive economic impacts. Older respondents tended to be more positive about receiving economic benefits from the Olympic Games. Table 13 shows that a larger proportion of respondents aged above 55 felt they or their family obtained the Games-induced positive economic impacts, such as economic benefits (31.3 per cent agreed and 25 per cent disagreed), job opportunities (45.8 per cent agreed and 22.9 per cent disagreed), and business opportunities (36.4 per cent agreed and 18.2 per cent disagreed) than younger respondents.

In addition, more people aged above 55 (80.4 per cent) agreed that they and Beijing had gained more job opportunities because of the Games (see Table 13).

**Table 13** Age vs Positive Economic Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive economic impacts</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Beijing Residents (N=300)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>P-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosting the Olympic Games has brought economic benefits to me and/or my family</td>
<td>18-35</td>
<td>59.7%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36-55</td>
<td>55.7%</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56+</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosting the Olympic Games has created more job opportunities for me personally</td>
<td>18-35</td>
<td>54.7%</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36-55</td>
<td>54.3%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56+</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosting the Olympic Games has created more job opportunities in Beijing</td>
<td>18-35</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>49.2%</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36-55</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56+</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>80.4%</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosting the Olympic Games has created more business opportunities for me personally</td>
<td>18-35</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36-55</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56+</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Age changes respondents’ attitude towards some positive socio-cultural Olympic impacts as well. Younger respondents (below 35 years of age) tended to have less positive attitudes towards perceived positive Games-induced socio-cultural impacts than older respondents (over 55 years of age). Table 14 shows that fewer younger respondents agreed (50.8 per cent agreed) that the Games have improved the quality of Beijing residents’ life, while senior respondents were more supportive on the statement (72.9 per cent agreed). There were also more senior respondents (85.4 per cent) who agreed that the Games have encouraged preservation of local culture and tradition.

**Table 14 Age vs Positive Socio-cultural Impacts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive socio-cultural impacts</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Beijing Residents (N=300)</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Olympics has improved the quality of Beijing residents’ life</td>
<td>18-35</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36+</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosting the Olympics encouraged preservation of local culture and tradition</td>
<td>18-55</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56+</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of positive environmental impacts of the Games, younger respondents again showed less positive attitudes towards these impacts. About 65 per cent of younger respondents agreed that the Games had improved Beijing’s air quality and had promoted environmental conservation; while more than 80 per cent of other older respondents agreed with these statements (see Table 15).

**Table 15 Age vs Positive Environmental Impacts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive Environmental impacts</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Beijing Residents (N=300)</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosting the Olympics has improved Beijing’s air quality</td>
<td>18-35</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36+</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosting the Olympics has promoted environmental conservation</td>
<td>18-35</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36-55</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56+</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.4.2 Respondents Perceived Olympic Games’ impacts vs Respondents’ Education Level

The results of this study showed that there were some significant differences when respondents’ highest education level is taken into account. It is not surprising since our respondents’ education level was highly correlated to respondents’ age (young respondents tended to have higher education level and senior/middle-aged respondents tended to have lower education level because of their experience of wars and the Cultural Revolution).

Respondents with a higher education level were less positive about the economic benefits of the Games than respondents with a lower education level (see Table 16). More highly educated respondents tended to disagree that the Games had brought economic benefits to them or their families, had created more job opportunities for them and for Beijing in general, or had created more business opportunities for them. It is an interesting finding that less educated respondents felt they had benefited economically more from the Olympic Games than the more educated respondents.

Table 16 Education Level vs Positive Economic Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive economic impacts</th>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>Beijing Residents (N=300)</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosting the Olympic Games has brought economic benefits to me and/or my family</td>
<td>Lower level</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Higher level</td>
<td>59.4%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosting the Olympic Games has created more job opportunities for me personally</td>
<td>Lower level</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Higher level</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosting the Olympic Games has created more job opportunities in Beijing</td>
<td>Lower level</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Higher level</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosting the Olympic Games has created more business opportunities for me personally</td>
<td>Lower level</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Higher level</td>
<td>49.8%</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17 shows that fewer respondents with a higher educational level agreed that the Olympic Games had facilitated modernization of Beijing (66.2 per cent). In addition, more respondents with a lower educational level (85.7 per cent) agreed that the Olympic Games had encouraged preservation of local culture and tradition.
Table 17 Education Level vs Positive Socio-cultural Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive Socio-cultural impacts</th>
<th>Educational Level</th>
<th>Beijing Residents (N=300)</th>
<th>Total n</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympics-induced tourism facilitated modernization of Beijing</td>
<td>Lower level</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>80.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Higher level</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>66.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosting the Olympics encouraged preservation of local culture and tradition</td>
<td>Lower level</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Higher level</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>63.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18 shows that there were more higher-educated respondents (49.8%) who had recognised that the Games had caused resentment for some groups of residents than lower-educated respondents (33.8%).

Table 18 Education Level vs Negative Socio-cultural Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negative Socio-cultural impacts</th>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>Beijing Residents (N=300)</th>
<th>Total n</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosting the Olympics has caused resentment for some groups of residents</td>
<td>Lower level</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Higher level</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
<td>49.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents with lower education level tended to perceive more positive environmental impacts created by the Olympics. They were more likely to agree that hosting the Games had improved Beijing’s air quality, had promoted environmental conservation, and had promoted the cleanliness of Beijing (see Table 19).

Table 19 Education Level vs Positive Environmental Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive Environmental impacts</th>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>Beijing Residents (N=300)</th>
<th>Total n</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosting the Olympics has improved Beijing’s air quality</td>
<td>Lower level</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>80.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Higher level</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>68.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosting the Olympics has promoted environmental conservation</td>
<td>Lower level</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Higher level</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>68.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Olympics has improved the cleanliness of Beijing</td>
<td>Lower level</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>86.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Higher level</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>71.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.4.3 Respondents Perceived Olympic Games’ impacts vs Respondents’ Occupation

In terms of occupation, although this research has found that respondents working in a tourism-related industry tended to hold very positive attitudes towards Olympics impacts, due to the small sample size of respondents working in a tourism-related industry (n=16), these differences are not included here.

Table 20 shows that respondents who were retirees or were recognised as “others” (including job-seekers and freelance workers), perceived greater positive economic impacts of the Olympic Games. These people were more likely to get a job or work as a volunteer, during the Games (40 to 50 per cent of them agreed that the Games had created more job opportunities for them). As discussed previously, more than half of senior respondents, who tended to be retired, were recruited as volunteers during the Games. Because volunteers could still receive a little pay to compensate for their transportation cost and meal cost, they were more likely to perceive more economical benefits brought by the Olympic Games.

Table 20 Respondents’ Non-Tourism Occupation vs Positive Economic Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive Economic Impacts</th>
<th>Non-Tourism Occupation</th>
<th>Beijing Residents (N=300)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>P-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hosting the Olympic Games has brought economic benefits to me and/or my family</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>60.8%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>61.2%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Salesperson/Clerk</td>
<td>63.9%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retiree</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosting the Olympic Games has created more job opportunities for me personally</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>56.7%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Salesperson/Clerk</td>
<td>63.9%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retiree</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosting the Olympic Games has created more job opportunities in Beijing</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>61.2%</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>64.6%</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Salesperson/Clerk</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>47.2%</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retiree</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>76.1%</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosting the Olympic Games has created more business opportunities for me personally</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>62.7%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Salesperson/Clerk</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retiree</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The previous section suggests that more respondents with higher educational level agreed that the Olympic Games had caused resentment for some groups of residents. When analysing the same statement according to respondents’ occupation (see Table 21), the result indicates that respondents who were a professional or a salesperson/clerk tended to agree with this statement. Respondents who were a student (students tended to have higher educational level), however, did not show particular support for this statement.

Table 21 also shows that students tended to disagree that the traffic-limit policy had caused inconvenience to them. One possible explanation is that students tended to use public transportation or use a bicycle as their commuting method. Thus, they were less affected by this policy.

Table 21 Respondents’ Non-Tourism Occupation vs Negative Socio-cultural Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negative Socio-Cultural impacts</th>
<th>Non-Tourism Occupation</th>
<th>Beijing Residents (N=300)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hosting the Olympics has caused resentment for some groups of residents</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>29.4% 37.3% 33.3% 51</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>19.4% 23.9% 56.7% 67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Salesperson/Clerk</td>
<td>15.3% 25% 59.7% 72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retiree</td>
<td>23.4% 40.4% 36.2% 47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7.1% 57.1% 35.7% 14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The traffic-limit policy caused inconvenience to me personally</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>52% 22% 26% 50</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>34.3% 31.3% 34.3% 67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Salesperson/Clerk</td>
<td>20.8% 20.8% 58.3% 72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retiree</td>
<td>23.9% 32.6% 43.5% 46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>28.6% 28.6% 42.9% 14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.4.4 Respondents Perceived Olympic Games’ impacts vs Respondents’ Involvement in the Olympic Games

Whether respondents were personally involved in the Olympic Games only caused significant differences in respondents’ opinions on a few issues. Whether the respondents were involved in the Games did not show significant differences between their perceptions towards the economic impacts of the Olympic Games. It is an interesting finding since respondents involved in the Olympic Games could have a clearer picture of the direct economic benefits the Games could generate by counting the number of the spectators of the Games or looking
at the length of the queue for buying food or souvenirs on sites in person. Although senior respondents account for nearly half of the volunteers in this study, volunteers only occupies one-third of respondents involved in the Olympic Games (54 out of 155). Thus, senior respondents’ general positive perceptions of the economic impacts of the Olympic Games only had a limited effect on the general perceptions of respondents involved in the Games towards the same impacts.

Whether respondents were personally involved in the Olympic Games did not make many differences in their perceptions of positive socio-cultural impacts. There was only an exception that respondents who were personally involved in the Games were more likely to agree that the Games had improved the quality of Beijing residents’ life (see Table 22).

### Table 22 Involvement in the Olympic Games vs Positive Socio-cultural Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive socio-cultural impacts</th>
<th>Involvement in the Games</th>
<th>Beijing Residents (N=300)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Olympics has improved the quality of Beijing residents’ life</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents who were personally involved in the Olympic Games tended to perceive more negative socio-cultural impacts caused by the Games. They were more likely to agree that the traffic-limit policy has caused inconvenience to them and to all residents (see Table 23). Perhaps this is due to the fact that people involved in the Olympic Games were more likely to travel around Beijing during the Olympics. Thus, they might easily be affected by the traffic-limit policy. In addition, Table 26 also shows that fewer respondents involved in the Olympic Games disagreed (41.3 per cent) and more respondents involved in the Olympic Games agreed (16.1 per cent) that the Olympic Games had increased the crime rate in Beijing. This may due to the possibility that respondents involved in the Games could more easily find some petty crimes, such as scalpers and unethical merchants selling fake Olympic souvenirs, on the sites of the Olympic Games.
Table 23 Involvement in the Olympic Games vs Negative Socio-Cultural Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negative Socio-Cultural Impacts</th>
<th>Involvement in the Games</th>
<th>Beijing Residents (N=300)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>P-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Total n</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The traffic-limit policy caused inconvenience to me personally</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>140</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The traffic-limit policy caused inconvenience to all residents in general</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>0.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>139</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympics-induced tourism increased the crime rate in Beijing</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>41.3%</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>0.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>142</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents involved in the Olympic Games also saw more negative environmental impacts caused by the Olympic Games. Table 24 shows that respondents involved in the Games tended to agree that there was more littering in Beijing because of the Olympics.

Table 24 Involvement in the Olympic Games vs Negative Environmental Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negative Environmental Impacts</th>
<th>Involvement in the Games</th>
<th>Beijing Residents (N=300)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>P-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Total n</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is more littering in Beijing because of the Olympics</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>0.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>141</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.4.5 Respondents Perceived Olympic Games’ impacts vs Respondents’ Birthplace and Length of Residence (Community Attachment)

The results of this study found that community attachment, based on respondents’ length of residence in Beijing, seemed to result in some significant differences in respondents’ opinions. Respondents’ birthplace, however, did not make many differences. The only difference is that more respondents born in Beijing had perceived better air quality in Beijing because of the Olympic Games (See Table 25).
Table 25 Born in Beijing vs Positive Environmental Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive Environmental impacts</th>
<th>Born in Beijing</th>
<th>Beijing Residents (N=300)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Total n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosting the Olympics has improved Beijing’s air quality</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>67.4%</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of respondents’ length of residence in Beijing, the result shows that respondents who had short residence (within five years) in Beijing tended to have different perceptions of the impacts of the Olympic Games than other respondents (there was not much difference between perceptions of respondents who had been living in Beijing for six to twenty-five years and respondents who had been living in Beijing for more than twenty-six years).

Table 26 shows that there were less respondents living in Beijing for less than five years who agreed that they had personally received economic benefits (4.7 per cent agreed and 62.4 per cent disagreed) or more business opportunities (13.3 per cent agreed and 56.6 per cent disagreed) than respondents with a longer residence in Beijing.

Table 26 Length of residence in Beijing vs Positive Economic Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive Economic impacts</th>
<th>Length of residence</th>
<th>Beijing Residents (N=300)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Total n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosting the Olympic Games has brought economic benefits to me and/or my family</td>
<td>Within 5yrs</td>
<td>62.4%</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Above 6yrs</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosting the Olympic Games has created more business opportunities for me</td>
<td>Within 5yrs</td>
<td>56.6%</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Above 6yrs</td>
<td>40.2%</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

New residents of Beijing tended to have a less positive perception of the socio-cultural benefits brought by the Olympics. Fewer respondents living in Beijing for less than 5 years agreed (and more of them disagreed) that the Games had improved Beijing’s infrastructure, had improved the quality of local residents’ life, had facilitated modernisation of Beijing, and had promoted cultural exchange between residents and visitors (see Table 27).
Table 27 Length of residence in Beijing vs Positive Socio-cultural Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive socio-cultural impacts</th>
<th>Length of residence</th>
<th>Beijing Residents (N=300)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>P-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Total n</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beijing’s infrastructure has improved as a result of the Olympic Games</td>
<td>Within 5yrs</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>73.5%</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>0.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Above 6yrs</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>87.3%</td>
<td>213</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Olympics has improved the quality of Beijing residents’ life</td>
<td>Within 5yrs</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>0.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Above 6yrs</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>64.5%</td>
<td>211</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympics-induced tourism facilitated modernization of Beijing</td>
<td>Within 5yrs</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Above 6yrs</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>73.6%</td>
<td>212</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Olympics has promoted cultural exchange between residents and visitors</td>
<td>Within 5yrs</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>65.9%</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Above 6yrs</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>212</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 28 shows that respondents with a short residence in Beijing tended to regard the traffic-limit policy having fewer impacts on them. It is interesting since respondents with a short residence in Beijing tended to be less positive about the impacts of the Olympic Games. A possible explanation is that these respondents might not own a private car in such a short residence in Beijing. Thus, they were less affective by the traffic-limit policy.

Table 28 Length of residence in Beijing vs Negative Socio-Cultural Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negative Environmental impacts</th>
<th>Length of residence</th>
<th>Beijing Residents (N=300)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>P-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Total n</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The traffic-limit policy caused inconvenience to me personally</td>
<td>Within 5yrs</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Above 6yrs</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
<td>211</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

New residents were less optimistic about the improvement in Beijing’s air quality. Table 29 shows that only slightly more than half of the respondents living in Beijing for 5 years or less agreed that the Games had improved Beijing’s air quality, while approximate 80 per cent of respondents who had longer residence in Beijing agreed with this statement.
Table 29 Length of residence in Beijing vs Positive Environmental Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive Environmental impacts</th>
<th>Length of residence</th>
<th>Beijing Residents (N=300)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>P-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hosting the Olympics has improved Beijing’s air quality</td>
<td>Within 5yrs</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>55.4%</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Above 6yrs</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>78.7%</td>
<td>211</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.4.6 Respondents Perceived Olympic Games’ impacts vs Respondents’ Home Distance to the Birds Nest Stadium (Proximity)

This study (see Table 30) found that respondents living closer to the Birds Nest Stadium perceived stronger positive economic impacts of the Olympic Games. Respondents living within 5 kilometres from the Birds Nest Stadium perceived more personal economic benefits, personal job opportunities, personal business opportunities, and more job opportunities in Beijing brought by the Olympic Games. Whereas, respondents living far away from the Stadium (above 16 kilometres) perceived fewer personal economic benefits, fewer personal job opportunities and fewer personal business opportunities created by the Olympic Games.

Table 30 Distance between respondents’ home and the Birds Nest Stadium vs Positive Economic Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive economic impacts</th>
<th>Home distance to the Birds Nest Stadium</th>
<th>Beijing Residents (N=300)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>P-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hosting the Olympic Games has brought economic benefits to me and/or my family</td>
<td>Within 5 km</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6-15 km</td>
<td>44.8%</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>116</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Above 16 km</td>
<td>62.2%</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>148</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosting the Olympic Games has created more job opportunities for me personally</td>
<td>Within 5 km</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6-15 km</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>116</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Above 16 km</td>
<td>56.1%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>148</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosting the Olympic Games has created more job opportunities in Beijing</td>
<td>Within 5 km</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>74.2%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6-15 km</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Above 16 km</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
<td>144</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosting the Olympic Games has created more business opportunities for me personally</td>
<td>Within 5 km</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6-15 km</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Above 16 km</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>145</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Respondents who lived closest to the Birds Nest Stadium (within 5 kilometres) were most likely to agree that the Olympic Games had raised the cost of living in Beijing (see Table 31). This suggests that residents who lived close to a major tourist gathering spot, such as the Birds Nest Stadium, might have experienced a more obvious rise in prices during the Games. In addition, Table 33 showed that fewer respondents living within 5 kilometres from the Birds Nest Stadium agreed that the government had invested too much in constructing facilities for the Games.

**Table 31** Distance between respondents’ home and the Birds Nest Stadium vs Negative Economic Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negative economic impacts</th>
<th>Home distance to the Birds Nest Stadium</th>
<th>Beijing Residents (N=300)</th>
<th>Total n</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympics-induced tourism raised the cost of living in Beijing</td>
<td>Within 5 km</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>64.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6-15 km</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
<td>53.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Above 16 km</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The government has invested too much capital in constructing facilities for the Olympic Games</td>
<td>Within 5 km</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6-15 km</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Above 16 km</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>54.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents’ proximity to the Birds Nest Stadium did not make a significant difference to their perceptions of the socio-cultural and environmental impacts of the Olympic Games. It is quite interesting since that there were some respondents living close to the Stadium who had indicated on the open-ended questions that they had suffered from the problems of overcrowding, traffic jams, and pollution, such as littering and noise.

**5.5 Residents’ support/opposition for further tourism development**

In order to understand Beijing residents’ level of support for further tourism development post-Games, respondents were asked to rate their opinions on a statement of “there should be more tourism development in Beijing”. The result showed that Beijing residents were generally supportive for further tourism development (mean=3.9). Only 8.7 per cent of residents opposed further tourism development whereas 67.6 per cent agreed that there should be more (see Figure 9).
Figure 9 Respondents’ support for more tourism development in Beijing.

The results (see Table 32) show that respondents who perceived more positive economic, socio-cultural, or environmental benefits obtained from the Olympic Games were more supportive of further tourism development in Beijing. Whereas respondents who disagreed that the Olympic Games had brought those economic, socio-cultural, or environmental benefits tended to be less supportive of, and showed stronger opposition to, future tourism development in Beijing.

Table 32 There should be more tourism development in Beijing vs Olympic Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Olympic Games’ impacts</th>
<th>More tourism development in Beijing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Impacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosting the Olympic Games has brought economic benefits to Beijing</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosting the Olympic Games has brought economic benefits to me and/or my family</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosting the Olympic Games has created more job opportunities for me personally</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-Cultural Impacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beijing’s infrastructure has improved as a result of the Olympic Games</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There are more public facilities available as a result of the Olympics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>273</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Olympics has improved the quality of Beijing residents' life

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>60.8%</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>76.7%</td>
<td>176</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Olympics-induced tourism facilitated modernization of Beijing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td>205</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hosting the Olympics encouraged preservation of local culture and tradition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>71.7%</td>
<td>205</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Environmental Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>70.9%</td>
<td>223</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of analysing respondents’ support/opposition for further tourism development according to their personal attributes, the results (see Table 33) show that senior respondents were more likely to support further tourism development (approximate 90 per cent), while only 60 per cent of young respondents wanted more tourism development. Similarly, more respondents living in Beijing for more than 26 years agreed that there should be more tourism development, when comparing with other groups of respondents (see Table 33). The finding also reflected the previous conclusion that respondents who perceived more positive Olympic impacts, such as senior respondents and respondents with longer residence in Beijing would be more supportive for further tourism development in Beijing.

Table 33: The Olympics has improved the cleanliness of Beijing vs Age group and Length of residence in Beijing
5.6 Chapter Summary

In general, respondents’ attitudes towards the impacts of the Beijing Olympic Games tended to be positive overall. In terms of economic impacts, respondents tended to perceive the Olympic Games to have created more economic benefits to the host city rather than to themselves. The respondents also indicated that they received some Olympic-related economic costs as they experienced a rise in prices and cost of living. The socio-cultural impacts of the Olympic Games influenced respondents strongly. The analysis shows that respondents have given very high scores to statements related to positive social-cultural Olympic impacts. They were especially pleased with the improved infrastructure and public facilities. The Olympic Games also evoked their patriotism and their interests in doing sports and regular exercise. Respondents indicated the Olympic Games had also caused some significant social-cultural costs to the host community as well, such as overcrowding, pressures on resource and infrastructure, and resentment among some groups of residents. However, some of the common social-cultural costs caused by mega events, such as a rise in the crime rate and conflicts between individuals, were not experienced by most of the respondents. Respondents tended to agree that the Olympic Games had brought positive environmental impacts to them, such as the improved air quality, clearness of Beijing, and a rise in awareness of environmental conservation. However, they had divergent opinions on the environmental problem of littering.

After grouping respondents’ perceived impacts according to respondents’ personal characteristics, it is found that age played an important role in determining respondents’ perceptions of the Olympic impacts. On average, senior respondents tended to have more positive attitudes to the Olympic impacts than young respondents, with an exception that more senior respondents thought the Olympics had caused deterioration to the natural areas of Beijing. Respondents’ educational level resulted also in some differences in their perceptions. However, respondents’ gender did not have a significant effect on their responses. Other variables, such as distance between respondents’ home and the Birds Nest Stadium, respondents’ length of residence in Beijing, and respondents’ involvement in the Games caused some different opinions of respondents on some issues.

Respondents of this study generally showed support for further tourism development in Beijing, with older people being much more supportive than younger respondents. Those who perceived more positive impacts of the Olympic Games were more supportive of further
tourism development too. The next chapter will discuss these findings in light of previous studies and in light of the theories discussed in Chapter Two.
Chapter Six: DISCUSSION

6.1 Introduction

The previous chapter has outlined 300 Beijing residents’ perceptions of the impacts experienced by them and the host city generated by the 2008 Olympic Games. This chapter will discuss the possible factors contributing to residents’ perceptions of the Games. It will also investigate whether these impacts are consistent with the impacts stated in previous studies, particularly with the similar research conducted by Zhou and Ap (2009). This will be followed by an examination of the relationship between residents’ attitude towards tourism development and their perceptions of those Olympic impacts to see whether it is consistent with the social exchange theory. Finally, this chapter will discuss the relationship between the different characteristics of survey respondents and their attitudes towards the impacts of the Olympic Games.

6.2 Comparison between Findings in this Study and in Previous Studies

This research has shown that the 300 respondents of this study perceived that the 2008 Olympic Games had brought many positive and negative economic, socio-cultural, and environmental impacts to Beijing and to their lives. This is consistent with previous studies of the impacts of mega events, particularly the Olympic Games (Kaplanidou, 2012; Simonetta & Mihalik, 1999; Toohey & Veal, 2007; Weed, 2008a; Weed, 2008b; Kim & Petrick, 2005; Gursoy et al, 2011; Morgan & Condliffe, 2006; Fredline, 2008; Gursoy and Kendall, 2006; Singh and Hu, 2008; Waitt, 2004; Zhang & Zhao, 2009; Song, 2010; Kim et al, 2006; Hotchkiss et al, 2003; Shipway, 2007; Zhou and Ap, 2009; Kang, 2003; Jones, 2001; Orams, 2005; Tian & Brimblecombe, 2008).

Among those previous studies, Zhou and Ap (2009) conducted similar research on Beijing residents’ perceptions of the 2008 Olympic Games in 2006, two years before the Games took place. Thus, comparison between the current study and Zhou and Ap’s (2009) findings is presented in the following sections to show the differences between Beijing residents’ perceptions of the Games prior to, and after, the event.
6.2.1 Economic Impacts Brought by the Olympic Games

Zhou and Ap’s (2009) study found that Beijing residents held extremely positive perceptions towards the impacts of the Olympic Games prior to the event. In terms of the economic impacts, more than 90 per cent of respondents in Zhou and Ap’s study agreed that the Olympic Games would bring more business opportunities and employment opportunities. However, in the current study it is evident that after the Games had taken place, respondents showed less optimistic attitudes towards the positive economic impacts of the Games. Although there were still a lot of respondents who agreed that the Games had created more business opportunities (70 per cent agreed), more job opportunities (55 per cent agreed), and more economic benefits (69.3 per cent agreed) in Beijing, the percentages had dropped significantly (especially employment opportunities) compared to Zhou and Ap’s study. In addition, only about 20 per cent of respondents in this study reported receiving those economic benefits personally. This finding suggests that there is a gap between what local residents expected the Games to bring to their community and city, and what they perceived they had received from the Games in terms of economic benefits.

Why were Beijing residents still confident that their city would receive economic benefits by hosting the Games when they personally did not receive those benefits? Possible explanations could be that the respondents knew other people who had been benefited from the Olympic Games economically, or they might perceive a positive multiplier effect brought by the Olympic Games. In other words, they might perceive that Beijing could get long-term Olympics-induced economic impacts, which outweighed the limited direct economic benefits some respondents received during the Games period. However, there is also possibility that respondents have over-anticipated the positive economic impacts the Games could bring to the city/country. Their positive perceptions of the economic benefits for Beijing could be influenced also by the very positive propaganda and publications from the local government and the local media, which is one of the major sources of social representations (Fredline and Faulkner, 2000). As suggested by Gratton, Shibli and Coleman (2005), the official organisers of an event often overemphasize the economic benefits brought by an event to gain support for investment in the event. It is noted that the Chinese government, who was the major organiser of the Olympic Games, had been very positive about the economic benefits Beijing would get from hosting the Olympic Games (see Chapter Four). Under the powerful centralised political system in China, the power structure would make the government’s
position (such as emphasizing the economic benefits generated by the event) the guideline for its residents. Alternatively, respondents may have been influenced by the Chinese cultural tendency to provide an answer reflecting what the respondent thinks most people will think, and the national ideology of providing positive answers to show their patriotism and to maintain a positive image of their country mentioned by Zhou and Ap (2009). In this way, the respondents may have been complying with the government’s positions by providing positive responses on the Olympic economic impacts on Beijing, influenced by the Chinese cultural tendency and national ideology.

In terms of negative economic impacts, Zhou and Ap’s (2009) study revealed that “Higher Price Levels in Beijing” was a stronger perceived impact to the local residents compared to other perceived negative impacts of the Olympic Games. In the aftermath of the Olympic Games, the current study showed also that rising prices, especially rising property prices, were still the top concern of overall negative impacts of the Olympic Games by survey respondents. This could be explained by the relatively lower income level of residents in China that they would be more sensitive to the rise of prices and costs resulted from the suddenly increased demands of the influx of event visitors.

As previously stated, the Beijing Olympic Games were the most expensive Olympic Games in history, and some foreign media were critical of government expenditure in preparing for the Games (see Chapter Three). Similarly, 54.3 per cent of respondents agreed that there were too much capital invested for the Games. However, additional tax, as indicated in previous academic research (Kim et al, 2006; Gibson, Willming & Holdnak, 2003), was not added on Beijing residents to make up government’s huge spending. As scholars have indicated (for example, Porter & Fletcher, 2008; Gibson et al, 2003), many host communities are left with debts after the end of the Olympic Games. In this context it will be interesting to monitor whether the on-going return of the Beijing Olympic Games could offset or outbalance the investment of the Games. Furthermore, although the Beijing Olympic Games have been criticised as the most expensive Olympic Games in history, the spending has resulted in better infrastructure (82.7 per cent agreed) and facilities (91.3 per cent agreed), which was highly appreciated by the respondents of this study. They were happy the improved infrastructure had sped up and eased travel concerns such as traffic congestion. When evaluating the value of government’s spending on an event, researchers, such as Weed (2008a and 2008b), Preuss (2008), Kim et al (2006), Gratton et al (2005), Kasimati (2008),
and Jones (2001) tended to evaluate monetary returns of the event only, such as number of jobs created, tourists numbers, tourist spending, and foreign exchange earnings. Other non-monetary returns of government’s spending on the event, such as convenience created for residents through improved infrastructure and transportation and improved residents’ living quality through improved facilities, were often excluded from evaluating the returns of the investment on an event. Chen (2011) argues that the main purpose behind an event designed by local government is not economic benefits, but the intangible impacts, such as social and cultural consequences, which are more important to the local residents. Other researchers have found that residents of mega-event host communities view the positive social impacts of the events as more important than positive economic impacts of the events (Kim et al, 2006 & Simonetta & Mihalik, 1999). This study showed also that respondents were more positive about the Olympic socio-cultural impacts than the Olympic economic impacts. Many of those respondents’ appraised socio-cultural benefits were the outcomes of government’s investment. Thus, whether an investment is worthwhile should not be simply decided by the amount of economic returns and jobs it generates, but should also look at the other non-monetary benefits it could create as well.

6.2.2 Residents Perceived Socio-Cultural Impacts Brought by the Olympic Games

Similar to Zhou and Ap’s (2009) findings, the majority of respondents in this study (range from about 60 per cent to 90 per cent) agreed that the Olympic Games had contributed to better infrastructure, more public facilities, better quality of residents’ life, modernisation of Beijing, and cultural exchange between residents and visitors. There were many respondents in the open ended questions who indicated that the Games had enhanced Beijing’s international identity, had shown Beijing’s ability and competitiveness, had enhanced local residents’ pride and patriotism, had promoted tourism in Beijing, had provided a chance for local residents to be a spectator of the Olympic Games, and had brought the community closer. This study also found some Olympic Games-induced socio-cultural benefits which were not identified in Zhou and Ap’s (2009) study, such as more civilized behaviour among the local residents, better security in Beijing, preservation of local culture and tradition, and interest in sport and doing regular exercises among residents.
An interesting finding of this study is that many respondents indicated that they had started to do regular exercise because of the Games. Previous studies have found that there is a positive relationship between promotion of sports and fitness and hosting the Olympic Games (Shipway, 2007; Jones, 2001; London Health Commission and the London Development Agency, 2004 & Poynter, 2006). Echoing the London Health Commission and the London Development Agency’s (2004) statement, more sports and recreation facilities in Beijing and more free parks and green lands accessible for residents provided more places for local residents to do physical activities. The patriotism and the Chinese ideology also made the Chinese people give high attention on this mega event. They learned about sports and the benefits they could get from doing sports from participating or watching the Olympic Games. These incentives, maybe together with family members’, friends’, or community leaders’ invitation, had pushed many local residents starting to do regular exercise or fitness training to keep fit and healthy.

In terms of negative socio-cultural impacts of the Olympic Games, both respondents in Zhou and Ap’s (2009) study and in this study tended to hold neutral attitudes to or to disagree with these costs. Overcrowding is one of the problems both anticipated (57.8 per cent in Zhou and Ap’s study agreed) and experienced due to the Olympic Games (53.3 per cent in this study agreed). In Zhou and Ap’s (2009) study, 51.2 per cent of respondents agreed the Olympic Games would cause traffic congestion. However, in this study, there were many respondents that felt traffic congestion had been relieved because of the implementation of the traffic-limit policy, although this policy had brought inconvenience also to 39.6 per cent of respondents.

Both respondents in Zhou and Ap’s (2009) study (22.2 per cent agreed) and this study (14 per cent agreed) tended to disagree with the statement about a rise in the crime rate in China during the Olympic Games period events. This contradicts previous findings that crimes are often associated with mega events (Fields, 2010; Kim, Gursoy & Lee, 2006; Barker, Page & Meyer, 2002; Taylor, Wamser, Sanchez & Arellano, 2010; Crabbe, 2000; Toohey & Taylor, 2008; Ntloko & Swart, 2008; Jones, 2001; Jamieson & Orr, 2009; Jackson, 2008; Appelbaum, Adeland & Harris, 2005). As suggested by Andresen and Tong (2012), the substantial increase in security personnel deployed during the Beijing Olympic Games (see Chapter Three), together with the threat of the Chinese strict legal and punishment system, could effectively mitigate the potential increase in crime in the local community.
As stated in Chapter Three, there has been considerable foreign criticism over the destruction of old buildings, and the forced removal of some local residents, to make way for the new-look of Beijing for the Olympic Games. However, those interviewed in this survey who had been forced to move to another place indicated that they were pleased about the movement and their compensation. Their responses showed that as long as the government’s compensation is satisfactory, they were pleased to move to another place with better living conditions. However, this study also showed that there were 46.3 per cent of respondents who agreed that the Olympic Games had caused resentment for some groups of residents. Thus, these findings must be taken with caution, due to the small survey size and the cultural tendency to avoid criticising the government.

6.2.3 Residents Perceived Environmental Impacts Brought by the Olympic Games

Zhou and Ap (2009) did not research the positive environmental impacts that could occur through hosting the Olympic Games. However, this study has suggested that the Olympic Games had brought many environmental benefits to Beijing residents since more than 70 per cent of respondents in this study agreed that the Games had improved Beijing’s air quality, had promoted environmental conservation, and had improved the cleanliness of Beijing.

Previous studies suggest that negative environmental impacts resulting from hosting mega-events, such as pollution and damage on the natural areas, are significant and inevitable (Fairley, Tyler, Kellett & D’Elia, 2011; Kim, Gursoy & Lee, 2006; Dickson & Arcodia, 2010; Mallen & Chard, 2011; Gursoy & Kendall, 2006; Collins, Jones & Munday, 2009; Jamieson & Orr, 2009; Ministry for the Environment, 2010; Ntloko & Swart, 2008; Jackson, 2008). However, this research found that respondents tended to hold neutral attitudes or disagreed that there had been negative environmental impacts of the Olympic Games on their community, such as “more littering in Beijing”, and “deteriorating the natural areas of Beijing”. This finding was consistent with Zhou and Ap’s (2009) findings.
6.3 Residents’ Perceptions of the Impacts of the Olympic Games and Their Support for Future Tourism Development

This research has found that the respondents in this study tended to hold positive attitudes regarding the impacts of the Games in general. As previously indicated, the Chinese cultural tendency, the Chinese ideology and the Communalism could contribute to the overall positive responses shown in this study. This overall positive perceptions of respondents towards the Olympic impacts fitted into Zhou and Ap’s (2009) “embracers - tolerators” typology of residents, since many of respondents in this study indicated that they could tolerate the temporary inconvenience for the success of the Olympic Games. Similar to Zhou and Ap’s (2009) findings, there were no obvious “haters” in this study. Chen (2011, p.126) suggests that “in a hierarchical society like China, residents tend not to disagree strongly with their government’s decisions. Instead, they will try to embrace, tolerate, or adapt to them using different methods”. It is noted that hosting the Olympic Games were planned and managed by the Chinese government. Residents were expected to support the Games. Thus, strongly negative attitudes among the residents towards the Games were rare. However, according to Chen (2011), residents might express their concern in a moderate manner, which has been shown in this research. For example, when asking about the negative impacts of the Olympic Games, the number of respondents holding “Neutral” opinions increased a great deal (about one-third of respondents rated “Neutral”). As was mentioned in Chapter Four, there was a respondent who indicated that talking about the negative impacts of the Olympic Games was too sensitive and should be avoided. Moreover, when asking whether the Olympic Games had caused resentment for some groups of residents, this study shows that nearly half of the respondents agreed with this statement. This implies that respondents might still have some opinions about some negative impacts of the Olympic Games, but they chose not to express them; as suggested in Chapter Five, indicating “other people’s” resentment towards the Olympic Games could be a way for respondents to indirectly express their own negative opinions. As suggested in Zhou and Ap’s (2009) research, those respondents in the current study who had more positive attitudes towards the impacts of the Olympic Games, could be classified as “embracers”. The respondents who had concerns about the negative impacts of the Olympic Games and had less favourable attitudes towards the Games impacts and future tourism development could be classified as “tolerators”.
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Ap’s (1992) social exchange theory suggests that local residents would be more supportive of tourism development and be tolerant to some inconvenience in exchange for tourism benefits that they perceived are greater than the costs they have to pay. Chen (2011) similarly argues that social exchange theory is a suitable theoretical framework to explain why and under what circumstances local residents would hold positive attitudes towards and support for tourism.

This research found that respondents held positive attitudes to the impacts of the Games in general. However, since the Olympic Games had finished and some negative impacts had shown at the time of interview, as discussed in the previous section, respondents of this study showed less positive attitudes towards the impacts of the Olympic Games than those respondents in Zhou and Ap’s (2009) research. Consequently, respondents of this study supported future tourism development in Beijing, but their support was not as strong as respondents in Zhou and Ap’s (2009) research. Although there were only 8.7 per cent of respondents in this study opposed to future tourism development in Beijing, about a quarter of respondents held a neutral opinion, and 67.4 per cent supported for future tourism, compared to 92.5 per cent in Zhou and Ap’s (2009) study supporting future mega events held in Beijing. This finding supports Gursoy, Chi, Ai & Chen’s (2011) and Simonetta & Mihalik’s (1999) assertion that local residents’ perceptions of the impacts could change from positive before the event to less positive (or negative) after the event was over, when costs have shown and residents realised the benefits generated were lower than they had anticipated. It also supports the social exchange theory that when local residents perceived fewer benefits and more costs derived from (mega event) tourism, they would be less supportive for future tourism development in the host community.

Generally speaking, social exchange theory has been verified in this study. With the general positive attitudes towards the Olympic impacts, respondents in this study showed their supportiveness of further tourism development in Beijing. This study also showed that respondents, who perceived the Olympic Games had brought positive economic impacts (such as economic benefits and job opportunities), positive socio-cultural impacts (such as better infrastructure, more public facilities, better life quality, modernisation of Beijing, and preservation of local culture and tradition), and positive environmental impacts (such as improving cleanliness of Beijing) to the host community, were more supportive of future tourism development in Beijing. However, there was no significant relationship between respondents’ attitude towards negative impacts of the Olympic Games and their
support/opposition for future tourism development. This may be caused by respondents’ moderate attitudes (about one-third of respondents held neutral opinions) and no strong reactions/perceptions towards the Games’ negative impacts.

In terms of respondents’ personal attributes, this study revealed that senior respondents or respondents with a long residence in Beijing, who tended to perceive more positive impacts of the Olympic Games and less negative impacts of the Games than other sub-groups of respondents, showed very strong support for further tourism development in Beijing.

6.4 Relationship between Respondents’ Characteristics and Their Perceptions of the Olympic Games’ Impacts

Dogan (1989) suggests that different attributes of residents could cause different perceptions of the tourism impacts. This could result in different reactions taken by different types of residents. Unlike Zhou and Ap’s (2009) research, which has found residents’ socio-demographic attributes had little or no effect on residents’ perceptions, this research showed that some of respondents’ personal attributes did make differences on respondents’ opinions on the Olympic impacts.

Age/Educational Level

Age is an important attribute that caused significantly different perceptions of respondents towards the Olympics impacts in this research. The results reveal that senior respondents (and respondents with lower educational levels) held more positive attitude towards the impacts of the Olympic Games than younger respondents (or respondents with higher educational level). Senior respondents tended to be “Embracers”, and younger respondents tended to be “Tolerators”. This is different from Dogan’s (1989) suggestion that young and educated people are motivated to admire tourists and the Western culture, thus, young residents are prone to embrace the changes caused by tourism (Dogan, 1989, p. 224). This discrepancy could be partly explained by the fact that Chinese residents are influenced by the traditional Chinese cultural tendency, the Chinese ideology and the government-centralised Communism, which has had a particular influence and impact on senior residents in China. This influence may have contributed to senior respondents’ positive responses on the Olympic impacts. By comparison, after the “open door” policy implemented in China since
1978, many Western values, such as individualism, self-expression and quality college education have been gradually embraced in Chinese society (Fang & Faure, 2011). In this way, the younger generation in China has grown up in a more open society with influence of Western culture. They are well-educated and are more adept in expressing their opinions, including opinions on the negative impacts of the Olympic Games. Education plays an important role in opinion expression; as Hall, Rodeghier & Useem (1986, p. 565) state: “education increases commitment to civil liberties such as freedom of expression”. Educated people can gain more knowledge on a particular issue through different sources such as reading and the mass media (Hall, Rodeghier & Useem, 1986). Therefore, they can produce their own ideas about the issue through extensive information collection and are more willing to express their ideas. Wang, Guo, and Shen’s (2011) study supports this argument.

As discussed in Chapter Two, media plays an important role in shaping perceptions. Wan, Guo and Shen (2011) researched the impact of differential media exposure on Beijing and Shanghai residents’ perceptions of the Beijing Olympic Games during the Games period. They found that higher-educated and young respondents tended to be heavily exposed to pluralistic media messages through Internet applications, such as popular online forums in China, personal blogs, search engine, and online social network; they tended to have diverse opinions towards the Olympic Games due to their ability to obtain heterogenetic opinions from the Internet. On the other hand, respondents who were heavily exposed to monopolistic media messages through the traditional media, such as television, newspaper and magazine, which are highly controlled by the Chinese government, tended to be older and tended to have homogeneous point of views. This could be a reason to explain why the young and higher educated respondents had more negative opinions on the impacts of the Olympic Games than the older and lower educated respondents in this study.

Another explanation is that older respondents may have in fact received more benefits of the Olympic Games than younger respondents. The data showed that nearly one-third of senior respondents aged above 55 confirmed that they or their family have obtained some economic benefits because of the Games, and 45.8 per cent of senior respondents indicated that the Games had brought more job opportunities for them personally. This could be the huge demand of volunteers for the Games and more than half of senior respondents in this research indicated that they had been recruited as volunteers, who were entitled to receive a little pay. Because more senior respondents had gained personal economic benefits from the Games,
according to the social exchange theory, they would hold more positive attitudes towards the Games’ impacts and future tourism development.

The result of this study showed that there were more senior residents aged above 56 (85.4 percent) agreed that the Olympic Games had promoted the preservation of the local culture and tradition. Cohen (2000) has indicated that elders are usually viewed as “keepers of the culture” (p. 12), who pass on wisdom, traditions, and historical values to the younger generation. They tend to be conservatives (Reader and Baker, 2009). Conservatives advocate preservation of traditions and values (Ethridge & Handelman, 2010), and do not like to change for change’s sake (Reader & Baker, 2009). This theory could support the finding and explain why there were more senior respondents agreed the statement of the Olympic Games have helped preserving local culture and tradition. In addition, those senior respondents of this study were born in the time when China still strongly had its own traditional culture and values. When they grew up, they have seen the change of the local culture by the influence of the invasion of foreign cultures. The Great Cultural Revolution from 1966 to 1976 had made them witness and experience a massive depredation of local culture, relics and traditions. Forced withdrawal from schooling also meant lost chances to study Chinese culture and literature. With this background, it could be this experience made them become more appreciative of preserving local culture and tradition.

**Involvement in the Olympic Games**

Whether respondents were involved in the Games did not seem to impact perceptions towards the economic impacts of the Olympic Games. However, this study reveals that respondents involved in the Olympic Games had perceived more negative socio-cultural and environmental impacts of the Olympic Games. This is similar to Wood (2005)’s research, who found that local attendees of the two events held in Blackburn reported some socio-cultural and environmental event impacts, such as littering and traffic congestion. Since respondents involved in the Olympic Games did not significantly oppose future tourism development in Beijing, it may be suggested that respondents involved in the Olympic Games had a tendency to be tolerators. They might choose to tolerate these negative socio-cultural and environmental impacts in exchange for other perceived benefits generated from hosting the Games.
Community Attachment

Community attachment, as indicated by many researchers (Andereck, et al, 2005; Gu & Ryan, 2008), did play a role in influencing Beijing residents’ attitudes towards the Games’ impacts, in terms of residents’ length of residency in Beijing. Gu and Ryan (2008) suggest that residents with longer residency are more able to produce a sense of place identity and are more attached to the place/community. Because of their close bonding to the place, they tend to be more sensitive or to have stronger feeling about any change of the place brought by tourism. A similar conclusion is drawn from this research, which found that respondents who had short residency in Beijing (within 5 years) tended to perceive fewer positive economic, socio-cultural and environmental benefits obtained from hosting the Olympic Games. Lack of attachment to the community due to their short residency may make them pay less attention to the impacts of the Olympic Games on the community. This group of respondents also showed lower level of support for future tourism development in Beijing. This fits into the pattern of social exchange theory, which suggests that residents’ level of support of the mega event depends on the rewards they perceived would be brought by the event.

Proximity

This research showed that geographical proximity to activity concentrations influenced respondents’ perceptions of economic Olympic Games impacts. Respondents living close to the Bird’s Nest Stadium (within 5 kilometres) tended to perceive stronger positive economic Olympic Games’ benefits compared to respondents living far away (above 16 kilometres) from the Stadium. Increased tourism in the Bird’s Nest Stadium could bring more economic opportunities, such as business opportunities and employment opportunities, in the area and neighbourhood. Respondents in the area could therefore perceive more positive economic Olympic Games’ benefits. Social exchange theory suggests that residents who perceive greater economic benefits generated by tourism will be more willing to support tourism development in the area. However, the current study did not show that respondents living close to the Bird’s Nest, who tended to perceive more economic Olympic Games’ benefits, were more supportive for future tourism development in Beijing. This may due to the fact that in spite of the positive economic benefits generated by the Olympic Games, respondents living close to the Bird’s Nest Stadium also perceived stronger negative economic Olympic Games’ impacts, such as the rise of cost of living in the area possibly due to the increased demand of tourists. The different composition of both positive and negative Olympic Games’
economic impacts level perceived by respondents, living close to the Stadium, could result in mixed attitudes among them toward future tourism development in Beijing.

6.5 Summary

Similar to research on other sport or mega events, the 2008 Olympic Games has brought significant positive and negative economic, socio-cultural, and environmental impacts to the host community and its residents. Although respondents of this study held overall positive perceptions towards the impacts of the Olympic Games and future tourism development in Beijing, their attitudes were less positive compared with Zhou and Ap’s (2009) study, possibly due to more negative impacts and less positive impacts during and after the Olympic Games than residents had expected. The overall positive attitudes of respondents could be influenced by the Chinese cultural tendency, the Chinese ideology, and the Communism, which made respondents try to act like others, not to against the government and offering positive responses to maintain a good image of the country.

As Chen (2011) suggests, under the Chinese context, residents usually respond to the negative impacts of a government-organised event in a more moderate manner. This is significantly shown in this study whereby a third of respondents held “neutral” opinions on questions relating to negative impacts of the Olympic Games. This moderate manner made respondents of this study fit in to the “Embracer-Tolerator” typology of residents proposed by Zhou and Ap (2011). It suggested that respondents who had concerns about negative impacts of the Olympic Games would tolerate those impacts to show their support for this government-organised mega event.

The findings of this research fit into the pattern suggested in social exchange theory, with respondents who had perceived more positive economic benefits, socio-cultural benefits, or environmental benefits tending to voice greater support for future tourism development. Senior residents and residents with a longer residence in Beijing, who perceived more positive impacts of the Games and less negative impacts of the Games, also showed greater support for future tourism development in Beijing.

Consistent with Dogan’s (1989) assertion, respondents’ personal attributes had resulted in different perceptions towards the impacts of the Olympic Games in this study. The influence
of education and the ability of the more educated (mostly younger) respondents to obtain heterogeneous opinions regarding the Olympic Games’ impacts on the Internet meant their opinions on the Olympic Games differed from older respondents, who are considered more conservative. Respondents with short residency in Beijing tended to have lower attachment to the community and perceived less positive impacts of the Olympic Games for the community. This research found also that respondents involved in the Olympic Games and respondents living closed to the Bird’ Nest Stadium had perceived some negative impact of the Olympic Games. However, according to social exchange theory, as long as their perceived Olympic Games’ benefits outweighed the perceived costs, they would tolerate the costs and accept future tourism development in Beijing.
Chapter Seven: CONCLUSION

7.1 Introduction

The purpose of this research has been to investigate Beijing residents’ perceptions of the impacts of the Beijing Olympic Games and to see whether their perceived impacts would influence their attitudes towards future tourism development in Beijing. The previous chapters of this thesis have provided some background information of this research, an overview of existing research and theories relevant to this topic, and a detailed discussion of the findings of this research in light of previous studies and these theories. The aim of this final chapter is to integrate all the information presented in previous chapters to provide a detailed conclusion and implications of this study. The chapter begins with a review of the research aim and objectives. This is followed by a summary of the research findings and links to existing theories. The contribution of this research is also discussed. Finally, research limitations are summarized and suggestions for future research are presented.

7.2 The Research Aim, Research Questions and Research Objectives Revisited

Revisiting the aims and objectives set out for the research is important to make sure they have been answered and achieved in this thesis. The aim of this study was to explore the impacts of the Olympic Games perceived by Beijing residents and investigate the relationship between Beijing residents’ evaluation of those Games-induced impacts and their attitudes towards future tourism development in Beijing.

The central research questions of this study were:

1. What kind of Games-induced impacts are perceived by Beijing residents?
2. What kind of Games-induced impacts are stated by the academic scholars, the government, and the media?
3. Are those publicly identified impacts consistent with the impacts evaluated by the residents?
4. Are there differences among different groups of residents, distinguished by their characteristics, regarding their evaluations of the impacts induced by the Olympic Games?

5. Is there any relationship between residents’ perceived impacts and their support for future tourism development in Beijing?

Based on the above research questions, the following five objectives were set out for this research:

1. To explore the impacts caused by the 2008 Olympic Games from the perspective of Beijing residents.

2. To explore academic literature, government publications, and news from the media regarding the Games-induced impacts.

3. To identify the differences between residents’ perceived Olympic Games’ impacts and those impacts stated in previous studies, in the government’s publications, and in the media.

4. To identify any difference in Olympic Games’ impact perceptions amongst different Beijing residents groups.

5. To analyse the correlation between Beijing residents’ evaluation of impacts of the Olympic Games and their further support/opposition for tourism development.

To meet the above objectives, the researcher has researched on subject related academic studies, and then conducted an intercept survey in Beijing to collect primary data for this study. The research has been based primarily on quantitative research method, utilising a structured questionnaire, however, open-ended questions were included also to allow greater depth of information to be gathered.

The next section will provide a summary of the key findings of this research in relation to the research questions and objectives.
7.3 Summary of the Research Findings

Responding to the first, second, and third objectives, this research has found that Beijing residents perceived that the Olympic Games had brought many economic, socio-cultural, and environmental benefits and costs, which were mostly consistent with the impacts stated in previous studies, government publications, and the media. Respondents perceived a number of negative economic impacts, such as a rise in the property prices and cost of living in Beijing, and the huge financial investment of the government for the Games. Of these impacts, rising prices were the top concern to the respondents, which is similar to Zhou and Ap’s (2009) findings. Although respondents were optimistic about the economic benefits the Olympic Games had created for their city, such as more job and business opportunities, much fewer respondents indicated that they had personally benefited economically from the Games. This finding shows that there might be a lag between what residents anticipated the Games to bring to their city and what they had actually received from the Games in terms of economic benefits.

Similar to Kim et al’s (2006) findings, this study reveals that respondents reported more socio-cultural impacts of the Olympic Games - both positive and negative - than economic impacts. Respondents indicated that hosting the Olympic Games had resulted in many positive socio-cultural impacts, including better infrastructure and more public facilities available. An interesting finding seldom discussed in previous research is that many respondents had formed a habit of doing regular exercise because of the Games. More sports and recreation facilities in Beijing, more free parks and green lands opened for residents, residents’ attention to the Olympic Games, together with other people’s organisation and encouragement, were all incentives to encourage residents to do more sports and exercises.

Respondents tended to hold neutral attitudes to, or to disagree with, the negative socio-cultural impacts statements associated with the Olympic Games, with the exception that half of the respondents agreed that the Games had caused a problem of overcrowding, and nearly half of the respondents agreed that the Games had caused resentment for some groups of residents. This latter point is an important discovery; under the strict and highly centralised Chinese society, residents are used to not speaking against the government and their decisions (Chen, 2011). Therefore, they tend to hold moderate attitudes towards the negative impacts of the Olympic Games. Indicating other residents’ resentment towards the Olympic Games might be an indirect way for them to reveal their true feeling about the negative Olympic
Games’ impact. Contradicting previous studies’ suggestion that there could be an increase in crime rate during a mega event, Beijing residents tended to disagree that the crime rate had increased during the Olympic Games, possibly contributed by the strict legal and punishment system in China, and a lot of security staff were deployed during the Olympic Games to against crimes.

This research reveals that respondents perceived that the Olympic Games had brought some environmental benefits to the host community. However, similar to their attitudes towards the socio-cultural impacts of the Olympic Games, respondents tended to hold neutral attitudes to, or to disagree with, the statements about negative environmental impacts of the Olympic Games, such as more littering in Beijing and deterioration of the natural areas of Beijing, which are all significant and inevitable environmental impacts of mega events identified in many academic studies.

This study revealed that respondents of this study were not as positive about the impacts of the Olympic Games as those researched by Zhou and Ap (2009) two years prior to the Olympic Games. This supports Gursoy, Chi, Ai and Chen’s (2011) assertion that when costs were revealed and benefits were less than expected after the end of an event, local residents’ perceptions of the event’s impacts would become less positive. The overall positive attitude of respondents towards the Olympic impacts suggested that respondents of this study fitted into Zhou and Ap’s (2009) “embracers - tolerators” typology of residents, where embracers viewed the overall impacts of the Olympic Games more positively and were more supportive for the Games and tolerators were still overall positive but to a lower degree and had some concerns about the Games’ negative impacts on residents’ lives. The Chinese cultural tendency to provide an answer reflecting what most people will think and the Chinese and Communist ideology to promote government’s efforts may contribute to the overall positive attitudes of the respondents towards the impacts of the Olympic Games.

To address the fourth objective, this study found that respondents’ personal attributes could result in different perceptions towards the impacts of the Olympic Games. Senior respondents, who were more conservative, tended to be influenced by the traditional Chinese value, such as the Chinese cultural tendency, the Communist ideology deeply; they tended to hold more positive attitudes towards the Olympic Games’ impact. Young respondents, who had higher education level, were influenced by the Western culture and were more adept in expressing their opinions; they tended to have less positive attitudes towards the impacts of the Olympic
Games. This research also showed that respondents with short length of residency in Beijing tended to perceive fewer positive Olympic Games. Furthermore, this research found that respondents involved in the Olympic Games and respondents living closed to the Bird’ Nest Stadium (within 5 kilometers) had perceived some negative impacts of the Olympic Games.

To address the fifth objective, this study found that there was a positive relationship between respondents’ attitudes towards the impacts of the Games and their support for future tourism development in Beijing, fitting with social exchange theory. With the general positive attitudes towards the impacts of the Olympic Games, respondents tended to support further tourism development in Beijing. Particularly those who perceived greater economic benefits, socio-cultural benefits, and environmental benefits, such as senior respondents or respondents having longer residency in Beijing, had more positive attitude to support for future tourism in Beijing. However, the relationship between respondents’ attitude towards negative impacts of the Olympic Games and their support for further tourism in Beijing was insignificant in this study, due to respondents’ moderate attitudes towards the negative Olympic Games’ impacts.

### 7.4 Contribution and Implication of This Study

This research has identified 300 Beijing residents’ perceived economic, socio-cultural, and environmental impacts of the Olympic Games and their attitudes towards future tourism development in Beijing. It has contributed both theoretical and practical insights to the literature. Theoretically, it supplements the deficiency of literature of mega event tourism impacts in developing countries, particularly China. It also provides the value of adding to knowledge and research on residents’ perceptions of mega-event impacts in the Chinese context, where tourism and event planning is entirely top-down and local residents’ opinions are seldom examined. In addition, this study helps to explain the social exchange theory that residents who perceive more positive impacts of event tourism would be more supportive of future tourism development in the community. This study also support Zhou and Ap’s (2009) suggestion that different from the general “Lovers-Tolerators-Haters” typology of residents of event host community, it is more appropriate to group Chinese residents as “Embracers-Tolerators” of the event due to the influence of Chinese cultural tendency, Chinese ideology, and Communism. This study confirms that Dogan’s (1989) assertion that respondents’ attributes could cause different perceptions to the event impacts.
In practical terms, since residents are usually not allowed to participate in event/tourism planning process and in consultation in China. Residents’ opinions are often ignored. Thus, this research provides a value to benefit the Chinese government in understanding what benefits and costs the Olympic Games had brought to its residents, which could assist them to adjust their strategies for future event planning. The research itself could also contribute to the expansion of the current relatively limited research about Chinese residents’ perceptions of the impacts of tourism. Furthermore, because this research was conducted shortly after the Olympic Games had occurred, it provides a value to find out the differences between Beijing residents’ expectations of the Olympic Games and the actual Games’ consequences when comparing this study with Zhou and Ap’s (2009) study.

7.5 Research Limitations

One of the limitations of this research is the territorial constraint. Because of the time and budget constraint, the researcher could only conduct the survey in the Haidian district rather than conducting the survey in every district and county of Beijing. This may cause geographic bias since about 40 per cent of respondents lived in 6 to 15 kilometres away from the Bird’s Nest Stadium.

Another limitation is the over-representation of the younger group in the sample. It may be caused by the site selection that some survey sites were very close to a university where gathered more young people. In addition, many middle aged and senior residents refused to participate in this research. Lack of knowledge on the Olympic Games and their influences and the previous experience of the long-term suppression of free speech in public may contribute to their reluctance to participate in the survey. This may cause bias in favouring younger people’s opinions.

The result of this research showed that respondents’ attitudes towards the impacts of the Olympic Games were very positive. Some respondents indicated that they were unwilling to point out the negative part of their country’s efforts in hosting an international mega event in front of an interviewer who had a foreign identity. Thus, the researcher’s foreign identity became a limitation to stop respondents to express their true feeling. In addition, respondents may be influenced by the Chinese cultural tendency, Chinese ideology, and Communist ideology, which prevented the researcher from obtaining the genuine thoughts of the
respondents regarding the negative impacts of the Olympic Games. Thus, this has caused the outcomes of this research to appear perhaps overly optimistic.

7.6 Future Research

Event impacts could be short term but also could be long term. It is important to monitor the event impacts on a longitudinal basis. Since scholars (Kim, Gursoy & Lee, 2006; Porter & Fletcher, 2008; Jones, 2001) have suggested that the positive economic impacts of the Olympic Games were often exaggerated, future research could be conducted to examine the long-term economic benefits the Beijing Olympic Games had generated. Long term economic benefits, such as tourism generation by investigating visitors’ motivation to visit Beijing, could be included as well. In addition, this research has found that the Olympic Games had generated residents’ interests in sports participation. Future research could be conducted to investigate the causal relationship that how the Olympic Games would affect local residents’ sports habit and how long this sports interest would last.

Furthermore, long-term negative impacts of the Olympic Games, which were perceived by the respondents of this study as insignificant in general, could be researched again in the future (preferably to be conducted by the local Chinese researchers to obtain more genuine responses) to see whether they have caused a different degree of impacts on the residents in the long-term. For example, re-examining residents’ attitude to the permanent traffic-limit policy after the Olympic Games had finished a while can find out whether there is a change in residents attitudes toward this impact. In addition, more qualitative methods are suggested to be used in future research to obtain more depth of information about the impacts of the Olympic Games on residents. For example, the researcher can use the methods of focus group and interview to obtain in-depth information regarding “WHY” the respondents have formed a particular perception of the impacts of the Olympic Games. Researcher can lead a discussion of the negative impacts of the Beijing Olympic Games among the group members to encourage participants to express their true opinions about the negative Olympic Games’ impacts to avoid the overly optimistic responses found in the Chinese context.
7.7 Conclusion

This chapter has revisited the research questions and research objectives to ensure that they have been answered in this thesis. This study concludes that the Olympic Games had generated many economic, socio-cultural, and environmental benefits and costs in the host community and that respondents tended to have positive opinions of the positive impacts of the Olympic Games and moderate attitudes towards the negative impacts. In terms of the typology of the respondents, it is concluded that respondents tended to be either “Embracers” or “Tolerators” of the Olympic Games. This research also found that respondents who perceived greater benefits of the Olympic Games would be more supportive for future tourism development in Beijing. This research has contributed to the enrichment of current literature of mega event tourism in developing countries and community-based research on tourism impacts. It could also be a reference for the Chinese government and other event organisers in planning future events and in setting up relevant policies to magnify the benefits and to remedy costs of the events. Future research is suggested to be conducted in monitoring the long-term impacts of the Beijing Olympic Games.
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Appendix: Research Questionnaire

Beijing residents’ perceptions and attitudes towards the 2008 Olympic Games and future tourism development

Questionnaire

My name is Vicky Hsiao-Yu Lin. I am a Postgraduate student at Lincoln University in Christchurch, New Zealand. I am conducting a Lincoln University-funded Master thesis research on Beijing residents’ perception of Olympics impacts and relevant tourism impacts and their attitudes towards tourism development in Beijing. If you are a Beijing resident over 18 years old, you are invited to participate in my research. This survey will take about 10 minutes to complete. Your participation is entirely voluntary. You are free to refuse to answer any question and to withdraw at any time up to completion of the interview. Your answers will be anonymous. If you start answering the questionnaire it will be understood that you have consented to participate in the research and consent to publication of the results of the research, with the understanding that anonymity will be preserved in any published report.

The results of this survey will be used for academic research. This research could facilitate the researcher and other interested parties to understand the impacts of the Olympic Games on Beijing and on its residents. It could also make theoretical contributions to supplement the deficiency of empirical research on community impacts of tourism in China. In addition, this research can also be a reference for the Chinese authorities and interested groups in planning for future tourism development.

Again, thank you very much for your assistance. Your assistance is important to the success of my research. I appreciate your willingness to help.

Vicky Hsiao-Yu Lin
Q1. Please rate your opinion of the following tourism impacts associated with the Olympic Games. Use a scale from 1 up to 5 where 1= Strongly Disagree, 2= Disagree, 3= Neutral, 4= Agree, and 5= Strongly Agree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) Hosting the Olympic Games has brought economic benefits to Beijing
2) Hosting the Olympic Games has brought economic benefits to me and/or my family
3) Hosting the Olympic Games has created more job opportunities for me personally
4) Hosting the Olympic Games has created more job opportunities in Beijing
5) Hosting the Olympic Games has resulted in a rise in Beijing’s property values
6) Hosting the Olympic Games has created more business opportunities for me personally
7) Hosting the Olympic Games has created more business opportunities for Beijing
8) Olympics-induced tourism raised the cost of living in Beijing
9) The government has invested too much capital in constructing facilities for the Olympic Games
10) Beijing’s infrastructure has improved as a result of the Olympic Games
11) Olympics-induced tourism has resulted in pressure on resources and infrastructure
12) Olympics-induced tourism has resulted in problems of overcrowding
13) There are more public facilities available as a result of the Olympics
14) The Olympics has improved the quality of Beijing residents’ life
15) Hosting the Olympics has caused resentment for some groups of residents
16) Olympics-induced tourism promoted civilized behaviour among residents
17) Olympics-induced tourism facilitated modernization of Beijing
18) Olympics-induced tourism increased the crime rate in Beijing
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19) Olympics-induced tourism strengthened security in Beijing</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20) The Olympics has promoted cultural exchange between residents</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and visitors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21) The Olympics increased conflicts between residents</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22) The Olympics increased conflicts between residents and visitors</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23) Hosting the Olympics encouraged preservation of local culture and tradition</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24) Hosting the Olympic Games has improved Beijing’s air quality</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25) The traffic-limit policy caused inconvenience to me personally</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26) The traffic-limit policy caused inconvenience to all residents in general</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27) There is more littering in Beijing because of the Olympics</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28) Hosting the Olympic Games has promoted environmental conservation</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29) The Olympics has improved the cleanliness of Beijing</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30) Olympics-induced tourism deteriorated the natural areas of Beijing</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31) There should be more tourism development in Beijing</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q2. Before the Olympic Games occurred, what positive benefits did you think you personally would experience from hosting visitors for the Olympics? For each, to what extent did these occur?

Benefit 1.

To what extent did it occur (Please tick)?  □ A great deal  □ A bit  □ Not at all

Benefit 2.

To what extent did it occur (Please tick)?  □ A great deal  □ A bit  □ Not at all

Benefit 3.

To what extent did it occur (Please tick)?  □ A great deal  □ A bit  □ Not at all
Please state any other positive benefits experienced by you that you had not anticipated but occurred after the Olympics took place.

Q3. Before the Olympic Games occurred, what positive benefits did you think Beijing would experience from hosting visitors for the Olympics? For each, to what extent did these occur?

Benefit 1.
To what extent did it occur (Please tick)? □ A great deal □ A bit □ Not at all

Benefit 2.
To what extent did it occur (Please tick)? □ A great deal □ A bit □ Not at all

Benefit 3.
To what extent did it occur (Please tick)? □ A great deal □ A bit □ Not at all

Please state any other positive benefits experienced by Beijing that you had not anticipated but occurred after the Olympics took place.

Q4. Before the Olympic Games occurred, what negative costs did you think you personally would experience from hosting visitors for the Olympics? For each, to what extent did these occur?

Cost 1.
To what extent did it occur (Please tick)? □ A great deal □ A bit □ Not at all

Cost 2.
To what extent did it occur (Please tick)? □ A great deal □ A bit □ Not at all

Cost 3.
To what extent did it occur (Please tick)? □ A great deal □ A bit □ Not at all
Please state any other negative costs experienced by you that you had not anticipated but occurred after the Olympics took place.

Q5. Before the Olympic Games occurred, what negative costs did you think Beijing would experience from hosting visitors for the Olympics? For each, to what extent did these occur?
Cost 1.

To what extent did it occur (Please tick)? ☐ A great deal ☐ A bit ☐ Not at all
Cost 2.

To what extent did it occur (Please tick)? ☐ A great deal ☐ A bit ☐ Not at all
Cost 3.

To what extent did it occur (Please tick)? ☐ A great deal ☐ A bit ☐ Not at all

Please state any other negative costs experienced by Beijing that you had not anticipated but occurred after the Olympics took place.

Finally some questions about you to help us analyse our results

Q6. What is your gender?
☐ Male ☐ Female

Q7. Please indicate the age group to which you belong:
☐ 18-25 ☐ 36-45 ☐ 56-65
☐ 26-35 ☐ 46-55 ☐ 66 and above

Q8. What is the highest level of education you have achieved?
☐ No formal qualification ☐ Postgraduate qualification
☐ Primary school qualification ☐ Trade certificate or equivalent
☐ High school qualification ☐ Other (specify) _____________
☐ Undergraduate degree or diploma
Q9. Do you currently work in tourism-related industry (including tourism, hotel, restaurants, and other tourism-related retail sectors)?
- Yes, please state your occupation
- No, please state your occupation

Q10. Were you personally involved in the Olympics in any way, such as a spectator or a volunteer?
- Yes, please state
- No

Q11. Were you born in Beijing?
- Yes
- No, please state where were you born

Q12. How long have you been living in Beijing?
- 1 or less than 1 year
- 2 – 5 years
- 6 – 15 years
- 16 – 25 years
- 26 – 35 years
- 36 years and above

Q13. How far do you currently live away from the Birds Nest stadium?
- 5 or less than 5 kilometers
- 6 – 15 kilometers
- 16 – 25 kilometers
- 26 – 35 kilometers
- 36 kilometers and above