

Legacy in Action: How Event Legacies Fuel Community Development and Supportive Behavior

Wonyoung Kim¹, Yong-Chae Rhee², Namhun Lim³, and Homun Jun⁴

¹Department of Sport and Leadership Studies, Wichita State University

²Center for Sport Leadership, Virginia Commonwealth University

³Department of Business, Accounting, & Sport Management, Elizabeth City State University

⁴Mokpo National University

Abstract

This study examines the multidimensional relationship among social impacts, knowledge of legacy, and the intention to support hosting future large-scale sports events. Only limited research has explored how the perceived legacies influence stakeholders' behaviors, particularly considering the mediated role of knowledge about the legacies from hosting a large-scale sports event. [To assess the relationship, legacy factors derived from social exchange theory were used to reflect both positive and negative social impacts], and knowledge of legacy is conceptualized and developed from existing studies. The results suggest that knowledge of legacy significantly mediates the relationship between perceived social impacts and community support for hosting future large-scale sports events. In particular, understanding the legacy of past events [reduces the negative perception] of economic costs associated with the future support of hosting large-scale sports events in the community. On the other hand, community development is crucial in directly enhancing support for hosting future events. The findings of this study can serve as valuable insights for prospective communities and event administrators to establish an effective and successful planning process by providing a clear rationale to utilize various managerial and communicational strategies to cultivate the understanding of event legacies toward hosting future events.

Keywords: event legacy, social impact, community development, supportive behavior

1. Introduction

Hosting large-scale sports events generates substantial social impacts that could reshape attitudes toward the hosting communities and residents' quality of life (Kim et al., 2015). Ongoing controversies have concerned whether the retained social impacts outweigh the costs of hosting large-scale sport events. Hosting large-scale sports events commonly requires the development of

substantial infrastructure involving new sports facilities, transportation systems, and other peripheral facilities to stage the events. However, critical issues have arisen around large-scale sports events as the infrastructure cannot be sufficiently used after the event, particularly for long-term perspectives. Therefore, hosting organizations and regions developed comprehensive strategies to maximize positive legacies (e.g., community development, economic benefits, etc.) while minimizing negative legacies (e.g., economic costs, environmental costs, etc.). This has raised questions about the sustainability, long-term planning, and managerial strategies of hosting large-scale sports events. Existing studies have primarily focused on the short-term impacts rather than assessing how residents' attitudes toward long-term legacies may impact their supportive behaviors in hosting future large-scale sports events.

Any changes may influence residents' quality of life and their continued residence in the hosting communities] as the legacy of the events (Preuss, 2018); thus, a comprehensive understanding of long-term perceived social impacts is critical for generating support while reducing conflicts for hosting prospective large-scale sports events. Numerous studies pertain to intangible socio-psychological impacts, encompassing social cohesion, community pride, social unity, and enhancing community image. While existing studies have acknowledged the significance of examining residents' perceived social impacts on hosting a large-scale sports event, there has been a lack of thorough long-term analysis of legacies. This oversight is concerning, as understanding the long-term legacies of hosting communities (e.g., residents) is vital for the sustainable development of future events. Evaluating how residents' perspectives and experiences related to past event hosting can provide valuable insights for event planners and administrators. It concerns intangible social effects such as community cohesion, civic pride, uniting people, or improving self-esteem, and has examined the relationship between perceived social impacts and behavioral attributes. This is mainly because they are difficult to quantify (Walton et al., 2007). Despite this, it is often stipulated that these intangible effects could be at least comparable in scale to the tangible impact (Noll & Zimbalist, 1997). In addition, limited research has examined how the knowledge of the legacies may influence residents' behavior, such as supporting future event hosting.

Event Legacy

Previous research on the legacies of hosting sports events utilized the framework established by Preuss (2007), which includes the five-dimensional legacy structure, such as positive/negative, tangible/intangible, planned/unplanned, time, and space (Thomson et al., 2013). Event legacy is often recognized as a host city's long-term or permanent outcomes from staging an event (Kim et al., 2015; Thompson et al., 2013). Due to increasing social and political challenges and conflicts surrounding hosting sports events of various sizes, public policy planners and event organizers are actively highlighting the legacies of hosting sports events as a compelling justification for the significant tangible and intangible investments required to host the events (Preuss, 2018). Positive social capital and legacies mitigate potential conflicts among stakeholders so that event planners can justify public spending on events, boosting public support for event hosting and advancing community development through hosting sports events (Kim & Walker, 2012).

Social Impact

Social impact is "...the changes in quality of life of residents of tourist destination" based on hosting various events (Mathieson & Wall, 1982, p. 137). Social impacts of residents toward hosting sports events have been studied in various research contexts, such as mega-sport events (Kim & Petrick, 2005; Kim & Walker, 2012; Wu et al., 2023) and [large-scale international sports events (Carlini et al., 2020)]; Kim et al., 2015). Residents recognize a perceived social impact following the event by

evaluating its outcomes based on the expected benefits (Chalip, 2006). Growing attention has been given to exploring the socio-psychological impacts derived from hosting various sports events. Nonetheless, there is still a lack of attention on how sports event planners and administrators can effectively create legacy outcomes, particularly positive legacies, during the planning and design of hosting sports events (Carlini et al., 2020).

Perceived social impacts of stakeholders, such as residents, can vary by socio-demographic characteristics, such as age, gender, level of attachment, length of residency, political preferences, or the level of identification with the community (Inoue & Havard, 2014; Kim et al., 2015). Residents who recognize legacies from hosting sports events indicated substantial positive legacies, indicating support and interest in getting involved with the event. Numerous studies have identified the legacies of hosting sports events and found that positive legacies enhance the planning of prospective events and facility developments (e.g., Balduck et al., 2011; Inoue & Havard, 2014; Kim et al., 2015).

Social Exchange Theory

Social exchange theory assumes that social behavior results from an exchange process (Lawler & Thye, 1999), with the purpose of the exchange to maximize benefits (e.g., positive social impacts) and minimize negative impacts (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005). According to social exchange theory, when recipients receive expected benefits from the exchange process, they feel the need to reciprocate positively (Fazal-e-Hasan et al., 2014; Hsiao et al., 2023). Common observations were identified in the planning and evaluations of hosting sports events, where stakeholders, the beneficiaries, recognize the benefits provided by the efforts of event administrators and planners, the benefactors (Kim et al., 2024; Kim & Lee, 2013). Positive outcomes from the exchange process facilitate attitudes toward satisfaction that can lead to reciprocal behaviors, including but not limited to positive word-of-mouth and intention to support prospective sports event hosting. Intrinsic benefits such as social affiliation and enjoyment directly influence stakeholders' intention to share knowledge positively (Zhao & Detlor, 2023). On the other hand, stakeholders express negative intentions to share their knowledge on the exchange process and contexts when anticipated benefits are not delivered fully (Kim et al., 2015).

Research Context: Formula One Korean Grand Prix

The Republic of Korea hosted a Formula 1 race from 2010 to 2013 in Yeongam-gun, Jeollanam-do, near the southwestern area, a very rural area of the Korean peninsula (Horton, 2024). The hosting site was not a typical tourist destination and had no infrastructure (e.g., hotels, restaurants, etc.) to accommodate event visitors. Additionally, racing sports were not a mainstream sport that garnered support and interest from the public, even in major cities in South Korea. The Korean Grand Prix, hoping to vitalize the local economy and build an attractive image as a tourist destination, built the racing track and peripheral infrastructures with public subsidies and governmental funds. However, many issues surged immediately, including delays in the construction of the Korea International Circuit (KIC), poor track conditions, lower attendance at 150,000, mixed with paid and complimentary attendees compared to other F1 events, and a lack of funds for hosting prospective events (Bulley, 2024). The event was eventually abandoned as attendance died down, coupled with the maintenance costs that Formula 1 tracks require. The track remains for smaller domestic and regional racing competitions, but lacks the glitz and glamour of big-ticket events, such as the Formula 1 race. After years of controversies regarding how to revitalize the hosting site and left-over infrastructures, the local government, in partnership with private developers, executed a strategic development plan, including but not limited to the construction of public golf courses, nature campsites, hosting various leisure and entertainment events (e.g., concerts, festivals, etc.), research and development centers for electric vehicles, and driving center that can host regular

drivers to get quality driving training.

The Purpose of the Study

Based on the preceding commentary, this study examines the relationship between residents' perceived legacies of hosting a large-scale sports event and the intention to support hosting future events. Based on utilizing the social exchange theory, this study also examined a model focusing on how residents' knowledge of the legacies mediated the relationships between five factors of the perceived social impacts on the future behavioral intention to support hosting prospective large-scale sports events in the community.

2. Methodology

Participants and Data Collection

This study explored the social impacts as legacies of hosting a large-scale international sports event by analyzing survey data from 473 residents of the Southwest Jeollanam-do area, South Korea, in 2022 (N = 473) as the region hosted the Formula One Korea Grand Prix from 2010 to 2013. Participants, selected through convenience sampling, represented a diverse demographic profile: 53.9% male and 46.1% female, spanning generational categories from Generation Z to Baby Boomers. The sample also encompassed a range of income and education levels, reflecting the socio-economic diversity of the host community.

Measures

The survey instrument assessed perceptions of social impacts across multiple domains, using scales adapted from established measures (e.g., the Perceived Social Impact Scale by Kim et al., 2015). Items were rated on a 1-7 Likert scale (1 = Strongly Disagree, 7 = Strongly Agree), with higher scores indicating more substantial agreement or greater levels of the measured construct. The knowledge of legacy was measured as follows:

- **Community Development (CD):** Six items measured perceived improvements in community image and opportunities (e.g., "Increased understanding of other cultures," "Enhanced media visibility").
- **Community Pride (CP):** Five items captured the sense of local pride fostered by the event (e.g., "Enhanced the community pride of residents," "Reinforced community spirit").
- **Economic Benefits (EB):** Four items addressed perceptions of economic gains, including business growth and improved infrastructure (e.g., "Increased trade for local businesses").
- **Economic Costs (EC):** Three items gauged concerns about potential financial burdens due to event hosting (e.g., "Excessive spending on new infrastructure").
- **Traffic Problems (TP):** Three items assessed inconveniences related to event-induced traffic congestion (e.g., "Resulted in traffic congestion").

In addition, the Knowledge of the Legacy (KL) was included as a mediated variable (MV) using a four-item scale (KL1 to KL4 on a 1-5 Likert scale) to assess the awareness of legacies derived from hosting the Formula One Korean Grand Prix and its infrastructure development (Cronbach's $\alpha = .957$). The items were conceptualized and developed based on previous research on the stakeholders' perceived knowledge of legacies related to hosting various sports events. (Kim et al., 2015; Preuss,

2018; Thomson, et al., 2013). The dependent variable (DV) in this study was Support for Hosting Future Events (*SPT*), a construct measured through two items assessing community support for future large-scale events (Cronbach's $\alpha = .930$). Each scale demonstrated internal consistency, with Cronbach's alpha values exceeding .70, indicating reliable measurement.

Statistical Analysis

This study employed a GLM Mediation Analysis to examine both the indirect and direct effects of five independent variables (IVs)—Community Development (*CD*), Community Pride (*CP*), Economic Benefits (*EB*), Traffic Problems (*TP*), and Economic Costs (*EC*)—on the dependent variable, Support for Hosting Future Events (*SPT*), with Knowledge of Legacy (*KL*) included as a mediator. This approach provides insight into both the direct pathways (IVs \rightarrow *SPT*) and mediated pathways (IVs \rightarrow *KL* \rightarrow *SPT*), through which perceptions of social impacts influence community support.

The model is specified as follows:

1. Mediator Equation: $KL = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 CD + \alpha_2 CP + \alpha_3 EB + \alpha_4 TP + \alpha_5 EC + \epsilon_{KN}$
2. Outcome Equation:

$$SPT = \gamma_0 + \gamma_1 KL + \gamma_2 CD + \gamma_3 CP + \gamma_4 EB + \gamma_5 TP + \gamma_6 EC + \epsilon_{SPT}$$

In this model,

- α coefficients estimate the effect of each independent variable on the mediator, Knowledge of Legacy (*KL*), representing the indirect pathway from social impacts to support for hosting future events.
- γ coefficients estimate the direct impact of each independent variable on the dependent variable (*SPT*), accounting for the influence of *KL*.
- γ_1 specifically captures the mediating role of Knowledge of Legacy (*KL*) on *SPT*, illustrating how increased awareness and positive perceptions of the event may translate the effects of social impacts into stronger support for future events.

The GLM Mediation Analysis procedure was used to calculate indirect and direct effects, with statistical significance assessed at $p < .05$. This analysis framework allows for a comprehensive understanding of the mediated and direct pathways influencing support for future events.

3. Results

The sample included 473 participants, with a nearly balanced gender distribution (53.9% male, 46.1% female). Generational representation spanned from Baby Boomers (23.7%) to Generation Z (25.2%). Most participants were full-time employed (49.1%) or students (18.2%), and 32.6% held a college degree. This study adopted the classifications of the generations by Twenge (2023), which consists of six generations: Silents (born 1925-1945), Boomers (1946-1964), Generation X (1965-1979), Millennials (1980-1994), Generation Z (1995-2012), and Polars (2013-2029). Income levels predominantly ranged between 1 million and 3 million won (52.6%), and 60% of participants reported residing in the area for over 10 years, reflecting strong community ties.

Table 1.*Descriptive Statistics of Dependent and Independent Variables (N = 473)*

Variable	Label	N	Mean	SD
Support for Hosting Future Events	<i>SPT</i>	473	5.70	1.33
Community Development	<i>CD</i>	473	5.01	.70
Community Pride	<i>CP</i>	473	4.42	.81
Economic Benefits	<i>EB</i>	473	4.35	.99
Traffic Problems	<i>TP</i>	473	4.45	1.12
Economic Costs	<i>EC</i>	473	5.00	.88
Knowledge of Legacy	<i>KL</i>	473	4.09	.98

Descriptive Statistics

Table 1 presents descriptive statistics for the main survey variables. Overall, participants expressed moderate to high agreement with positive community impacts, including favorable perceptions of Community Development ($M = 5.01$, $SD = .70$) and Economic Benefits ($M = 4.35$, $SD = .99$). Moderate concerns were raised regarding Economic Costs ($M = 5.00$, $SD = .88$) and Traffic Problems ($M = 4.45$, $SD = 1.12$). Knowledge of Legacy showed moderate awareness ($M = 4.09$, $SD = .98$), while strong community support was indicated for future events ($M = 5.70$, $SD = 1.33$).

In addition to examining the relationships among perceived social impacts, knowledge of legacy, and support for future event hosting, this study utilized generational clusters to analyze group differences in attitude toward legacies and their likelihood of supporting future large-scale sport tourism event initiatives. Table 2 summarizes these descriptive statistics by generation, highlighting some generational trends. Notably, Generation Z exhibited the highest mean support for hosting future events ($M = 6.12$, $SD = 1.13$), potentially reflecting different social or cultural perspectives compared to older generations.

Table 2

Descriptive Statistics by Generation for Dependent and Independent Variables

Variable	Generation	N	Mean	SD
Support for Hosting Future Events	Boomers	112	5.43	1.36
	Generation X	105	5.37	1.66
	Millennials	137	5.82	1.05
	Generation Z	119	6.12	1.13
Community Development	Boomers	112	4.87	0.72
	Generation X	105	4.98	0.77
	Millennials	137	4.87	0.65
	Generation Z	119	5.32	0.59
Community Pride	Boomers	112	4.36	0.77
	Generation X	105	4.43	0.90
	Millennials	137	4.25	0.74
	Generation Z	119	4.68	0.79
Economic Benefits	Boomers	112	4.07	1.11
	Generation X	105	4.31	1.07
	Millennials	137	4.21	0.89
	Generation Z	119	4.80	0.75
Traffic Problem	Boomers	112	4.11	1.18
	Generation X	105	4.48	1.19
	Millennials	137	4.44	1.04
	Generation Z	119	4.75	1.00
Economic Costs	Boomers	112	4.95	0.89
	Generation X	105	5.07	0.95
	Millennials	137	4.98	0.87
	Generation Z	119	5.01	0.83
Knowledge of Legacy	Boomers	112	3.94	1.10
	Generation X	105	3.95	1.07
	Millennials	137	4.11	0.87
	Generation Z	119	4.33	0.86

As we found an interesting result of the generational differences in all three variables, generational effects were assessed using a regression analysis with Boomers as the reference group. Results showed that Generation Z demonstrated significantly greater support than Boomers ($\beta = .238, p < .05$), while Millennials and Generation X displayed an insignificant trend ($p > .05$). These findings indicate that younger generations, particularly Generation Z, are more inclined to support future events, possibly reflecting distinct social or cultural views on the event's impact.

Table 3*Generalized Linear Model Results*

Independent Variable	Support Future Events (β)
Intercept	1.20 **
Community Development (CD)	.16 *
Community Pride (CP)	-.15 *
Economic Benefits (EB)	.00
Traffic Problems (TP)	.00
Economic Costs (EC)	-.03
Knowledge of Legacy (KL)	1.08 **
Generation (ref = Boomers)	
Generation X (Gen X)	-.09
Millennials (Mil)	.18
Generation Z (Gen Z)	.24 *
R^2	.678

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

Generalized Linear Models (GLM) Mediation Analysis

The mediation model results, presented in Table 4, include both direct and indirect effects, providing insights into how perceptions of social impacts are associated with support for future events:

1. **Indirect Effects:** Knowledge of Legacy served as a significant mediator for the effects of Traffic Problems ($\alpha_4 \cdot \gamma_1 = .121, p < .05$) and Economic Costs ($\alpha_5 \cdot \gamma_1 = -.185, p < .05$) on Support for Hosting Future Events. These findings indicate that the awareness and legacy of the event can either enhance or diminish support, depending on specific social impact factors.
2. **Direct Effects:** Community Development ($\gamma_2 = .174, p < .05$) and Community Pride ($\gamma_3 = -.160, p < .05$) had significant direct effects on Support for Hosting Future Events. While Community Development positively influenced support, Community Pride showed a negative association, suggesting a complex relationship with future support motivations.
3. **Total Effects:** The combined direct and indirect effects underscore the role of Knowledge of Legacy (KN) in mediating the relationship between social impact perceptions and support for future events. Specifically, Community Development ($\alpha_1 \cdot \gamma_1 + \gamma_2 = .234, p < .05$), Community Pride ($\alpha_2 \cdot \gamma_1 + \gamma_3 = -.192, p < .05$), Traffic Problem ($\alpha_4 \cdot \gamma_1 + \gamma_5 = .136, p < .05$), and Economic Cost ($\alpha_5 \cdot \gamma_1 + \gamma_6 = -.223, p < .05$) showed significant total effects on support for future events.

Table 4.*GLM Mediation Analysis: Direct, Indirect, and Total Effects on SPT*

Effect Type	Path	Estimate	SE
Direct Effects	CD → SPT	.17 **	.07
	CP → SPT	-.16 **	.05
	EB → SPT	.02	.05
	TP → SPT	.02	.03
	EC → SPT	-.04	.04
Indirect Effects	CD → KL → SPT	.06	.09
	CP → KL → SPT	-.03	.08
	EB → KL → SPT	-.10	.06
	TP → KL → SPT	.12 *	.05
	EC → KL → SPT	-.18 **	.06
Total Effects	CD → SPT	.23 *	.11
	CP → SPT	-.19 *	.09
	EB → SPT	-.08	.08
	TP → SPT	.14 *	.06
	EC → SPT	-.22 **	.07

Note. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

The GLM Mediation Analysis indicates that Knowledge of Legacy (KL) significantly mediates the relationship between perceived social impacts and residents' support for future events. This mediation suggests that increased awareness of the legacies and positive perceptions of the event enhances the long-term translation of perceived social impacts into community support.

4. Discussion

In the dynamic landscape of the sport industry, substantial studies have focused on analyzing the impact of hosting large-scale sports events on local communities (Kim et al., 2006; Kim et al., 2015). Studies have examined both the tangible and intangible impacts, such as the influx of visitors (Gulak-Lipka, 2024; Knott & Tinaz, 2022), infrastructural development (Burbank et al., 2002; Waitt, 2003), and the development of sports facilities (Kim et al., 2024; Sparvero et al., 2015) that result from hosting various sports events. Although there has been more focus on examining legacy as a justification for political and socio-economic reasons in planning sports events, there is limited

research on how knowledge of legacies influences behavioral attributes, particularly how the perceived legacy of events shapes residents' future support and engagement. The findings of this study provide comprehensive insights to answer the multifaceted relationships among perceived legacy, knowledge of the legacy, and behavioral intention associated with hosting large-scale sports events.

Legacy in Action

Overall, participants indicated positive social impacts, including a moderately positive perception of Community Development ($M = 5.01$, $SD = .70$) and a moderate attitude toward a negative social impact factor: Economic Costs ($M = 5.00$, $SD = .88$). Knowledge of Legacy showed an adequate level of awareness ($M = 4.09$, $SD = .98$), while strong community support for future events ($M = 5.70$, $SD = 1.33$) was identified. These findings are consistent with the previous research. There were statistically significant results on generational perceptions of the perceived social impacts, knowledge of legacy, and support for hosting future events. Interestingly, Generation Z indicated the highest attitudes toward support for hosting future events, a positive social impact factor: community development and knowledge of legacy. Understanding these generational differences can help event planners tailor their strategies to better engage and motivate younger audiences, who are more inclined to support initiatives that enhance quality of life and community growth. This outcome provides valuable insights for event planners: younger generations emphasize the quality of life through community development with a higher understanding of the event legacies regarding support for future event hosting.

According to Wu et al. (2023), when residents appraise social camaraderie and the perceived social impacts as credible, they form positive attitudes toward the events. However, the current study found that Community Pride, despite being a positive social impact factor, negatively influenced the intention to support future event hosting, whereas Community Development had a positive influence. This suggests that while fostering a sense of pride might not directly translate to future support, focusing on tangible community improvements is more effective in encouraging continued engagement. Many studies found positive intangible social impacts, including civic pride, improving self-esteem, and a sense of belonging through hosting sports events (Coghlan et al., 2017; Crompton, 2004; Groothuis & Rotthoff, 2016; Kim & Walker, 2012). However, the current study reveals critical insights for event planners and administrators that they may consider less promoting community and civic pride through the events, as residents do not buy into this as a vital factor to support hosting future events. However, they should deliberately execute public relations strategies to disseminate information on how the event enhances community development and quality of life to garner more stakeholder support.

Regarding the indirect effects, knowledge of residents' legacies from previous event hosting has been identified as a critical mediator between negative social impacts and support for hosting future events. When residents understand the legacies from past events, they are more likely to view negative social impacts, like economic costs or traffic issues, in a positive light. This increased awareness reduces concerns and fosters greater support for future events. The study also shows that a clear understanding of event legacies can directly influence residents' future behavioral intentions by mitigating concerns about economic costs and highlighting potential community benefits (Groothuis & Rotthoff, 2016; Kim & Petrick, 2005).

Lastly, Knowledge of Legacy was confirmed as a critical mediator influencing the effects of social impacts, including positive effects from Community Development and Traffic Problems, and negative effects from Community Pride and Economic Costs. The outcomes of this study can serve as positive motivators for prospective hosts to establish the planning process by providing a clear and justifiable rationale for cultivating positive social impacts while reducing negative social impacts from hosting large-scale sports events. Planning for large-scale sports events, along with the accompanying political rhetoric, typically includes promises of enhancing community development,

fostering community pride, and providing economic benefits while mitigating economic concerns, traffic issues, and environmental challenges for host business communities in both the short and long term (Carlini et al., 2020; Zawadki, 2022). For example, the 2012 London Olympics successfully fulfilled these promises by creating lasting community infrastructure, boosting local pride, and providing significant economic uplift, which positively impacted both local businesses and residents (Smith, 2014).

Practical Implications

According to Matsuoka et al. (2024), various factors such as enhancement of external image, community consolidation and pride, and an interest in sports perceived by hosting the Winter Games positively influence improving attitudes toward hosting another mega-sports event. This study revealed that awareness of legacies from past events significantly mediates the relationship between perceived social impacts and community support for hosting future large-scale sports events. In particular, Knowledge of Legacy [reduces the negative perception] of economic costs associated with the future support of hosting large-scale sports events. On the other hand, community development is crucial in directly enhancing support for hosting future events.

The findings of this study can be used to develop effective public relations strategies. To ensure the awareness of legacies garnered from hosting large-scale sports events, event planners and administrators should consider emphasizing the benefits of community development and image enhancement through hosting large-scale sports events. For instance, although not all outcomes from planned initiatives were successful concerning the Formula One Korean Grand Prix, some leisure-related initiatives have garnered residents' support while drawing visitors to the community. The vacant area near KIC was transformed into a links-style public golf course where golfers can play without caddies and drive on the fairway, which is rare in South Korea. The lower green fees and scenic views have received positive feedback from visitors and residents, particularly younger generations (e.g., Generation Z and Millennials). Newly developed diverse leisure activities, such as small-scale sports events (e.g., F1 Marathon), concerts, camping festivals, and theme parks (e.g., Yeongam Motopia), have contributed to generating a more vibrant atmosphere in the community that raises the hope for future development (Han, 2024; Lee, 2024). In addition, the collective initiative of the SolaSeaDo project by three different neighborhood counties has added more resources to the area development and revitalization plans to attract not only tourists to the community but also to enhance the quality of life for residents, particularly younger generations (e.g., Millennials and Generation Z), so that the region can retain younger populations in the area (Lee, 2024; SolaSeaDo, 2020).

Hosting large-scale sports events inevitably results in excessive spending on facilities and infrastructure development, eliciting economic concerns among residents (Deccio & Baloglu, 2002). This might be attributed to residents' lack of involvement in decision-making and fewer opportunities to learn comprehensive event strategies for hosting large-scale sports events and related facility development (Delamere et al., 2001; Kim et al., 2024). Event planners should develop an ecosystem to equip effective communication channels for enhancing residents' engagement in the decision-making process throughout the hosting events (Delamere et al., 2001; Orr & Inoue, 2019). Addressing concerns about economic costs while improving residents' understanding of positive legacies through public relations strategies is critical to cultivating more significant support for future events.

Limitations and Future Research

This study contributes critically to the literature and practice in sport management and related fields. Specifically, it enhances understanding of perceived legacies and their recognition among residents regarding hosting large-scale sports events and faculty development. However, this study

contains a few limitations. First, the current study measured gross legacies, including direct and alternative developmental projects of the Formula One Korean Grand Prix. We believe the results might be different if we measured the net legacies. Second, the scale to measure the perceived social impacts and understanding of legacies would need to add more variables, as the path model explained 64.8% of variance to predict the support for future sports events hosting; thus, the applicability of the results may be limited.

For future research suggestions, the current study examined the complex nature of the mediating effects of understanding legacies by residents. Thus, developing a valid scale to measure the longitudinal legacies would contribute to sport management and related fields. Lastly, evaluating different contexts, including but not limited to mega-sport events, community sports events, facility development, and franchise relocations, would be meaningful to offer comprehensive managerial insights for sport administrators by fostering a better understanding of residents' attitudes toward legacies from hosting sports events.

References

- Balduck, A., Maes, M., & Buelens, M. (2011). The social impact of the Tour de France: Comparisons of residents' pre- and post-event perceptions. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 11(2), 91-113. <https://doi.org/10.1080/16184742.2011.559134>
- Bulley, J. (2024). *Ten years on, has the Korean Grand Prix seen its final red flag?* <https://koreajoongangdaily.joins.com/news/2024-07-16/sports/more/Ten-years-on-has-the-Korean-Grand-Prix-seen-its-final-red-flag/2091238>
- Burbank, M. J., Andranovich, G., & Heying, C. H. H. (2002). Mega-events, urban development, and public policy. *Review of Policy Research*, 19(3), 179-202. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1541-1338.2002.tb00301.x>
- Carlini, J., Coghlan, A., Thomson, A., & O'Neil, A. (2020). From legacy rhetoric to business benefits: A case study of the Gold Coast 2018 Commonwealth Games. *Event Management*, 24, 75-96. <https://doi.org/10.3727/152599519X15506259856057>
- Chalip, L. (2006). Towards social leverage of sport events. *Journal of Sport and Tourism*, 11(2), 109-127. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14775080601155126>
- Coghlan, A., Sparks, B., Liu, W., & Winlaw, M. (2017). Reconnecting with place through events: Collaborating with precinct managers in the placemaking agenda. *International Journal of Event and Festival Management*, 8(1), 66-83. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEFM-06-2016-0042>
- Crompton, J. L. (2004). Beyond economic impact: An alternative rationale for the public subsidy of major league sports facilities. *Journal of Sport Management*, 18(1), 40-58. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jsm.18.1.40>
- Cropanzano, R., & Mitchell, M. S. (2005). Social exchange theory: An interdisciplinary review. *Journal of Management*, 31(6), 874-900. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206305279602>
- Deccio, C., & Baloglu, S. (2002). Nonhost community resident reactions to the 2002 Winter Olympics: The spillover impacts. *Journal of Travel Research*, 41(1), 46-56. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287502041001006>
- Delamere, T. A., Wankel, L. M., & Hinch, T. D. (2001). Development of a scale to measure resident attitudes toward the social impacts of community festivals, Part 1: Item generation and purification of the measure. *Event Management*, 7(1), 11-24. <https://doi.org/10.3727/152599501108751443>
- Fazal-e-Hasan, S. M., Lings, I., Neale, L., & Mortimer, G. (2014). The role of customer gratitude in making relationship marketing investments successful. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 21(5), 788-796. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2014.06.007>
- Groothuis, P. A., & Rotthoff, K. W. (2016). The economic impact and civic pride effects of sports teams and mega-events: Do the public and the professionals agree? *Economic Affairs*, 36(1), 21-32. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ecaf.12156>
- Gulak-Lipka, P. (2024). Evaluating the impact of mega-sport events: A case of EuroBasket 2022. *Journal of Physical Education and Sport*, 24(1), 204-210. <https://doi.org/10.7752/jpes.2024.01025>

- Han, D. (2024). *Jeollanam-do's first garden-type plant 'Sani Garden' officially opened*. Seoul Economic News. <https://www.sedaily.com/NewsView/2D9315EUDV>
- Horton, P. (2024). *Korea delivers letter of intent to rejoin F1 calendar*. <https://www.autoweek.com/racing/formula-1/a60429482/korea-delivers-letter-of-intent-rejoin-f1/>
- Hsiao, A., Ma, E., Manfreda, A., Baker, M., & Xu, J. (2023). A social exchange perspective on boosting customer loyalty through culturally competent servers. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management*, 32(4), 555-577, <https://doi.org/10.1080/19368623.2023.2184439>
- Inoue, Y., & Havard, C. T. (2014). Determinants and consequences of the perceived social impact of a sport event. *Journal of Sport Management*, 28(3), 295-310. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jsm.2013-0136>
- Kim, H. J., Gursoy, D., & Lee, S. (2006). The impact of the 2002 World Cup on South Korea: comparisons of pre- and post-games. *Tourism Management*, 27(1), 86-96. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2004.07.010>
- Kim, W., Jun, H. M., Walker, M., & Drane, D. (2015). Evaluating the perceived social impacts of hosting large-scale sport tourism events: Scale development and validation. *Tourism Management*, 48, 21-32. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2014.10.015>
- Kim, S., & Lee, J. (2013). Is satisfaction enough to ensure reciprocity with upscale restaurants? The role of gratitude relative to satisfaction. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 33, 118-128. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2012.06.009>
- Kim, W., Lim, N., & Rhee, Y. (2024). Analysis of the relationships between residents' perceived social impacts of a publicly subsidized multipurpose facility and behavioral intentions. *Journal of Sport Sciences Research*, 9(3), 323-340. <https://doi.org/10.25307/jssr.1550357>
- Kim, S. S., & Petrick, J. F. (2005). Residents' perception on impacts of the FIFA 2002 World Cup: The case of Seoul as a host city. *Tourism Management*, 26(1), 25-38. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2003.09.013>
- Kim, W., & Walker, M. (2012). Measuring the social impacts associated with Super Bowl XLIII: Preliminary development of a psychic income scale. *Sport Management Review*, 15(1), 91-108. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.smr.2011.05.007>
- Knott, B., & Tinaz, C. (2022). The legacy of sport events for emerging nations. *Frontiers in Sports and Active Living*, 4, 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fspor.2022.926334>
- Lawler, E. J., & Thye, S. R. (1999). Bringing emotions into social exchange theory. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 25, 217-244. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.soc.25.1.217>
- Lee, D. (2024). *Haenam-gun, Jeollanam-do, overcoming local extinction problem through large-scale public-private partnership urban development project*. Chosun Il Bo. https://www.chosun.com/special/special_section/2024/08/26/IEGDVZIQRRF6FFRZTVAX2S5LG4/
- Mathieson, A., & Wall, G. (1982). *Tourism economic, physical and social impacts*. Longman Limited.

- Matsuoka, H., Kang, T., Oshimi, D., & Hahm, J. (2024). What motivates residents' approval of hosting another winter mega-sporting events? *Current Issues in Tourism*, 28(16), 2613-2629. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2024.2377399>
- Noll, R. G., & Zimbalist, A. (1997). *Sports jobs, and taxes: The economic impact of sports teams and stadiums*. Brookings.
- Orr, M., & Inoue, Y. (2019). Practitioner perspectives of legacy: insights from the 2015 Pan Am Games. *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health*, 12(5), 717-729. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2159676X.2019.1673468>
- Preuss, H. (2007). The conceptualization and measurement of mega sport event legacies. *Journal of Sport & Tourism*, 12(3-4), 207-228. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14775080701736957>
- Preuss, H. (2018). Event legacy framework and measurement. *International Journal of Sport Policy and Politics*, 11(1), 103-118, <https://doi.org/10.1080/19406940.2018.1490336>
- Smith, A. (2014). Leveraging sport mega-events: New model or convenient justification? *Journal of Policy Research in Tourism, Leisure and Events*, 6(1-3), 15-30. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19407963.2013.823976>
- SolaSeaDo. (2020). SolaSeaDo Development Project. <https://solaseado.com/eng/>
- Sparvero, E. S., Warner, S., & Tingle, J. K. (2015). RunTex: A community landmark run out of business. *Sport Management Review*, 19(3), 343-351. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.smr.2015.10.003>
- Thomson, A., Schlenker, K., & Schlenkorf, N. (2013). Conceptualizing sport event legacy. *Event Management*, 17(2), 111-122. <https://doi.org/10.3727/152599513X13668224082260>
- Walton, H., Longo, A., Dawson, P. (2007). A contingent valuation of the 2012 London Olympic Games: A regional perspective. *Journal of Sports Economics*, 9(3), 304-317. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1527002507308769>
- Waitt, G. (2003). Social impacts of the Sydney Olympics. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 30(1), 194-215. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383\(02\)00050-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383(02)00050-6)
- Wu, J., Orr, M., Inoue, Y., & Chang, Y. (2023). Drivers of the perceived social impact of the Super Bowl: mediation and moderation analyses. *International Journal of Sports Marketing and Sponsorship*, 24(5), 837-852. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJSMS-12-2022-0208>
- Zawadki, K. M. (2022). Residents' perception of intangible benefits and costs associated with hosting major sporting events. *Event Management*, 26(2), 297-317. <https://doi.org/10.3727/152599521X16192004803502>
- Zhao, Li., & Detlor, B. (2023). Towards a contingency model of knowledge sharing: interaction between social capital and social exchange theories. *Knowledge Management Research & Practice*, 21(1), 197-209. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14778238.2020.1866444>