

SPORTS FACILITIES DEVELOPMENT TOWARDS SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITY: A CASE STUDY OF KUALA LUMPUR

¹Maassoumeh Barghchi, ¹Dasimah bt Omar, and ²Mohd Salleh Aman

¹*Department of Town and Regional Planning, Faculty of Architecture, Planning & Surveying Universiti Teknologi MARA (UiTM), Shah Alam, 40450 Selangor, Malaysia*

²*Sports Centre, University of Malaya (UM), 50603 Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia*

Abstract

Sports and sports facilities development have improved rapidly over the past years in Malaysia. However, such improvements are inadequate compared to the overall development of sports at international level. In recent years sport is getting more and more influential and it will continue to grow in importance, even for developing countries. Increase in the amount of public money being spent on sports facilities, at the same time, increase in the number of sports facilities as well as increasingly importance of sustainability necessitate demand to investigate issues surrounding sports facilities development especially in Kuala Lumpur as the regional and national centre for sporting activities. The long-term benefits to cities and local communities need to achieve more initiative by decision-makers. However, sustainability is more important for sports facilities due to requirement of huge money for construction, ancillary needs and constant maintenance costs. This research aims to examine the effectiveness and intangible benefits of sports facilities in Kuala Lumpur through residents' perceptions. Four case studies each selected from one of the four managing zones of sports facilities developed by Kuala Lumpur City Hall provide information for this research. The research able to rank the case studies based on residents' perception towards their attitude about facilities and programmes, using of the facilities, and respondents' willingness to pay. The paper argues that the sports facilities could only have limited impacts on residents which need to improve and increase the impacts for further development.

Keywords: *Sports facilities, intangible benefits, local communities, Kuala Lumpur*

INTRODUCTION

In Malaysia, sports and sports facilities developments have improved rapidly over the past years. However, such improvements are inadequate compared to the overall development of sports at international level (National Sports Policy, 2007). There is currently tremendous interest in sports and a wave of sports investment. Moreover, sport in Malaysia is only considered as an industry in the last ten years (Aminuddin and Parilah, 2008). On the other hand, in recent years sport is getting more and more influential and it will continue to grow in importance, even for developing countries.

During informal interviews with the managers of several sports facilities at Kuala Lumpur through preliminary data gathering, it was learnt that sports facilities are underutilised and people do not use them. However, they are not economic oriented and the policy of the government is to serve people and they are tax-exempted. This is while Kuala Lumpur City Hall (KLCH) plays its role in providing different types of sports facilities to promote the community participation to actively involve in sports activities to develop healthy community towards achieving the aim for 'Active Malaysian' (KL Structure Plan 2020).

Increase in the amount of public money being spent on sports facilities, at the same time, increase in the number of sports facilities as well as increasingly importance of sustainability necessitate demand to investigate issues surrounding sports facilities development especially in Kuala Lumpur as the regional and national centre for sporting activities. This study aims to examine the effectiveness and intangible benefits of sports facilities in Kuala Lumpur through residents' perceptions. However, the long-term benefits to cities and local communities need to achieve more initiative by decision-makers. Sustainable communities looking after the places people live and work. In recent years, sustainability has assumed increasingly importance. It is more important for sports facilities due to requirement of huge money for construction, ancillary needs and constant maintenance costs. In Malaysia despite an increase in the amount of public money being spent on sports facilities construction, the existing facilities are underutilised. In addition, to guide the planning system to focus on the concept of sustainable development is a new approach to planning and design (Dasimah, 2002).

This paper uses the quantitative data from the questionnaire survey with special format to residents nearby sports facilities. It is structured as follows. The next section focuses on theoretical background of the study. It provides a brief overview on sports facilities development and explains the contingent valuation method. The third section concentrates on the sports facilities in Kuala Lumpur. However, research methodology, results and discussion are explained in section four and five. Finally, the conclusion argues that the sports facilities could only have limited impacts on residents which need to improve and increase for further development.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Definition of a sports facility is different, from open recreational areas such as golf courses to indoor arena, dome, and single-purpose or multi-use stadia (John et al., 2007). Sports facilities have changed through the years from functional facilities, adapted facilities, state-of-the art facilities to center of business and regenerating area facilities. The sports facilities construction boom that hit the North American in the 1990s started to spread internationally (Fried, 2005) which lead to a lot of researches on sports facilities. Sports facilities development require huge money for construction, almost certainly with substantial public investments, and which involved too much money compared to the cost benefit analyses. There are also needs for ancillary construction that are often built at public expense with every provision of a new facility. In addition, there is a high cost for maintenance and the truth is that it is now very difficult for a sports facility to be financially viable without some degree of subsidy. However, although so many researches, there is still an ongoing debate to build a new sports stadium with public funds (Sam and Scherer, 2008).

There are a wide range of positive and negative impacts that sports facilities construction have on their surrounding areas and wider cities. At a very basic level, the impacts are categorized as economic impacts and non-economic impacts. Rosentraub (2006) concentrate on benefits and divided them into, tangible and intangible benefits. However, majority of researches on the impacts of sports facilities have also proceeded along two very different paths, one strictly economic and the other with an eye towards non-economic impacts. In addition, there are some researches explicitly examine the ability of sports facilities as urban development in different case studies. Although so many research findings, there has been ongoing debate on the impacts of sports facilities development. The literature on non economic impacts is somewhat more positive, concluding that non economic impacts are present and often positive, but hard to quantify (Walton *et al.*, 2008). In recent years, scholars have begun to turn their attention to non-economic matter.

Contingent valuation (CV) method is the only method attempting to empirically measure intangible non-use values and potential consumption benefits associated with sports subsidies (Walker and Mondello, 2007). CV methodology, a technique commonly used in valuing environmental public goods, can be used to provide an empirical measure of the potential public consumption benefits associated with major league sports teams and facilities (Santo, 2005).

CV methodology (CVM) estimates are based primarily on hypothetical survey questioning and speculative outcomes involving individuals' willingness to pay (WTP) for natural resources, social programs, and other public projects. A consumer's WTP reflects their economic valuation of improved environmental resources. These measures of value are what economists would like to estimate so that non-market goods can be included in public policy decisions (Hanley *et al.*, 1997). Nonetheless, given the economic impact studies typically produce negligible or even negative estimates of net benefits from hosting major sporting events or building sports facilities, constructing an argument in terms of WTP represents a more credible approach to this policy choice problem (Atkinson *et al.*, 2008).

Davis (1963) used questionnaires to estimate the benefits of outdoor recreation and introduced the survey-based CVM technique to the broader scope of economic theory in the 1960s. Since then, CVM has been used to measure the benefits of a variety of non-market goods which include but are not limited to: outdoor recreation, reductions in morbidity and mortality risk, congestion in wilderness and national park settings, wildlife population restoration and facilitation, water quality, public works projects, and stadium and sport team impacts.

Survey methodologies are used exclusively by CVM researchers to present respondents with a scenario describing a hypothetical alternative level of provision of a non-market good or resource. Respondents are then asked to state their maximum WTP or minimum WTA for the hypothetical change in the quality or quantity of the good described in the scenario. Individual WTP or WTA values are initially averaged then aggregated over the population to estimate the total economic benefits associated with the scenario. Other questions typically included in a CVM survey ask respondents about their socioeconomic and demographic characteristics and their overall use of the resource (Mitchell & Carson, 1989).

Although much of the research in CVM field has sought to test the validity and reliability of the methodology, but it has been employed by sports researchers to identify consumer preferences toward team relocation and new facility construction.

SPORTS FACILITIES IN KUALA LUMPUR

Sports and Sports Facilities in Malaysia

In Malaysia the Ministry of Youth and Sports is the central administrative agency for sport and recreation (Aman, 2005). However, according to National Sports Policy (2007), the Ministry of Youth and Sports draws up a blueprint of sport facilities, coordinate planning and distribution of major facilities which is based on the strategy to have both high performance sport and mass sport for all strata of the community. Further, the State Government and the Local Authorities are responsible for planning and develop sports facilities at state and district level. The National Policy is a sport policy for all. It encompasses both High Performance Sport and Mass Sports and the role of sports facilities development is to get the local community involved in sports (National Sports Policy, 2007). However, according to Dato' Yasin (interview: 2010), Mass Sports are more related to local government.

On the other hand, Malaysia is a multi-racial and multi-religious society. These groups with different cultural backgrounds are free to practice their culture, religion and languages. Arising from this plurality of ethnic cultures, governments may seek to promote some common cultural practices as part of nation building. The aim of the National Sports Policy is to develop an active, health and fit society through sports and physical recreational activities in line with the overall efforts of the government in nation building (National Sports Policy, 2007). Undoubtedly, recreation and leisure activities, on top of other political, social and cultural activities, provide a powerful influence in the integration of all ethnic groups for social well-being (Ainol Adnan, 1979). This underlines the importance of sports, sports facilities and getting the local community involved in sports in the Malaysian context.

Sports Facilities in Kuala Lumpur Developed by KLCH

Kuala Lumpur, being the premier city and the capital of a nation with a highly trade oriented economy that aspires to be fully developed by the year 2020, Kuala Lumpur's vision, goals, functions and growth must be seen both from the national and the broader global perspective. The vision for Kuala Lumpur that is consistent with the national vision is: Kuala Lumpur – a world – class city with the aim of creating a sustainable city striking a balance between physical, economic, social and environmental development (Structure Plan, 2020). It is also mentioned by National Urbanisation Policy (2006), that the goal of urban development is to create a liveable environment which could realize peaceful community and living environment through sustainable urban development in all aspects.

Currently there are 72 sports facilities provided by KLCH. These sports facilities are divided into four managing zones. They are including football field, futsal courts, sports complex, stadium, community centres, swimming pools, multi-purpose hall etc. Majority of these facilities are not new. However, the number of these facilities will increase from year to year in line with intention of KLCH to have Kuala Lumpur as the centre for international sport centre. There are four stadiums including Stadium Titiwangsa, Badminton Stadium, Hockey Stadium and Football Stadium. The Titiwangsa and Badminton stadiums are for different type of sports, however, Hockey and Football stadiums are single use facilities.

METHODOLOGY

The research aims to examine the effectiveness and impacts of sports facilities in Kuala Lumpur through residents' perceptions. According to Spirou (1997), case study approach is an appropriate way to study the development of sport stadiums and the relationship/effect to local communities. This research focuses on the sports facilities developed by KLCH. However, mass sports in Malaysia are more related to the above agency and local authorities. In addition, to investigate and examine the impacts, it has to go through facilities which have been built at least for 5 years. The sports facilities developed by KLCH are divided into four managing zones. The four case studies were selected through interview with the managers of four managing zones based on their size namely, in zone 1, Taman Tun Dr Ismail Community Centre, zone 2 Bangsar Sports Complex, zone 3 Stadium Titiwangsa and zone 4 Swimming Complex Kuala Lumpur.

Residents' perceptions were gathered by a self-administered questionnaire distributed to the areas nearby the four case studies. The questionnaire was pre tested in a pilot study among the residents of one of the case studies. In addition, it was pre tested with the help of the statisticians and experts in Universiti Teknologi MARA. A total of 2000 questionnaires were distributed equally, 500 for each case study, by a self-administered to the letter box of houses together with a cover letter signed by the postgraduate's coordinator and also a self addressed envelope of the researcher. The quota sampling method was used as sampling and stratified with the 2008 number of housing by type including high, medium and low cost. The questionnaires were distributed by December 2009. After three months only around eleven per cent was received from all the questionnaires, which are 221 out of 2000. Even though the response rate was only 11.05 per cent, it was higher than 2.5 per cent which is according to Ahmad (2003) the frequent response rate for survey conducted in Malaysia.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section presents results and discussion from the survey. The SPSS computer software was applied for data analysis. Descriptive statistics and the correlation analysis were done by applying the SPSS. The questionnaire sent out to the residents consisted three parts of residents' attitude and interest on existing sports facilities, opinion about value and their personal profiles.

Attitude and Interest

Part I of the survey was asked residents nearby each case study on their attitude and interest towards existing sports facility in four case studies. This is concerning attitude about facilities, programmes, their using and getting to the sports facilities. The residents' perception are assumed to be an important indicator for a particular sports facility being effective to the surrounding areas and residents.

There were 31.2 per cent of the respondents who stated moderately satisfied on the existing sports facilities. The biggest group of respondents who formed 35.7 per cent either slightly satisfied or neither dissatisfied nor satisfied. Only 9 per cent of respondents with a frequency of 20 are strongly satisfied from the existing sports facilities. There were almost equal per cent of respondents who stated slightly dissatisfied or moderately dissatisfied at 2.7 and 2.3 per cent, respectively.

The respondents attitude on the programmes show that the biggest group of respondents, who forms 26.7 per cent, stated moderately satisfied on the programmes of the requested sports facilities and only 10.9 per cent strongly satisfied. The same as respondents' attitude on the facilities around 35 per cent (35.3 per cent) of respondents stated either slightly satisfied or neither dissatisfied nor satisfied. Strongly dissatisfied and moderately satisfied goes on 1.4 and 3.2 per cent with frequency of 3 and 7 out of 176 who were answered to this question. Table 1 presents the attitudes on facilities and programmes by case studies, separately.

Table 1: Comparison of Attitude on Facilities and Programmes by Cases Studies

Case Studies	Attitude about Facilities (Mean)	Attitude about Programmes (Mean)
Swimming Complex K L	4.16	3.88
Titivangsa Stadium	5.60	5.56
Bangsar Sports Complex	5.79	5.79
Taman Tun Dr Ismail Community Centre	4.81	4.50

There were 19 per cent and 20.4 per cent of respondents respectively who declined to state their attitude about the facilities and programmes of the questioned sports facility. However, it is obtained from the data that the majority of no responses are related to respondents who never use the sports facilities while there were 23.1 per cent with a frequency of 51 out of 216 who stated never use the sports facilities. The results of the question on using the existing sports facilities reveal that only 7.7 per cent of respondents use the sports facilities every day. The majority of respondents, 53 per cent, use the sports facilities sometimes or a few days per week and there were 14 per cent who use the sports facilities rarely. The results show that the Bangsar Sports Complex is the most been used sports facilities among the other, followed by Titivangsa Stadium, Taman Tun Dr Ismail Community Centre and Swimming Complex, respectively.

In the other question the respondents were asked to select how to go to the sports facilities. Although the survey was conducted to the area surrounding to the sports facilities but the majority of respondents were selected car or motorcycle for getting to the facilities at 38.5 and 33.5 per cent, respectively. Bicycle and walking were selected by 8.1 and 9 per cent of respondents. There were only 7.2 per cent of respondents who stated public transportation for going to the sports facilities.

Opinion about Value

Part II of the survey was asked residents nearby each case study on their opinion for staying close to a sports facility and willingness to pay for construction of a new sports facility. As explained earlier and obtained from literature review there are intangible benefits associated with sports facilities but the important issue is how to measure. Contingent valuation (CV) method is the only method attempting to empirically measure intangible non-use values and potential consumption benefits associated with sports subsidies (Walker and Mondello, 2007).

This part presents the analysis of CV survey to determine the value that residents surrounding each case study place on the potential consumption benefits associated

with the sports facilities. This value can be used to determine the extent to which such benefits justify a public investment in a new sports facility.

The residents were asked to state their opinion about living close to a sports facility. The majority were stated no or not important which formed 62.8 per cent of the total respondents. There were 37.2 per cent who stated yes for this question. However, 56.6 per cent with a frequency of 125 out of 213 would vote against the referendum to do renovation or construct new sports facilities by the government. There were 39.8 per cent who were voted for and 3.6 per cent did not state their opinion.

The most willing to pay (WTP), out of the respondents own household budget each year in additional taxes, to make a new sports facility possible was provided in the other question. Table 2 presents the results.

Table 2: Willingness-To-Pay

Amount of additional taxes of household budget	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Zero	85	38.5	42.1
Between RM 10 and RM 25	56	25.3	27.7
Between RM 25 and RM 50	30	13.6	14.9
Between RM 50 and RM 75	23	10.4	11.4
Between RM 75 and RM 100	6	2.7	3.0
More than RM 100	2	0.9	1.0
Total	202	91.4	100.0
No response	19	8.6	

The portion of respondents who expressed a zero WTP is so large so it is important to compare the characteristics of this group to those who expressed a positive WTP before providing more detailed analysis of WTP. The following question asked the choice on WTP. The respondents were asked to identify the reasons that best describes why they were, or were not willing to pay additional taxes to make new sports facility.

The most common reasons that respondents provided for a positive WTP were to use the sports facility close to their house and attend games in the sports facility close to their house quoted by 30.8 and 29.9 per cent, respectively. However, the next rate goes on improving areas prestigious and image at 27.1 per cent.

On the other hand, the majority of those who said they would not be willing to pay additional taxes to make new sports facility possible indicated that taxes should not be used to pay for sports facilities. About 40 per cent of those with a zero WTP selected "taxes should not be used to pay for sports facilities," as the reason that best describes why they were not willing to pay. Another 24 per cent selected, "I do not get sufficient personal benefit from new sports facility." There were 22.6 per cent who indicated a concern about the opportunity costs of such spending.

One additional question was asked to provide insight into whether respondents' stated WTP of zero truly reflects their expected utility from a new sports facility. Respondents who indicated a zero WTP were asked whether they would be in a

favour of a new sports facility construction if it did not involve additional taxes. The majority (70.1 per cent) indicated that they would not. Then referring to previous question that only 42.1 per cent of the respondents indicated a zero WTP and the rest are from respondents with positive WTP. This shows that, in most cases, a reported positive WTP should not be considered a placeholder for an unobserved positive value. In fact these group of respondents seemingly would not sure to receive benefits from the presence of a new sports facility, but are willing to pay additional taxes. There were 16.3 per cent with a frequency of 36 who indicated that they would.

Reliability analysis was done using SPSS 16.0 for quantitative variables. The alpha value calculated for all quantitative variables from the test shows that the research instrument to be treated as reliable. In addition, the correlation test was done between different variables, separately. According to comparison of different variables, including the attitude about facilities and programmes, using of the facilities, and WTP from the residents' perception, the research was able to rank the case studies. It is presented in the Table 3.

Table 3: Ranking the Type of Sports Facilities

Variables	Rank Type of Facilities			
	1	2	3	4
Attitude about Facilities	Bangsar Sports Complex	Titivangsa Stadium	Taman Tun Dr Ismail Community Centre	Swimming Complex K L
Attitude about Programme	Bangsar Sports Complex	Titivangsa Stadium	Taman Tun Dr Ismail Community Centre	Swimming Complex K L
Using of the Existing Facility	Bangsar Sports Complex	Titivangsa Stadium	Taman Tun Dr Ismail Community Centre	Swimming Complex K L
WTP	Bangsar Sports Complex	Taman Tun Dr Ismail Community Centre	Titivangsa Stadium	Swimming Complex K L

Respondents' Profile

Part III of the survey was asked residents on their demographic characteristics. Further, distance from the sports facility which was used for data analysis. The survey questionnaires were distributed to the residents around the four case studies. In addition, to achieve more response rate and due to time constraint of the research, the researcher managed to get help from the residents' associations or sports facilities staffs. The results of the data gathered shown that around 20 per cent of the people who use the facilities were staying between 6 to 15 miles which is considered as very far from the facilities. There were only 2.3 per cent of the respondents who were staying less than 1/2 miles and 36.7 per cent between 1/2 to 2 miles from the facilities, which is the area that the questionnaires were distributed by quota sampling method. This reveals that the provision of sports facilities are unbalance.

CONCLUSION

The results of the residents' perceptions survey were able to demonstrate the effectiveness and intangible benefits of the sports facilities through the four case studies. However, it can use to generalise to other sports facilities in Kuala Lumpur Federal Territory developed by KLCH. The research found that the sports facilities are not used by the people who were staying in the area surrounding. However,

around 20 per cent of the respondents were staying between 6 to 15 miles from the case studies. Although, eighty per cent of the questionnaires distributed less than two miles distance. This reveals that the provision of sports facilities are unbalance. The results of residents' perception show that attitude about facilities are better than programmes. In addition, the minimum response for facilities was moderately dissatisfied, while it was strongly dissatisfied for programmes. This research was used the Contingent Valuation (CV) Method which obtained from the literature. The results shows that the sports facilities could only have limited impacts on residents which need to improve and increase the impacts for further development. The research able to rank the case studies based on residents' perception towards their attitude about facilities and programmes, using of the facilities, and WTP from the residents' perception that can be used for future improvement. The result of overall ranking the case studies was as follows: (1) Bangsar Sports Complex, (2) Titiwangsa Stadium, (3) Taman Tun Dr Ismail Community Centre and (4) Swimming Complex K L.

REFERENCES

- Ainol Adnan. (1979). *Unity through sports*. National Sport Congress, University of Malaya & Ministry of Culture, Youth and Sport, Malaysia: Kuala Lumpur.
- Ahmad, K. Z. (2003). *So You Want To Get A Ph. D.* Malaysia: Thomson.
- Aminuddin, Y. and Parilah, M. S. (2008). Globalization and the Malaysian Sports Industry. *Research Journal of International Studies*, 8.
- Atkinson G., Mourato S., Szymanski S., and Ozdemiroglu E. (2008). Are We Willing to Pay Enough to “Back the Bid”? : Valuing the Intangible Impacts of London’s Bid to Host the 2012 Summer Olympic Games. *Urban Studies*, Vol. 45, No. 2, pp. 419-444.
- Barghchi, M., Dasimah Bt Omar. & Mohd Salleh Aman. (2009). Sports Facilities and Sustainable Development. Proceedings, ARCOM Doctoral Research Workshop 'Sustainability in the Built Environment', 16 November 2009, University of Plymouth, UK.
- Dasimah Bt Omar. (2002). New Town Development in Peninsular Malaysia: Case Studies of New Town Development by State Economic Development Corporation (Doctoral dissertation, Universiti Teknologi MARA, Malaysia, 2002).
- Fried, G. (2005). *Managing Sport Facilities*. Boston London Singapore: Human Kinetics.
- Government of Malaysia. (2007). National Sports Policy.
- Government of Malaysia. (2004). KL Structure Plan, 2020.
- Government of Malaysia. (2006). National Urbanisation Policy.
- John G., Sheard R. and Vickery B. (2007). *Stadia: A Design and Development Guide*. Germany: Architectural Press.

- Mohd Salleh Aman. (2005). Leisure policy in New Zealand and Malaysia: a comparative study of developments in sport and physical recreation (Doctoral dissertation, Lincoln University. New Zealand).
- Rosentraub, M. (2006). The Local Context of a Sports Strategy for Economic Development, *Economic Development Quarterly*, Vol. 20, No. 3, pp. 278-291
- Sam, P. M. and Scherer, J. (2008). Stand Up and Be Counted: Numerical Storylines in a Stadium Debate. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 43(1).
- Santo, C. (2005). The Economic Impact of Sports Stadiums: Recasting the Analysis in Context. *Journal of Urban Affairs Association*, 27(2), pp. 171-191.
- Spirou, C. S. (1997). Stadium Development and Urban Communities in Chicago (Doctoral dissertation, Loyola University, Chicago, USA, 1997).
- Walker, Matthew, & Mondello, J. Michael,. (2007). Moving Beyond Economic Impact: A Closer Look at the Contingent Valuation Method. *International Journal of Sport Finance*, 2(3), 149-160.
- Walton, Harry, & Logo, Alberto, & Dawson, Peter,. (2008). A Contingent Valuation of the 2012 London Olympic Games: A Regional Perspective. *Journal of Sports Economics* 9(3), 304-317.