CONSTRUCT VALIDITY OF SOCIAL IMPACT SCALES FOR SPORT EVENTS
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Synopsis:
This study tests the construct validity of two different social impact scales by comparing the perceived social impact of a non-mega sport event for the same group of respondents.

Abstract:

1. AIM OF ABSTRACT/PAPER - RESEARCH QUESTION
This study tests the construct validity of two different social impact scales by comparing the perceived social impact of a non-mega sport event for the same group of respondents.

2. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND OR LITERATURE REVIEW*
Work related to economic and tourism impacts of sport events do not show substantial economic growth or sustainable tourism outcomes in host communities. Therefore, researchers have begun to focus their attention on the social value of events (e.g., Inoue & Havard, 2014; Taks, 2013). Given that social impact is an intangible outcome and not directly observable, accurately measuring this concept is challenging. To date, several theories have underpinned the development of various social impact scales, including Social Exchange Theory (e.g., Karakadis & Kaplanidou, 2012), Community Attachment Theory (e.g., Onyx & Bullen, 2000), and Social Identity Theory (e.g., Heere et al., 2013). Vargas-Sanchez et al. (2010) recommended using an integrated approach to measuring social impact in order to take into account the multiple dimensions of this concept. Resultantly, there is a need to further develop the scales that exist in the social impact literature, so the research field can rely on more robust and unified measurement tools.

3. METHODOLOGY, RESEARCH DESIGN AND DATA ANALYSIS
Data were collected in the context of the 2014 Ontario Summer Games (OSG), which were hosted in a medium sized city in Canada. A total of 626 residents’
responses were collected. Event attendees (29%) completed the paper questionnaire on site at the time of the event. Non-event attendees (71%) were intercepted in a public space over the course of four separate days around the time of the event to complete the questionnaire (electronically or on paper). The dataset used social impacts constructs (17 items on a 7-point Likert scale from 1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree), and reflect two previously developed scales. Social Impact Scale A (SIS-A) consists of 4 constructs: (1) psychological, feel-good factor (4 items); (2) social cohesion, community pride and engagement (4 items); (3) disorder and conflict (4 items), and (4) a newly added construct: sport participation and physical activity (1 item). Social Impact Scale B (SIS-B) consists of 5 constructs: (1) social cohesion (3 items); (2) community spirit and pride (4 items); (3) disorder and conflict (4 items); (4) community engagement (1 item), and (5) sport participation and physical activity (1 item, newly added and similar to SIS-A). EFA (Principal Component Analysis) was used to test the construct validity of the scales. The following scenario’s were being tested: (1) convergent and discriminant validity of the original constructs in both scales; (2) EFA of both scales (without and with the newly added sport participation variable); and (3) EFA for all variables in the data set (combining all items of SIS-A and SIS-B). Inter-reliability (Cronbach’s Alpha scores) was tested for all constructs. Based on the analyses, the best possible alternative is proposed.

4. RESULTS, DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS/CONCLUSIONS**

The theoretical constructs in both scales showed sufficient convergent validity, but only partially supported discriminant validity as the correlations between some constructs exceed r=.80 (p<.001). EFA of SIS_A resulted in two components a “positive” and “negative” social impact factor (whether or not the new sport participation variable was included). EFA of SIS-B without the sport participation variable resulted in a similar set of two components. However, when the sport participation variable was added to SIS-B, three components appeared. The positive social impact was now represented by two constructs; the third factor remained the negative social impact factor. An EFA of all 17 items revealed the same three constructs: (1) “Feel-Good and Social Cohesion”, (2) “Social Capital”, and (3) “Conflict and Disorder”. Overall, the negative social impact factor “Disorder and Conflict” consistently appeared as a standalone factor, even if different sets of items were being used. Adding the sport participation variables into the mix, added an important dimension to the initial, one-dimensional positive social impact construct, as two distinctive positive social impact constructs appeared. Based on the findings, a scale of 13 items and three constructs is proposed. The proposed scale also captures measurement of social impact utilized in other scales such as: community excitement, community attachment, event excitement, community pride, social camaraderie (e.g., Inoue, Y. & Havard, 2014), and interconnection, interdependence, and social connectedness (e.g., Heere et al., 2013). This scale needs to be applied in a variety of future events, and in different contexts and settings to tests its consistency. Using similar instruments for different events will assist in developing an event typology that maps different types of sport events and their contexts with their specific outcomes.
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