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Abstract

While the Japanese tourism industry came close to its maturity, behind the industry’s growth, there is a great concern that the country might fall into overtourism issues, which are similar to other tourism developed countries. This study investigates which factor is more influential on residents’ support for tourism development through the case of the Tokyo Olympics. Based on the hypothesis derived from Social Exchange Theory, the research was conducted that people who feel certain benefits from the Tokyo Olympics have supportive opinions for tourism development. As a part of the investigation, an online questioner was distributed to residents and commuters in the Tokyo area. Respondents were asked what impact (positive and negative) they expect Tokyo Olympics might cause. The results were analyzed by using multiple regression analysis and crosstabulation. The result indicated that community attachment is the most positive influence on residents’ perceptions towards the Tokyo Olympics, amongst other variables. Furthermore, it became clear that even respondents expect a negative impact from the event, it does not necessarily influence their support of tourism development. The result pointed out the complexity of exchange between people which Social Exchange Theory cannot fully explain.
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1 Introduction

On the evening of 7 September 2013, the announcement that Tokyo will be the host city of Olympic Games 2020 was welcomed by great excitement and joy by the people of Japan. Although the Games have been postponed due to the effects of COVID-19, if the plan comes to reality, it will be the fourth Olympics to be held in Japan, following the 1964 Summer Olympics in Tokyo, the 1972 Winter Olympics in Sapporo, and the 1998 Winter Olympics in Nagano. The ultimate aim of the Games is human development and world peace through sport, and there are many other ripple effects that the Olympic Games are expected to bring.

However, it is clear from past editions that the Olympic Games do not only bring benefits to countries and individuals but also lead to losses. In previous Olympic host cities, after the frenzy of excitement is over, the facilities used for the competitions and the Olympic Village have often been left unused (Davis, 2020). In some cases, the abundant facilities have been covered with graphite and left in ruins, or the demolition of buildings has been left in progress. In Turin, Italy, the Olympic village was occupied by refugees looking for a place to live, which caused complications for the city (Provost & Lai, 2020).

In the case of the Tokyo Olympics, it is clear that the Olympic logo’s copyright issues (BBC News, 2015) and bribery scandal (Ingle, 2017) are delivering negative impacts on Japan’s reputation on the global stage. Furthermore, it has become clear that the Tokyo Olympics will be the most expensive Summer Olympic Games on record, even at the pre-event phase (Wade, 2020). Above all, with the Olympics just around the corner and no clear management plan is in place to deal with the COVID-19 situation, some are questioning the government’s ability to take responsibility for organizing the event.

It is no wonder that the significance of hosting the Olympic Games has been called into question in the wake of these problems. In particular, it is not surprising that friction is emerging between event stakeholders, event organizers, and the residents of the city who are making a significant contribution to providing the space and financial resources for hosting the Olympic Games. Some have started questioning whether there is any point in holding an event at the risk that is already being foreseen.

This aim of this study is to determine what factors influence the public’s opinion of the Olympic Games. Ultimately, this study will show how the Olympic Games can be approached in a way that maximizes the benefits for all event stakeholders. By further exploring differences in perceived benefits between local residents and commuters in the destination, this study also touches on
identifying stakeholders’ highest interests in hosting the Olympics, which policymakers can utilize to achieve accomplishing beneficial events for all parties.

1.1 Scientific relevance

As will be discussed in the section on societal relevance, the Japanese government is not taking into account the risk of overtourism as they design current tourism management policies. One of the reasons for the lack of understanding of tourism pollution in Japanese society as a whole, in both government and residents, is the regional breakout of overtourism phenomena. The concentration of overtourism phenomena in certain popular tourist destinations is natural since tourism-related activities bring mass visitors, which are the cause of the phenomena. However, due to problems occurring only in specific locations, they receive limited attention from society as a whole. In 2018, UNWTO conducted a survey subjected to residents in fifteen countries to measure residents’ perception towards city tourism (UNWTO & IPSOS, 2019). During the survey, Japanese residents assigned the lowest score among the countries with the questions measuring the extent of residents’ negative experience by tourism¹.

The survey conducted by UNWTO and IPSOS shows that the country does not encounter many causes of overtourism effects. Yet, another research shows the impact of overtourism exists in Japan. The Japan Tourism Agency (JTA) and the National Institute for Land and Infrastructure Policy conducted an extensive local-level survey with 214 local governments that host major tourism cities in order to focus on more specific areas to assess the current overtourism situation in Japan (Japan Tourism Agency, 2019). Both organizations agreed that it is overreached to conclude that the country experiences overtourism cases yet, even though it is unquestionable the phenomena already occur locally. The results of the survey indicate that all 138 local authorities who responded to the survey were aware of the challenges associated with the rise in the number of travelers visiting and were especially aware of the individual problems associated with congestion and bad manners in recent years. They conclude the study by acknowledging that many local authorities have started to take steps to resolve these challenges (ibid.).

In Japanese academia, the topic of overtourism, not to mention the relation of resident’s welfare, has not been explored in-depth. Studies attempting to find ways of improving tourism in a

---

¹ In regard of negative effect of tourism, the participants were asked to what extent tourism influences overcrowding on the streets/shops/public transport, increasing cost of housing, increasing cost of goods and services, and increasing cost of transport.
way that takes into account the well-being of residents are rare. Some of the research, which deals with the topic of sustainability, is focusing on the methods mitigating the negative impact of overtourism by controlling tourists. Researchers analyze the subject, such as achieving sustainable tourism development by controlling tourist behaviors, guiding tourists to new destinations, imposing entrance fees, and promoting diverse travel styles based on time. Therefore, even though the relevant information for sustainable tourism development is available in the academic world, the current situation has not yet reached the stage of applying this knowledge to come up with solutions to practice strategic development.

Furthermore, because of the newness of the topic, few studies have been conducted on the topic of investigating the relationship between overtourism and Tokyo Olympics take into account Japanese characteristics within the academic field. Thus, there is a wide unknown area of research on this topic, and it can undoubtedly contribute to the educational field. It can therefore be argued that the conduct of this study would help to fill the information gap in the implementation of resident-friendly tourism growth that has been missing in previous studies.

1.2 Societal relevance

Despite the fact that Japan has set its sights on an intensive investment into the tourism industry as a tourism-oriented nation after the declaration of a tourism-based nation policy in 2003, there is still a lack of critical view on tourism development with regards to residents’ quality of life. In 2003, the Japanese government announced a plan to make tourism responsible for Japanese economic growth, and commit to harvesting benefits from the industry because of the prospect of significant growth and the ripple effect in the economic sector (Japan Tourism Agency, 2020). The policy plan, called ‘Visit Japan Campaign’, was carried out by both public and private sectors as an intensive inbound marketing promotion targeting the fourteen countries where they are predicted to experience economic growth (Japan National Tourism Organization, 2017). One of the policy goals was to increase the number of foreign tourists up to 20 million by the year 2020. However, the government reached the initial goal by 2018, earlier than it was planned initially, and the government revised the target number of international tourists to 40 million.

In general, the government’s tourism policies are mainly focused on attracting more tourists and maximizing the inflow of tourism expenditure. Contrary to the optimistic attitude of attracting more tourists, the attitude focused on preventing tourism’s adverse impact seemed lacking in the policy makers’ minds. ‘The vision of tourism industry supporting the future of the Japanese industry’,
launched in 2016, is the policy plan to determine the Japanese tourism industry’s direction for the forthcoming years (Japan Tourism Agency, 2016). The focus of the policy is characterized by three pillars: energizing local economies with local characteristics as a tourist attraction, being competitive in the world-class tourism industry, growing the tourism industry as the primary industry in Japan and achieving a stress-free environment for visitors. However, none of those policy elements are dedicated to preventing the negative impact of tourist arrivals.

Kohsaka (2019) warns for the lack of the Japanese government’s risk awareness of overtourism by analyzing the current pattern of the Japanese government’s tourism management strategy and the contents of the policy plan in-depth. According to the scholar, in the action plan of ‘tourism vision and planning for a prospect in 2018’, the government is proactive about opening up public facilities such as palaces, gardens, national banks as tourist attractions. Also, the places that used to be subjects of preservation in prior years such as a national park, art, or science museum collections, are now encouraged to be utilized as tourist attractions. Despite the government’s ambitious planning of resource usage, there are no policies included in the project intended to protect or preserve the cultural and natural heritage from overuse (ibid.).

As it has become clear that the concept of overtourism is still a new subject to discuss in Japanese society, it can be pointed out that Japanese society is not used to handling the negative consequences of tourism. The country is not ready to face the drastic growth in tourism or prevent unfavorable consequences of tourism. The future prospects of the industry in the country indicate that there are more tourists than ever before. The empirical data shows that drastic tourism development would result in disadvantageous results compared to small-scale development with organic and slow speed (Ratz, 2003).

Given the current situation, shedding light on the relationship between the residents of a tourist destination and tourism development in the Japanese tourism industry, which has not yet been clarified, could identify possibilities to make tourism development more accommodating. Applying those possibilities into practices in tourism development will bring the industry closer to society’s goal of managing tourism development in the long term in a sustainable way.

Furthermore, as a part of a promotion in the tourism industry, the Japanese government has turned its attention to the use of sports tourism to create a purpose for tourists and encourage the movement of people. In fact, Japan has been hosting or expecting world-class sports events for three consecutive years, including the Rugby World Cup 2019, the Tokyo Olympic and Paralympic Games (Oripara) 2020, postponed to 2021, and the World Masters Games 2021 Kansai in 2021 (Japan Sports
Agency, 2020). As Japan is expected to actively host several international events in the future, exploring ways to grow the tourism industry in a sustainable manner is worthwhile for Japanese society.

1.3 Research objectives & Research questions

This thesis aims to contribute to the current knowledge of how residents in tourism destinations develop their attitudes towards tourism development. To be more precise, the purpose of this thesis is to identify what variables positively or negatively influence the attitudes of residents in the host city Tokyo to hosting Olympic Games, and subsequently their support for hosting the Tokyo Olympics 2020. It is vital to gain insight into the elements that influence residents’ opinions on tourism development as the country is spurring on growth in the tourism industry. The aim is to establish a correlation between optimistic residents’ perception of tourism development and certain variables, such as economic and social factors, an increased focus upon which would support harmonious tourism development during the development management. However, while many types of research have been conducted to show the relationship between positive and negative perception of tourism and support from residents, “historically most research on residents’ perceptions has been atheoretical” (Haley et al., 2005, p. 649). Therefore, diving into this subject would contribute to exploring the social impact of tourism, especially residents’ perception, where intensive research has not been performed yet.

Taking account of the goal of this thesis, this work will contribute to:

- Understanding the overall picture of the relationships between stakeholders involved in the Tokyo Olympic Games
- Understanding the mechanism of residents’ process of developing perceptions in the context of tourism development
- The knowledge for Japanese policymakers and practitioners in the tourism industry to come up with new solutions for organizing mega-events to alleviate residents’ burden.

In order to achieve the aims mentioned above, the main question is formulated as:

“What elements affect host city residents’ perceptions of tourism development in the context of hosting the Tokyo Olympic Games 2020?”

This research is based on the social exchange theory’s idea that almost all social interactions are based on some form of ‘exchange’ (the theory will be explained in more details later in 2. Theoretical Debate on Tourism). In short, if one’s expenses in the relationship exceed benefits, for
instance, the amount of effort or money put into a relationship is not reciprocal. The imbalance in the exchanging activity may cause problems. Based on this theory and past research performed by other researchers, several hypotheses are formulated.

HY 1: The people who perceive benefits from the Tokyo Olympics (e.g., increase in income, feeling of unifying Japan as a whole, good reputation for Japan as a tourist destination) tend to have higher support towards the Tokyo Olympics compared to those who do not.

HY 2: The people perceive individual benefits from the Tokyo Olympics tend to have higher support towards the Tokyo Olympics than those who perceive collective benefits.

HY 3: The people who perceive economic benefit from the Tokyo Olympics tend to have higher support towards the Tokyo Olympics compare to other benefits.

HY 4: The people who have emotional attachment to Tokyo tend to have higher support towards the Tokyo Olympics.

HY 5: The people who feel their opinions are taken into account in creating the Tokyo Olympics (e.g., volunteering, joining projects/ campaigns) have more relaxed views towards negative impacts caused by the Tokyo Olympics compared to those who do not.

Hence, another purpose of this thesis is to show if the hypotheses established based on the theoretical expectation are consistent with the empirical data. Suppose the primary hypothesis is not correct, then it is also worth analyzing what factors caused the outcome to be different from the assumption based on theories and past research. In order to answer the main question, several sub-questions are formulated:

1. In the past research what has been identified the relation between tourism development and residents’ perception in the destination?
2. Who are the stakeholders involved in the Tokyo Olympics?
3. What measures do the authorities take to reduce the negative impact on residents while hosting the Tokyo Olympics?
2 Theoretical Debate on Tourism

This chapter serves to introduce necessary background knowledge as we speak of the theme in this research. To better understand which factors come into play in a mechanism for residents to form an opinion on tourism development, intensive research has been performed through literature. This chapter can generally be divided into three sections.

The first section focuses on the topic of overtourism, which is believed to be a significant factor in the forming of local residents’ opinion on tourism development. The information collected mainly focuses on the historical pre-overtourism era, critical incidents in the emergence of overtourism, definitions of overtourism by major authorities in the tourism industry, and gaining a deeper understanding of overtourism through a deconstruction of its phenomena.

The second section of this chapter introduces the role of local residents in tourism studies and how it has changed over time. Specifically, a discussion on the subject of local residents in tourism development, and the surrounding factors and situations which have caused the change in their role are discussed in greater depth.

The third section introduces the theoretical framework, Social Exchange Theory (SET), which was employed in this research to see the relationship between residents’ perception and the event of hosting the Tokyo Olympics. In addition to the general concept of SET by Homans, significant fragments of the theory which are useful to employ to this research are explained in depth. Cases of tourism research which utilized SET are also introduced.

2.1 Overtourism

Urban tourism is defined as a type of tourism that involves tourism activities happening in urban environments. The definition of urban tourism includes “the activities of international and domestic visitors as well as residents in urban areas, contextualized by built and natural landscapes, amenities and infrastructures” (Cave & Jolliffe, 2012, p. 268). This type of tourism style is welcomed by a wide range of tourists, since tourists’ motivation is often to look for the gateway to other places from what they are used to in their ordinary life. In addition to the tourist’s motivation, urban tourism holds the advantage of speaking to tourists desires as the urban tourist destinations provide “a broad and heterogeneous range of cultural, architectural, technological, social and natural experiences and products for leisure and business” (The World Tourism Organization, 2020). The characteristics of every city, which stems from its “own natural form, sense of place, sense of history, spirit and ethos”
(Giriwati et al., 2013, p. 165), are the essence that most of the tourists from outside of the community find interesting and worth seeing.

The tourist attractions that cities can offer, “sightseeing, leisure, shopping, visiting friends and family, religion, business venues, participation in congresses, conferences, entertainment (events, clubs), training, transport” (CEOpedia, 2019), are considered as essential functions of a city. That is to say, every city which is capable of supplying tourism components has the potential to attract tourists (Giriwati et al., 2013). The nature of urban tourism covers a wide range of situations: “megacities of more than 10 million inhabitants, to small cities and towns in both the developed and undeveloped worlds” (Cave & Jolliffe, 2012, p. 268). Because of the high degree of applicability of urban tourism, urban tourism is often seen as “an essential tool to achieve redevelopment of urban space, for economic regeneration and job creation and rebrand cities” (Williams & Lew, 2014, p.173) and many cities attempt to revitalize their economy with it. The establishment of new travel styles in urban area creates an influx of tourists into living areas, which can eventually become a cause of nuisance for residents. Such cases of abundant tourist influx give rise to tensions between tourists and local residents. As the frequency of these tensions increases, it becomes increasingly important to establish measures and definitions in order to assess potential problem spots, and to find ways to address them.

2.1.1 Carrying Capacity

The word ‘carrying capacity’ was introduced as a critical concept in sustainable tourism discourse around the 1960s in tourism and recreational studies (Kennell, 2016). Until establishing the definition of carrying capacity, the amount of a tourist resource which tourists can consume in destinations was abstract. Without a common understanding between researchers, it was hard to measure or visualize the impact of tourism on society. Thus, the model was established as a way to measure the “ideal number of tourists who can make use of a tourist resource” with a variety of scientific methods (ibid., p.133). UNWTO also refers to carrying capacity as “the maximum number of people that may visit a tourist destination at the same time, without causing destruction of the physical, economic and socio-cultural environment and an unacceptable decrease in the quality of visitors’ satisfaction” (UNWTO 2018, p.3).

In 1983, Getz explained the variety of factors that construct carrying capacity by deconstructing the concept into six elements: physical, economic, perceptual, social, ecological, and political (Kennell, 2016). In his explanation, physical carrying capacity means the maximum amount of a tourist resource tourists can consume before showing severe damage to the resource. This criterion
relates to issues of overcrowding in specific locations. The economic capacity indicates the highest use of tourism recourses that will not contribute to the local’s unsustainable degree of dependency on the tourism business. Tourism destinations that exceed their economic capacity often face issues such as uncontrollable inflation or shortage of labor. The perceptual carrying capacity refers to the maximum capacity of tourist recourses before tourists start feeling overcrowded and looking into alternative tourist destinations. The social carrying capacity is the maximum capacity of resources in the destination, which would not cause the trouble feelings in locals’ mind. The ecological capacity is the highest use of natural resources without causing irreversible damage to the local ecosystem. The potential issues related to this capacity are wildlife's and nature’s viability in destinations. Lastly, political capacity is the maximum degree of resource usage without causing political instability. This capacity is deeply connected to institutional issues such as conflict over land rights. Rather than using these carrying capacity concepts directly to determine the maximum acceptable number of tourists at a particular destination, Kennell (2016) suggests using them as key indicators for monitoring the health of a tourist destination.

With the establishment of the concept of carrying capacity, it has become much easier for researchers and practitioners to visualize the impact of excessive tourism activities in destinations and measure the magnitude of negative impacts. Yet, no clear definition of overtourism has been established in tourism studies.

As an example of a definition of overtourism by institutions, UNWTO describes the concept as “destinations where hosts or guests, locals or visitors, feel that there are too many visitors and that the quality of life in the area or the quality of the experience has deteriorated unacceptably” in the report: “Overtourism”? Understanding and Managing Urban Tourism Growth beyond Perceptions” published in 2018 (UNWTO, 2018, p. 4). UNWTO consolidates the definition of overtourism by applying the concept of carrying capacity and brings clarity to the term overtourism in general. For instance, there is the common misunderstanding that the damage from tourism is caused by an excessive number of visitors. To change such common misunderstandings, UNWTO emphasizes the importance of the capacity of destinations, good management practice, and controlled development.

2.1.2 Socio-cultural Effect
The swarm of tourists and the lousy manners of some tourists make residents feel unwelcome in their own home. Amsterdam is a city historically famous for its image as a liberal and tolerant city, and the government used to actively promote the city’s image as a part of city branding. The promotion
attracted specific groups of tourists who wish to engage in activities involving soft drugs and prostitution. For instance, thanks to the excessively marketed images of the destination, the city is now famous for stag and hen parties. The city is occupied with tourists day and night. In addition to the significant number of tourists Amsterdam is accommodating, 17 million visitors in 2017 and prospect higher up to 30 million by 2025 (Hospers, 2019), the nuisance from tourists such as noise disturbance, public intoxication and public urination are enough to lower the resident’s quality of life.

In addition to disturbing tourist’s behaviors, the tourism industry also contributes to lowering the quality of life of residents by modifying city structures. In current-day Amsterdam, tourism-related shops, cannabis shops, and major street food brand shops, which are targeted to tourists and day-trippers, dominate the local living area in the city. The abundance of tourist-targeted shops in the town results in the homogenization of culture through the loss the historic and unique characteristics of the city. Furthermore, it makes the city less livable for residents because of its lack of a variety of necessary shops for daily life. In response to these phenomena, the municipality of Amsterdam implemented a rule which bans building new tourists-targeted shops in postcode 1012 area and more than 40 shopping streets adjacent to this area (Gemeente Amsterdam, 2020).

Another example of negative change affecting locals through tourism development is the case of Himalayan porters who are forced to carry out dangerous tasks because of the high dependency on tourism. Thanks to the higher demand for trekking tourism, mountain areas such as the Khumbu region located in northeastern Nepal have been experiencing societal and environmental change since the 1960s (Nyaupane et al., 2014). The region is known as experiencing a “relatively rapid transition from subsistence to a cash economy” (Pawson et al., 1984, p. 237). The transition from a conventional lifestyle to a modern cash economy was encouraged by the rise of demand for trekking tourism. The change guided the local economy to gradually rely on tourism.

However, the downside of trekking tourism in the Khumbu region is that the majority of trekking visitors arrive during the high season during spring and fall, with summer being considered offseason due to the rainy season. The seasonal fluctuation of tourist numbers heavily affects porters’ income and prevent porters from gaining stable income throughout a year. Furthermore, people’s enthusiasm towards trekking has brought tourists without sufficient experience in trekking. As a consequence, porters are forced to face risks as they carry extra luggage from visitors, or by guiding them in severe conditions in the mountains. It is reported that the chance of porters getting injured during trekking is four times as high as for trekkers (Responsible Travel, 2020). Even though porters face great danger during their work, it is not a common choice for them to remove themselves from a porter job since the income is necessary for local to sustain their life.
2.1.3 Economic Effect
As an easy way of making cash or an alternative option for pricy hotel rooms, short-term stay business is accepted around the world as a new way of travelling for both tourists and locals. At a glance, the service seemed a great deal for both visitors and locals. Yet, now the expansion of service is perceived as the trigger of the gentrification issue in destinations.

In popular tourist destinations such as Barcelona, more and more rooms are now purchased or rented in order to make use of them as rental rooms. Because of the higher demand, the general price of property has been increasing sharply. In the end, the permanent population cannot compete with the high price of properties and are forced to move out of the city (Hinsliff, 2020). This is explained as ‘tragedy of commons’. In this case, private property is considered a common resource and eventually, the individual’s action based on their self-interest causes a disadvantage for the collective benefit (Banyan, 2014).

Another example of the tragedy of commons is the inflation of the price of goods in destinations. The rise of goods in a popular tourist destination applies not only to properties but also daily necessities, the price for transportation and prices at restaurants. For locals, the goods are essential to sustain their lives in destinations. Therefore, the gentrification caused by commercial changes are crucial for locals in the matter of staying in or leaving from their neighborhood.

Since tourism-related jobs are considered as a kind of work that comprise low-skilled jobs: requiring relatively low levels of technology and basic labor skills (Walmsley, 2017) compared to other industries, the workers in the industry are paid less and garner less respect.

In addition to the comparably lower salary, the key characteristic of the tourism sector makes the job less advantageous to employees. The tourism industry holds a high rate of part-time employment, which indicates less security and stability for workers. In fact, in the EU economy, the ratio of temporary workers is significantly higher than in the non-financial business economy at 23% versus 14% (Eurostat, 2018). Observing the whole economy, excluding popular destination such as Greece, Cyprus, Portugal and Spain, it can be concluded that the tourism industry has a higher proportion of part-time employment compared to the rest of the industries (ibid.). If the tourism economy experiences instability due to obstacles such as natural disaster or pandemic, part-time workers are more prone to losing employment compared to permanent workers. The tourism industry generates a system in which employees are indirectly forced to choose a disadvantageous work style.
2.1.4 Environmental Effect
As we speak of environmental issues in destinations, they are not limited to exceeding the use of natural resources. As well as the concern of abuse of environmental resource, the term environmental issue also includes the condition of physical residents’ area. Venice is a city where the severe deterioration of location is prominently observed. It was not so long ago when concerning levels of flooding started being observed in the city, which was originally built above the water as a port city (Hospers, 2019). The city is not as resilient as normal cities on the land to a large number of visitors because of its structure, and the excessive number of tourists causes water flooding and sinking problems in Venice. Of course, there are other factors contributing to flooding issues, such as water level rise caused by climate change, yet it is also clear that the process is accelerated by mass tourism (ibid).

2.2 Local Residents
In order to identify which segment of tourism study is relevant to this research, it is relevant to research in what topic local residents are discussed more often in a manner we are trying to investigate in this research.

In the early stages of development studies, the relationship between tourists and residents is generally described as host and guest. Originally, international tourism has been introduced to society as a tool of achieving redistribution of economic power between countries and the cure for the economic imbalance between countries. The hope behind the attempt was that developing countries could gain tourists’ expenses and the profit would support improving infrastructures in the area to create a suitable environment for tourism, which would result in improving the quality of life of the local population and bringing more financial gain and societal development (OECD Tourism Trends and Policies 2020, 2020). The WTO objectives were also primarily focused on the contribution of tourism to the less developed countries of the world (Sharpley, 2002).

However, the structure of international tourism created a disadvantageous relationship between developing countries and developed countries. The relationship is built on the power structure throughout the tourism business that the developing countries in the South experience social, cultural, and environmental impacts caused by the economically powerful countries in the North consuming the tourism resource, and eventually are forced to alter their lifestyles. Even though the system that caused negative impacts on the destination community was initially described with developed countries and developing countries, the basic structure of the problem applies to the relationship between developed countries as well. In this study’s case, the case of hosting the Tokyo
Olympics, we can see a cause-effect relationship between residents in Tokyo and the Tokyo Olympics. Therefore, it is clear that this study most probably deals with the power relationship created in the destination.

An example of an area of study that focuses on residents’ role in relation to tourism development is Tourism Development Studies, in which researchers are concerned with issues related to the development from caused impact, involved parties, a way of measuring impact, and consequences of development. Also, in the field of tourism study, tourism impact studies and QoL studies are common areas of study in which researchers look into the role of residents’ perceptions. According to Porras-Bueno et al. (2018), the fundamental difference between these two studies exists in the measurement methods which they employ. On the one hand, attitude/impact studies heavily focus on the way in which tourism is viewed as having an effect on communities, whereas QoL studies mainly focus on how these impacts affect the satisfaction of the community, neighborhood, and individuals. In the next section, we will look more specifically at the topic of how residents are concerned in the discussion of tourism development.

As the research on the relationship between tourism development and resident has advanced, additionally to the role of victims, residents have also come to be considered a critical pillar of sustainable development plans because of their role as solutions to the adverse impact of tourism. This is because the focus of research has shifted from “understanding the mechanism of tourism development, causing negative impact on residents” to “finding the solution to the adverse effect”.

2.2.1 Tourism-Related Tensions
To elaborate on the topic of the resident role and residents’ perceptions in the context of contemporary tourism development, it is necessary to revisit the relationship between the tourism development system and local resident members in past tourism studies. In relationship with tourism development, residents are often seen as the victims of the negative impact of tourism.

In the process of tourism development, the local residents are considered as obstacles for projects by development management leaders and are often believed to slow down the process of development projects (Reid, 2019). This is because the residents’ strong identity rooted in their home makes them reluctant to accept change in their traditional lifestyle and in physical scenery of the destination (Janusz et al., 2017), causing conflict between the two parties. As a result, residents are often excluded from making decisions for development plans by the practitioners focused on bringing results in time, and profit-focused tourism development often brings worse effects than benefits to local inhabitants. Thus, the negative impact of tourism development has become the norm in people’s
minds and new projects are often treated by local community members with scepticism (Reid, 2019). Residents who have no voice in important management decision are affected by rapid or unplanned tourism development. This has resulted in residents being established in their position as victims in the unplanned tourism growth in the research.

One of the reasons contributing to ineffective and unsuccessful development in the tourism industry is using the wrong criteria to measure the success of tourism development. The majority of a conventional evaluating system for tourism success relies on metric information such as the number of tourists arriving. This type of data is an easy way to inform the public of the growth of the industry by presenting the amount of growth over a certain period of time. Policies are also often based on a growth-paradigm that places major value on gaining more tourists. In the OECD report from 2020, the need for change in the measurement of tourism success is expressed as the ideal future of the industry. According to the report, the success of tourism should not be measured in visitor numbers alone, but rather “should focus on the positive impact that tourism can provide at the destination level and the benefits delivered to local economies and communities.” (OECD Tourism Trends and Policies 2020, 2020, p.96).

Several NGOs from different disciplines, devoted to taking action against the inequality in globalized tourism, have come together to discuss the possible future of the tourism industry and have published an online compendium (Alba sud et al., 2017). In the “Tourism in the 2030 Agenda”, they emphasize the importance of evaluating tourism through sustainable development instead of economic success.

They claim that there is a need to carefully choose the right indicators to measure tourism growth. There is no doubt about the power and impact of the tourism industry, with the fact that more than one billion international tourists travel every year. However, blindly accepting such a number as a growth measurement is an inaccurate move since it masks a large amount of relevant detail. For example, the number does not reflect the fact that only a specific group of people, a small, wealthy minority of the world, travels several times a year. Furthermore, there should be much more attention paid to domestic travel rather than just international travel, since when it comes to domestic travel, the global number of trips is estimated to be five to six billion per year. Therefore, the simple sum of international tourist arrival numbers hides the complexity of the industry and diminishes the public’s interest in issues surrounding the industry.

Tourism development plan often neglect residents’ opinions, and lack of support for overtourism issues cause harm to local communities in various ways. The tourists’ desire to see the cultural and societal difference in the urban area causes a significant increase in the number of tourists. Given the nature of urban tourism, it is inevitably facing a conflict between permanent residents and
visitors over resources, since the tourist mobility area often overlaps with local’s everyday spaces. The areas where tourists walk around are a resident’s neighborhood, and where tourists stay is also a house which locals actually live in. For instance, the spread of short-term accommodation rental services (Airbnb, HomeAway) paved the way for tourists to enter the most personal space belonging to locals. The companies often advertise the consumption of these private spaces as an “authentic” travel style. MacCannell (1973) claims that tourists are driven by their desire for experiencing authenticity, and trying to find authenticity in the destination’s everyday life. The desire of tourists directly or indirectly forces locals to commodify or even maneuver the authenticity to meet the demands of tourists. The private space, house, where strangers were used to not be allowed to enter are now sold at a price, and tourists entertain themselves by telling that spending time in a local’s house is an ultimate authentic urban life experience. Yet, in reality, the house is a setting created by force, and the authentic atmosphere is orchestrated with convincing props and decoration carefully chosen by the house owner. This topic is often discussed in tourism studies as commodification of culture and staged authenticity (Urry, 2011; see also MacCannell, 1973).

The pressure residents experience from tourism development has brought on social movements called “tourismphobia”: the focus of local residents on degrowth of tourism and rejecting tourism behavior in the destinations. The term tourismphobia was introduced to society for the first time in 2008 by a Catalan anthropologist, Manuel Delgado (Milano et al., 2019, p. 355). He noted the emergence of a new tourist class dominating the city over the working class and longstanding local residents. Barcelona is one of the most progressive cases when it comes to tourismphobia, and residents are actively fighting for their rights. Similar to many cities suffering from overtourism, the city experienced excessive tourism, gentrification caused by overly promoted speculation. Eventually, what arises among the locals is a grassroots-led social movement against tourism development. In the form of politicization from below, this social movement has become widespread as local residents oppose tourism development that is being imposed by authorities. The residents of the tourist destinations start protesting to regain the respect and rights that have so far not been given proper attention in the development process.

2.2.2 Impact Studies
In order to conduct research on residents’ perceptions, there has been a need for researchers to define the abstract concept of residents’ perceptions with a measurable scale. There are several popular theories that have come to be used as a necessary basis for fundamentally understanding the residents’ perceptions, and they are often employed in the operationalization process. As the popular tools enable researchers to measure the level of residents’ resentment towards tourism and also to
predict how their feelings will evolve, Butler’s Tourism Area Life Cycle and Doxey’s Index of Resident Irritation are often employed.

Broadly speaking, a tourism destination can be seen as a product in terms of being the object to be consumed by visitors. Based on this notion, in 1980, Richard Butler established a chronological model to identify the process of tourist area evolution, as well as variables causing dynamics in the process (Butler, 2006).

The first stage of the tourism area life cycle is named the exploration stage. This is because the area is not discovered by many tourists, and the number of visitors is quite small. Because of the lack of attention from tourists in the past, the area does not contain facilities to accommodate tourists. However, the lack of preparation for tourism creates more opportunities for visitors to interact with locals and it is seen as an attractive point. Tourism is not taking a significant role in the local economy, and the dependence on the industry is also quite low (ibid.).

As the area welcomes more visitors, it goes into the involvement stage. At this stage, local community members actively launch advertisements and promotions through which the general area of the tourist destination is consolidated. Governmental organizations and public agencies are pressured to establish smooth transportation for tourists (ibid.).

As the area enters the development stage, most of the control over development is transferred from locals to external groups. The tourist facilities, especially accommodations, which local communities have been providing so far, are increasingly being provided by external organizations, as a result of which local involvement decrease as fewer community members get involved (ibid.).

On top of establishing a clear timeline of evolution in the tourism destination, what was so significant to development studies was the implication of TALC theory showing that the overall quality and attractiveness of the destination for both visitors and residents in an area will decrease once the destination reaches its carrying capacity of resources. Butler refers to the change in local residents’ experience and feeling, along with the destination’s development stages. He claims that the more destinations use resources to pursue economic benefit and residents lose control over management, the more opposition and discontent among permanent residents will appear.

Adding to the issue that the separation between private space and tourist settings are getting blurrier, anti-tourism attitude in residents’ minds is caused by the fact that tourism outbalances the optimal point for locals of carrying out business and continuing daily life. As has been discussed in the previous section, the exceeding tourist flow pouring into local’s daily life pressures fulltime inhabitants by causing competition over resources.
Doxey’s index of resident irritation and Butler’s Tourist Area Life Cycle share a generally corresponding segmentation, and are often used in tandem. Doxey’s irridex refers to residents’ attitude towards tourists and tourism in correlation with the stage of destination development (Pavlić & Portolan, 2015). This theory comes in handy as we try to understand the changes in residents’ perceptions towards tourism development in the timeline of destination development. Shifts in residents’ attitudes towards tourists and tourism in a tourist destination are explained by comparing the level of maturity of the destination. There are four stages of elaborating resident’s perceptions towards tourism and tourist: euphoria, apathy, irritation, and antagonism. The first stage, euphoria, is the level at which the number of visitors is still insignificant, and residents welcome the changes. The second phase, apathy, is the stage at which there is an increase in tourist visits, and the formal relationship between residents and tourists is established. The third stage, irritation, is the stage at which the dramatic increase in the number of tourists causes issues among residents since both parties compete for resources in the destinations. In the last stage, antagonism, tourists become more mindful about their action and start being responsible for their actions in tourist destinations.

In a sense, the relationship between residents and tourism development has been a topic discussed among researchers and practitioners in the tourism field for a long time. As a part of city branding, some residents are involved in creating a positive image of destinations as place branding stakeholders and opinion makers (Jeuring & Haartsen, 2016). In the context of storytelling in the tourism scene, local community members were given the role of providing stories of the city, enhancing the city’s attractiveness for tourists, and appealing to visitors (Keskin et al., 2016). The role of residents in tourism products is also recognized as an essential factor in the mindfulness debate since the tourists’ communication with residents can improve tourists’ experience in the destination (Ganesan et al., 2014). Furthermore, among the discussion on tourism development management, local community members are recognized as the critical stakeholders for sustainable development in rural tourism, since autonomous regional development is a key to facilitating tourism in a sustainable way to the benefit of the local stakeholders (Van der Straaten, 2000). As we speak of local community members in tourism studies, they were most of the time seen in relation to tourism development as a component to understanding various tourism phenomena. However, the opinion of residents was not receiving attention from researchers as the main subject of research.

During the rapid acceleration of tourism development, it has since become clear that tourism development solely focused on profit brings impacts residents’ lives both positively and negatively. Economic perspective-focused tourism development often compromises residents’ welfare. Its drawbacks have become so apparent to both residents and researchers that they can no longer be
dismissed. The growing empirical evidence that residents are pressured by tourism development, and realizing the importance of residents’ welfare in the tourism scene (Bimonte & D’Agostino, 2020) has shifted researchers’ and practitioners’ attention to the topic. The shift in trends in the academic field raised opportunities for researchers to investigate the relationship between residents’ perception and tourism development at a more profound level.

Jurowski et al. (1997) have researched what elements residents would balance and value in dealing with tourism development by identifying seven factors with which residents shape tourism development. The researchers designed the study based on a belief that community members are willing to get involved with tourists in a tourism setting, as they feel the transaction would be beneficial for them. In their paper, the researchers further divided three key factors (economic, social, and environmental-related perceived impacts) into the following variables: potential for financial gain, use of the tourism resource, community attachment, and ecocentric attitude. In the end, they concluded that the seven values determined in the research interplay in the process of formulating residents’ perception towards tourism development both directly and indirectly.

Even though the principal elements which affect local residents’ perception towards tourism have been determined, there is always a need to analyze the topic further to provide a more precise picture of the whole situation because of the complexity of tourism phenomena. Oviedo-Garcia et al. (2008) attempted to develop a model to explain the level of residents’ support for tourism development and planning by looking into how residents develop attitudes towards tourism development. They investigated the topic of tourism development from a perspective of community wealth and emphasized that the kind of benefit an individual receives from tourism will affect their perception of tourism development and its undesired consequences. To start, the researchers speculated that the difference between the type of benefits that residents earn from tourism development might cause differences among residents’ attitudes. As a result of their research, it is confirmed the residents’ opinions are affected by three types of effects: economic, cultural, and environmental factors. In addition to those three factors, the difference between personal benefits and collective benefits residents obtain from the industry also affects residents’ perception towards tourism. It shows that the group that receives personal gain appears to overlook detrimental effects on society compared to the group that claims they receive indirect benefits. In conclusion, the researchers drew readers’ attention to the fact that the local population in divided into two groups: one that directly profits from the tourism industry and one that does not. They highlight their concern that the divide between groups could create an imbalance that could lead to polarization between groups and against tourism development.
In Japanese tourism studies, the amount of research that investigated the relation of residents to tourism development is significantly lower compared to research in Western countries. Even though the research focused on residents’ reaction to tourism development, most cases have been limited to investigating the current state of residents’ awareness of adverse outcomes of tourism development, or stating negative consequences of tourism development (Kosaka, 2019; Kwon, 2018; Yang, 2006).

As the tourism development studies have matured over the course of time, resident opinions have increasingly been introduced into research as a useful measurement tool to observe tourism impact. The researchers’ interest in resident attitudes has been increasing on the basis that resident attitude is an indicator of one’s behavior regarding the tourism industry in the future (Hadinejad et al., 2019). Research on resident attitudes has been appearing since 1984, with a growth in the number of related publications ever since. The most popular theoretical base used to investigate resident attitudes is by far SET, followed by social representation theory. However, despite the explanatory power of SET, it has been criticized for the way it observes human decision-making processes in a too systemic way, and its lack of ability to consider the cognitive aspect of those processes (ibid.).

An example of how the role of residents in the discussion of tourism development has shifted from victim to active participants in solving issues is Murpy’s (1985) “Tourism: A community approach”. In his book, he raised awareness of the consequences of pure business-oriented planning and offered a solution for it. The core of his argument is strongly based on the view of a community approach, and is to shift the notion of the industry from a simple source of revenue to an outcome of local resources. By this means, it is suggested that the host community must be involved in the planning process since all the tourism products are based on the local community and their resources. Therefore, Murphy’s model of community-based tourism planning places a greater focus on the social acceptability of tourism development (Jamal & Robinson, 2009). As shown in this study, residents have later shifted from being victims of impacts to taking on the role of activists in achieving sustainable development.

2.3 Social Exchange Theory

The first appearance of the Social Exchange Theory (SET) concept is in the American Sociological Review published in 1958 written by George Homans (Ritzer, 2004). The theory is one of the major theoretical perspectives utilized in sociology. It has its roots in various disciplines such as psychology, sociology, anthropology, and microeconomics (ibid.).
Homans (1958), a scholar in sociology, observed the world with the idea that all the social interactions happen through ‘exchange’. In the paper, “Social Behavior as Exchange”, Homans demonstrates this through a pigeon experiment from behavioral psychology (for a visualization, see Figure 1). During the investigation, as the pigeon pecks a target on a machine, it gets fed corn. Homans defines the positive gain for the pigeon, in this case corns fed to the pigeon, as ‘value’ and the negative gain, in this case the pigeon’s fatigue coming from pecking gesture, as ‘cost’. The experiment also showed that the more corn the pigeon receives, the more frequently pigeons start pecking the target. In the experiment, the (social) exchanging behavior is happening between two actors (pigeon and researcher). Through observation of the series of exchanges between the pigeon and the psychologist, Skinner, a behaviorist, explained that the pigeon’s actions are “reinforced” by the positive action (ibid. p.598).

On the other hand, the pigeon shows fewer pecking actions if it gets no corn. Moreover, over the course of time, the pigeon stops the pecking actions completely. This means that if the action is not reinforced, eventually the “exchange” diminishes. The researcher is aware of the fact that in the experiment, the behavior of the pigeon does not determine that of the psychologist at all, meaning the determination of actors in the exchanging relation is not mutual. Still, Homans believes the basic foundation of the exchange relation between the pigeon and the psychologist applies to the social situation where the motivation of engaging in exchange is mutual.

The components of exchange could be tangible goods, material goods, and non-tangible goods such as a sense of approval or prestige (Homans, 1958). Similarly, the rewards that cannot be obtained without social interaction are called “social rewards” (Van Redmond, 2015). These rewards are often psychological; the feeling of being loved, being socially accepted, being respected all require other people’s existence (ibid.) Homans emphasizes that his study deals with the elementary social behavior, the behavior which happens on a smaller scale of the more prominent structures, namely classes, firms, communities, and societies. In other words, a social exchange can occur between multiple actors.

| Exchange = Trade something of value (cost) for something needed/valued (reward) |
| Rewards – Costs = Positive Outcomes (profits), or Negative Outcomes (net loss) |
| Inequity = Cost > Reward, or My Costs > Your Costs, or My Rewards < Your Rewards |

Figure 1 Visualization of Social Exchange Theory (SET). Reprinted from “Social Exchange Theory”, by M. van Redmond, 2015, English Technical Reports and White Papers, Volume 5, Iowa State University. Copyright 2015 Mark Redmond.
2.3.1 Power-Dependence Relations

Initially, the social exchange theory was spoken of in the context of mutual exchange built on equal power balance. Emerson (1962), a scholar in sociology, expanded the theory by focusing on the “power difference” between actors and explained how the power difference would affect exchanging relations.

First, in order to understand how the power difference emerges, he introduced the concept of “power structure”: the hierarchy of power with which people are ranked in social relations. The power structure can only be established under comparison of two or more actors, since the concept explains the power difference emerges based on a comparison of one’s assets.

As it was initially explained, the social exchange theory will be established when both parties share mutual dependence. In other words, actor A wishes to achieve a goal depending on actor B. Hence, as a social exchange relation is established, both parties play a role in communication (Emerson, 1962). It implies both parties are dependent on each other. Moreover, there could be differences in the degree of dependence on each other in the relation between actor A and B. The differences in the dependence level can be explained as the dependence of actor A upon actor B ($D_{ab}$) is 1) proportionally increases/decreases by A’s motivational investment in goals which can be achieved with actor B’s existence and 2) inversely proportional to the availability of resources which are needed for actor A to achieve goals outside of the relationship between actor A and B (Emerson, 1962). In this relationship, the dependence of actor A upon actor B is defined by how much actor A is investing in the gratification which could be achieved with actor B’s support, and also how difficult it would be for actor A to find alternative resources achieving their gratification outside of the relationship.

In addition to the definition of dependence, it is also essential to understand that of power in the social situation. In SET, power is defined as the power of actor A over actor B ($P_{ab}$), which is the degree of resistance actor B facilitates, and potentially actor A can surpass. The power defined here is not always observed in social situations, only if actor A aims to fulfill their desire and B’s interest opposes A’s desire, namely B’s resistance needs to be overcome for A’s gratification.

This concept has similarities to the economic terms and can be explained much more easily with the example of economic dependency. For instance, as a home builder wishes to build a home (motivational investment), the person seeks support from a loan agency to raise the fund. Yet, the home builder has various choices when it comes to choosing loan agencies (availability). The dependency of home builders is affected by how strongly the person wishes to build the house and how much opportunity the person has for choosing alternative loan agencies other than the original
loan agency. The power-dependence relations in the formulations can be visualized as Figure 2 presents below.

\[
\begin{align*}
P_{ab} &= D_{ba} & P_{ab} &= D_{ba} \\
V & \quad V & \quad \| & \quad \| \\
P_{ba} &= D_{ab} & P_{ba} &= D_{ab}
\end{align*}
\]

Figure 2 The formulation of power-dependence in SET. Reprinted from “Power-Dependence Relations,” by R. Emerson, 1962, American Sociological Review, Volume (27), p. 34.

2.3.2 Imbalance in Power Relations

What is more noteworthy about power-dependence relationships is in some cases, the dominant actor intends to use their power over other parties. The level of reliance on another actor causes the hierarchy of power, and sometimes people take advantage of the dependence to gain benefits. As the power is exercised, there are two types of reactions expected to be shown by the party upon which power is being exercised.

2.3.3 Cost Reduction and Balance Operations

Emerson (1962) explains the imbalance in the power relation with an example of a couple’s relationship. Assume that there is a girl B who is desperate to have a relationship with boy A. The boy A takes out girl B from time to time for his pleasure gained from A’s accompany, and still he sees other girls, C, at the same time. Suppose we observe their relationship by following the social exchange theory. In that case, it shows that girl B’s gratification is mediated by boy A, and boy A’s gratification is also mediated by girl B even though the degree of gratification is less than that of B. The difference in the degree of dependence occurs since boy A has other sources to accomplish his goal. Therefore, in this relation, it is clear that B’s level of dependence on A is greater than that of A on B.

According to Emerson, there are two expected reactions from girl B to boy A’s attempts to dominate the relationship: ‘cost reduction’ and ‘balance operations’. Cost reduction quite literally means the process of reducing the cost, in other words, reducing the resistance to overcome. Girl B can achieve cost reduction by revaluing her moral value, which reduces her emotional cost needed in sustaining the relation with boy A. Generally, this process involves changes “in values (personal, social, economic) which reduces the pains incurred in meeting the demands of a powerful other” (ibid. p.35)
On the other hand, balance operations mean the process to reduce dependence on others by redirecting one’s purpose. Girl B can approach the unbalance in the relationship by increasing $D_{ab}$ or decreasing $D_{ba}$. Restoring the unbalanced relationship can be achieved by the following states:

1. If B reduces motivational investment in goals mediated by A;
2. If B cultivates alternative sources for gratification of those goals;
3. If A increases motivational investment in goals mediated by B;
4. If A is denied alternative sources for achieving those goals.” (ibid. p.35)

For the first and second option, the weaker party (girl B) has the power to direct operation. For the third option, the power dominance regarding decision-making is in A’s hand. The fourth option relies on actor B’s action since the choice can be achieved by the coalition between B and C called ‘power formation.

As we speak of the aforementioned solutions, special emphasis needs to be placed on the fact that cost reduction is never a solution for girl A to escape from power imbalance situations since the solution only mitigates the negative impact. Meanwhile, through balance operation, girl A can revise one’s dependency on the other party and eventually free oneself from the disadvantageous position. Hence, those two solutions are entirely different approaches towards power imbalance in social exchange situations.

The outstanding contribution of Emerson’s power-dependence theory to SET is that his idea brought more attention to the detail of the SET that the power inequality can forcefully make people engage in unfair exchange relations. Emerson’s theory proved that power in social situations is not always balanced, unlike the belief held by past researchers that social exchange behavior is built upon the mutual and complementary arrangement.

2.3.4 SET in the Organization Dynamics of the Tourism Scene

SET is widely applied to the study of tourism-community relationships because of its nature, the way of observing a world in which social interaction is formed based on the subjective cost-benefit analysis and comparison of alternative options (Yutyunyong & Scott, 2009). As one of the most prominent stakeholders in tourism development, residents’ perception is often discussed in tourism studies, since residents in destinations are a part of the foundation of tourism development. As the tourism-
community relationship is under the spotlight of research with the SET perspective, it often explores the balance between the cost and benefit of tourism development and support for the industry based on the outcome of cost-benefit analysis (Pearce et al., 1996). Other scholars also approached residents’ attitude towards tourists and tourism development with SET (Haley et al., 2005). To ascertain the relation, they picked the case of Bath in the United Kingdom. The researchers realized the significant increase in the number of the population working in the service sector and the importance of the role residence plays in tourism development since a large portion of industry developments’ success depends on the residents. The research attempted to examine residents’ attitude in the destination and identify what causes residents to perceive tourism in their way. The results of their study indicate that the variables that affect residents’ perception are strongly connected to economic factors. The residents engaged in the tourism industry or who have financial gain from tourism tend to be more supportive of further tourism development. This outcome supports the basis of SET.

In the next chapter, the relevant background knowledge needs to be supplemented to carry on the research that will be presented. In the third chapter, the general information about the Tokyo Olympics and strategies against the shortcoming of hosting the Olympic Games by involved parties are presented. The fourth chapter explains the methodology and design of data collection. In the fifth chapter, the empirical data collected by the online questioner and the analysis of collected data will be presented. And finally, in the last chapter, the conclusion of this research, discussion, and limitation of the study will be presented.
3 Tokyo Olympics 2020

In this chapter, the structure of the Tokyo Olympic Games will be reviewed based on the “Action and Legacy plan” and other official documents published by governmental organizations. It is also dedicated to investigating the sub-questions “Who are the stakeholders involved in the Tokyo Olympics?” and “What initiatives do the authorities take to reduce the negative impact on residents as hosting the Tokyo Olympics?”. First, general information regarding the Tokyo Olympics 2020 is presented by focusing on the characteristic features of the Japanese edition. Second, the tourism network within the Tokyo Olympics will be described to show the stakeholders involved in the event. Finally, the contents of the Japanese government’s strategies against the overtourism effect will be presented.

3.1 General Event Information

In September 2013, Tokyo was selected as the host city of the next Olympic games at the 125th IOC Session in Buenos Aires, Argentina (The Tokyo Organising Committee of the Olympic and Paralympic Games, 2020). Four months after the election, the Tokyo Organising Committee of the Olympic and Paralympic Games (TOCOG) was established as an organization responsible for ensuring the successful delivery of the Olympic and Paralympic Games in 2020. The event, the Games of the XXXII Olympiad (Tokyo 2020), was initially planned to take place from Friday, 24 July through Sunday, 9 August 2020 with 33 variety of sports games (The Tokyo Organising Committee of the Olympic and Paralympic Games Bureau of Olympic and Paralympic Games Tokyo 2020 Preparation, 2019). The Tokyo Olympic Games were planned to be followed by the Tokyo 2020 Paralympic Games to be held from Tuesday, 25 August through Sunday, 6 September 2020 with 22 variety of sports games. However, due to the worldwide COVID-19 pandemic, the events were postponed taking place from 23 July through 8 August 2021, followed by the Paralympic Games Tokyo 2020 from 24 August through 5 September (The Tokyo Organising Committee of the Olympic and Paralympic Games, 2020). The event holds “Striving for your personal best (Achieving Personal Best)”, “Accepting one another (Unity in Diversity)”, and “Passing on Legacy for the future (Connecting to Tomorrow)” as core concepts (The Tokyo Organizing Committee of the Olympic and Paralympic Games, 2019).

3.2 Recovery and Reconstruction Games

In March 2011, Japan experienced a catastrophic earthquake with a magnitude of 9.0 in the northeast part of Japan (Japan International Cooperation Agency, 2020). The earthquake and tsunami caused
devastating damages, especially on the Pacific coast of North-Eastern Japan (ibid.). The natural disaster caused not only economic damage by destroying housing and factories in the area, but mental damage to residents who lost their daily lives in the community as well. The Tokyo Olympics are acknowledged as the opportunity for the country to gain attention from foreign media, spread Japan’s image as a strong country recovering from the incident, and to show gratitude to foreign countries’ support. Furthermore, depending on the strategy, the Olympics will bring opportunities to create a tourist flow to the affected area, which needs a boost of its economy.

Based on the objectives, the government and TOCOG have planned activities that involve affected areas. For instance, the Torch Relay is adopted as a chance to showcase the highlights of all 47 prefectures during the 121 days before the start of the Tokyo Olympics, and the most-heavily affected prefecture, Fukushima prefecture, has been chosen as the starting point of the Relay (The Tokyo Organising Committee of the Olympic and Paralympic Games, 2019). Additionally, the same prefecture has been picked as the game venue for baseball and softball matches.

3.3 Influence on National Policy

The Paralympics are an opportunity for people with disabilities to demonstrate their potential and to gain publicity in a society that normally does not pay much attention to them, which has caused delays or dismissal in the fulfilment of the needs of disabled people in the. The goal of the Tokyo Paralympic is to make the most use of this opportunity to experiment with the design of a barrier-free city where everyone can move around without difficulty. Furthermore, it is also an opportunity to create a more inclusive society by changing people’s perceptions of others, not just making them physically barrier-free. Seeing the positive side of the group of people, who typically have less opportunity of integration in the labor market and social occasions, is a chance to change people’s perception of others, and a step towards a more inclusive society. Tokyo Olympics is working on the motto “Mental Barrier-Free” to achieve this goal (Secretariat of the Tokyo Olympic Games and Tokyo Paralympic Games Promotion Office, 2020).

The importance of universal design is primarily acknowledged in Japan because the country is entering the era of an extremely aging society. According to the Cabinet Office’s report in 2018, the population ratio of over 65 years old reached 28.1% of Japan’s entire population, while the balance was less than 5% in 1950. By 2065, the percentage is speculated to reach 38.4%, which indicates that one in 2.6 of the entire population will be over 65 years old. Furthermore, it is estimated that the
productive population aged between 15 and 64 will decline from 74.54 million in 2018 to 45.29 million in 2065 because of the continuous decrease in birth rates.

In light of this development, coming up with policies for preparing an extremely aging society has become a priority for the country. With the aim of mitigating the impact of a rapidly aging population, and therefore less productive population, the government implemented “Japan’s Plan for the Dynamic Engagement of All Citizens” in 2016. The policy is designed to maximize the labor force in Japan by lowering the threshold for groups that used to have difficulties joining the labor market. Concerns surrounding diversity and inclusion in the Japanese labor market have already been raised in the past. There have historically been a number of groups that have faced additional difficulties in the workplace. These include those with a disability, or members of LGBT groups (see Kumasako, 2012; Ministry of Health Labour and Welfare, 2013), as well as women returning to work after their maternity leave (Cabinet Office, 2020). The country believes that recognizing and supporting these groups who have not been able to fully integrate into the workforce as a potential labor force will be not only a step towards solving the labor shortage but stimulating customers’ purchase intention arising from secure income and inclusive society (Cabinet Office, 2016).

3.4 Tourism Network

The tourism industry holds complex structures, “where loose clusters of organizations within a destination […] cooperate and compete in dynamic evolution” (Baggio et al., 2008, p.3). Attaining a better understanding of the tourism network comes in handy by bringing many positive outcomes for analysis of tourism destination and organization (ibid.). In the same way, understanding the network in whole events would help to visualize and analyze the complex structure surrounding the Tokyo Olympic Games. Also, it is also essential to know the stakeholders and their relationships as we attempt to identify and address core concerns surrounding tourism development issues.

The Tokyo Organising Committee of the Olympic and Paralympic Games (TOCOG) is the organization responsible for ensuring the successful delivery of the Olympic and Paralympic Games in 2020. Since TOCOG does not fall under either IOC, JOC, or the Japanese government, recruitment is performed independently, in addition to those engaged from companies, metropolitan governments, and the government (Bureau of Olympic and Paralympic Games Tokyo 2020 Preparation, 2019).

This organization committee comprises members from various organizations, including the Japanese Olympic Committee, the Japanese Paralympic Committee, the Tokyo Metropolitan Government, and the national government (The Tokyo Organising Committee of the Olympic and
Paralympic Games, 2020). The organization maintains close contact with experts and relevant organizations such as “the Japanese Olympic Committee (JOC), the Japanese Para-Sports Association, the Japan Paralympic Committee, the City of Tokyo, the government of Japan, and organizations from the business world” (ibid.). This model is especially effective since the event’s goal is to build mutually beneficial outcomes for both public and private sectors.

Based on the information from public reports published by governmental organizations, the major stakeholders in the Tokyo Olympics are identified as the Tokyo Organizing Committee of the Olympic and Paralympic Games (TOCOG), the Japanese Olympic Committee (JOC), Japan Paralympic Committee (JPC), the government of Japan, the City of Tokyo, organizations from industry-related businesses, sponsors, and Japanese citizens (see Figure 3). On behalf of the Tokyo Olympics management organizations, TOCOG takes the lead in general preparation for organizing the event onsite: preparation for temporary facilities, planning service during the opening and closing ceremonies, developing a transportation plan, recruitment, training, and management of volunteers for the event (Bureau of Olympic and Paralympic Games Tokyo 2020 Preparation, 2015). The Cabinet Office of the Japanese government is the key node connecting various ministries of Japan to implement diverse Tokyo Olympics policies. In practice, the Cabinet Office performs this duty through the Office for Promotion of Tokyo 2020 Olympic and Paralympic Games (Cabinet Office, 2015). The Tokyo metropolitan government is the main venue of the Games. Therefore, it is natural that their role focuses on providing practical and functional facilities for both visitors and residents. Because of the nature of its role in the event, this group strives to create a tangible and intangible legacy. As the host city, its responsibilities also include supporting the TOCOG. At the same time, they are also responsible for guaranteeing that the city carries on its function as a hinge of the country during the event (Bureau of Olympic and Paralympic Games Tokyo 2020 Preparation, 2015).

Especially in this systematic overview of the tourism network in the Tokyo Olympics case, it is vital to note that the bottom of the organizational chart is composed of Japan’s citizens. Though many of the organizations in the structure are composed (partially) of Japanese citizens, as members of those organizations, their priorities will lie with the functions and goals of that organization. Decision-making power increases as one moves up along the chart. Here, it can be noted that the largest and most fundamental component of society, the citizens, have the lowest decision-making power of all stakeholders, meaning they can exert only limited influence over the organization of the Olympics.
3.5 Benefits for Local Residents

In the previous section, the anticipated benefits of the Olympic Games from the organizational side were introduced. However, what are the real benefits contributing to residents’ lives? It has already been mentioned that it is essential to create an event that brings mutual benefits for all the stakeholders. Also, the 1.35 trillion yen expenditure of the Olympic Games (The Tokyo Organising Committee of the Olympic and Paralympic Games, 2020b) has to be justified by showing positive and sufficient contributions to taxpayers’ lives. In the public report of progress of the event organization submitted to the Cabinet Office in 2019, the organization refers to tangible and intangible contributions of the Games to citizens. These are discussed below.

3.5.1 Promoting Regional Towns

Bringing visitor’s attention to the cities’ charm would create a stream of visitors and tourists to the location. Eventually, it will be an opportunity for revitalizing the local economy. With this prospect, a strategy of promoting regional cities as host towns has been implemented. The cities signing up for this project are expected to connect with partner cities in various disciplines, culture, economy, sports, education, and food on a grass root level (Secretariat of the Tokyo Olympic Games and Tokyo Paralympic Games Promotion Office, 2019). The government is encouraging the local governments
registered as host towns to establish a long-term legacy and to plan for the post-event period as well. As part of its recruitment campaign, the government has been holding informative meetings organized by local governments, private organizations, and universities, participating in events with the participation of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, holding individual consultations with embassies in Tokyo, and holding consultations with overseas sports organizations (ibid.).

3.5.2 Volunteer Activity

The Secretariat of the Tokyo Olympic Games and Tokyo Paralympic Games Promotion Office (2019) refers to the significance of citizens participation in the Olympic Games as volunteers in the following quote:

The TOCOG is offering opportunities for citizens to participate in the event as a volunteer to stimulate the interest of the public in the Olympic and Paralympic Games and to develop essential skills in people who can contribute to world peace with an international perspective through a renewed appreciation of the value and benefits of sports. (p.17)

The repeated aim for TOCOG to achieve through the Games in the report is educating citizens to obtain essential skills to adapt to international society. This is because Japan is striving to gain recognition as a global city from the rest of the world. According to Panagiotopoulou (2005), the benefit of facilitating volunteer opportunities such as organizing events can be deconstructed into political, economic, cultural, and athletic perspectives. Throughout the activities, the volunteers are working on the same goal, which helps to make a statement of unity of action in a large public event. The workforce provided by volunteers will have a significant effect on the reduction of the cost for organizers. Since the volunteers are diverse, the skill of people is also different amongst individuals. Some volunteers contribute to fast and effective event organization because of their professional skills. Working in a diverse crowd means people more often encounter unusual situations because of their various cultural origins. These encounters of cultural shock can be educational experiences for participants, forcing them to rethink their personal norms and values, and to accept the differences between people. The direct interaction with professional athletes will inspire young people and encourage them to become involved in sports. These are the benefits the scholar sees in locals volunteering. Plus, volunteering during the Olympic Games brings profits to individuals by providing once-in-a-lifetime experience, valuable training and experiences, elevating patriotism, and gaining insight into information or skills that are valuable and meaningful (Panagiotopoulou, 2005) in
exchange for volunteers’ time and energy. Given these points, the volunteer activities can be considered as being mutually beneficial for event organizers and citizens.

### 3.6 Measures Against Overtourism

It is needless to say the rest of the world is paying attention to Japan to see how the country will deal with the drawbacks of hosting mega-events. It is not new for Olympic host cities to face major drawbacks during and after the Games. Now the disadvantage of hosting the Olympic Games affects countries’ motivation and discourages many from being hosts. The 2004 Summer Olympics attracted eleven bids, yet the number of the bidders dropped to two for the 2024 summer Olympics. (Evans, 2018). Hence, coming up with solutions for these issues is a pressing need for those interested in hosting mega-events. Aligning with this issue, Japan is required to show clear and precise planning against overtourism effects. At the moment, TOCOG is actively working on preparation related to preventing overtourism effects in two categories: transportation and accommodation.

#### 3.6.1 Country Entrance

As an entrance to the country for foreigners, the airports are naturally points of congestion in the county’s transportation network. Major airports’ capacity in the Tokyo area requires revision to meet the handling capacity that is expected to be required during the events. Thus, the primary airports in the Tokyo area are now advised to increase their capacity, the number of runway movements that an airport can accommodate, to 80,000 times a day by 2020 (Secretariat of the Tokyo Olympic Games and Tokyo Paralympic Games Promotion Office, 2020). The optimization of airport capacity is also achieved by improving both hardware and software of the airport service. One of the hub airports in the Tokyo area, the predominantly domestic flight-serving Haneda airport, is gearing up for increased international traffic by having more international flights routed through it, and by building a high-speed taxiway.

#### 3.6.2 Regional Transport

As the hub airports in the Tokyo area, Narita and Haneda airport confront the possibility of shortage in effective transportation to the central Tokyo area. Haneda and Narita airport’s distance to the central Tokyo area is about 20 km and 60 km, respectively. Thanks to the various means of transport, the travel time is shortened to fit the range of time in which tourists do not start feeling uncomfortable.
However, in addition to the current transportation schedule, there is a need to supplement transportation options during early morning and late-night hours. Furthermore, preparing the environment to host English-speaking visitors (adding English translations in public signs, securing employees who are capable of communicating in English) is an issue the government has to sort out before the visitors’ arrival.

### 3.6.3 Metropolitan Area

The government is already aware of the risk of congestion created by visitors and residents during events in the Tokyo area. The issue of congestion at major stations in Tokyo, Shibuya, Shinjuku, and so on is nothing new to the residents and people on the management side. The congestion near event venues is expected to be intensified by visitors, volunteer, and athlete teams.

The government referred to the congestion issue as “For the success of the Games, it is crucial to ensure the smooth transportation of officials and spectators while minimizing the impact of the Games on economic activity and public life.” (Secretariat of the Tokyo Olympic Games and Tokyo Paralympic Games Promotion Office, 2020, p.13).

First, the country is expected to experience even more overcrowding than usual, in areas which are already experiencing problems with overcrowding, such as the Tokyo metropolitan area. As part of its efforts to manage the traffic situation in the Tokyo metropolitan area during the Games, the Tokyo Metropolitan Government is preparing to establish a transportation center consisting of TOCOG, representatives of traffic administrators, and representatives of road administrators.

As part of the development of road transport infrastructure, the Tokyo Metropolitan Government is constructing a north-south line along the waterfront alongside the existing second submarine tunnel (The Umi no Mori Tunnel and Umi no Mori Bridge, see Figure 4) in the waterfront area, which is expected to be in service by 2020. These new constructions of transport highways are expected to increase transport capacity by connecting critical traffic nodes, as well as expanding the capacity of existing connections (Ministry of Land, Infrastructure, Transport and Tourism, 2014b).
Second, on a small scale, overcrowding is expected to occur near event venues. The Bureau of Olympic and Paralympic Games Tokyo 2020 Preparation, a sub-organization of the Tokyo Metropolitan government, published “The expected impact of the Games on transportation map”, which shows expected temporary impact on road and railways without any preventive solutions (Bureau of Olympic and Paralympic Games Tokyo 2020 Preparation, 2018). In order to mitigate the impact, the bureau focuses on Transportation System Management (TSM) and Transportation Demand Management (TDM). Visualizing expected impact allows people to rethink their options for their choice of transportation during high-demand times.

The Tokyo Metropolitan Government is also looking into solutions for congestion by reducing the amount of travel by residents. Through a campaign called “Smooth Biz”, the government offers residents and companies alternatives to avoid unnecessary travel during periods of expected congestion. These include encouraging remote work, flexible work hours, taking time off during events, and changing the date of important meetings (Tokyo Metropolitan Government Smooth Biz Management Office, 2020).

3.6.4 Alleviating Accommodation Shortage

The occupancy rate of city hotels and business hotels in the popular Tokyo area regularly reaches around 80% on average throughout the year (Japan Tourism Agency, 2020b). This data indicates the
Tokyo area will most likely experience room shortage since the hotels are operating near capacity even before the Olympic Games. This concern is addressed in a public report: “Even though the operation rate of Ryokan [traditional Japanese hotel] is not as critical as rest of the kinds of accommodation, there is a pressing need to solve this issue in order to embrace the growth in the tourism industry” (Secretariat of the Tokyo Olympic Games and Tokyo Paralympic Games Promotion Office, 2017, p.37). The shortage of rooms could cause inflation in room prices and pressure tourists and Japanese citizens into an unhealthy competition for accommodation. To ease this situation, the government has started attempting alternative accommodation option by relaxing restriction for non-professionals to sublet their properties.

In popular tourist destinations, the short-term rental of private homes is commonly practiced. The advantage of this system is expanding accommodation capacity without investing in new buildings by utilizing existing resources such as unoccupied private rooms or houses. This type of informal economic activity, the so-called sharing economy, has been accepted in communities as a way to make extra income for non-professionals (Fang et al., 2016), and also a remedy for room shortage issues in popular tourist destinations. The Japanese government takes a similar approach to this issue by relaxing regulations on the temporary accommodation business.

There have been three major changes in Japanese law regarding private home rental services. First, the “Residential Accommodation Business Act”: a law regulating short-term “minpaku” lodging business took effect, which impacts room owners, private room management agencies, and online platform service providers. Until 2018, short accommodation rental service was considered illegal unless the property owner obtained business permission from the government. For instance, the property owner had to facilitate reception and conduct a regular sanitary inspection to meet the permit requirements. This national hotel law made the threshold even higher for property owners to cut into the short accommodation renting service industry and prevent the service to saturate into society. After the new regulation introduction, the property owner or service provider can rent out space for up to 180 days per year (Japan Tourism Agency, 2020a).

Second, the government allows property owners to rent out rooms within the “National Strategic Special Zone” that is designated as a significant area for Japanese economic activity. The strategic zone is planned to create “the most obstacle-free environment for both domestic and international business in the world” by allocating specific areas for specific fields of industries. Ten regions are registered as the special strategic zone (Cabinet Public Relations Office, 2019). In these areas, property owners can rent their property if the stay is longer than two nights.
Third, “Event homestay” is a system that enables the provision of lodging without a business license for events of a highly public nature, such as the provision of a home at the request of the local government of the host city, in order to solve the shortage of lodging facilities at the time of an event that takes place several times a year (about two to three days per event).

One of the reasons the government invests in optimizing is since these developments in the transportation system will contribute to the Japanese economy even after the Games. Achieving higher airport capacity means to the country inviting capital by providing accessible location from various continents, accommodating manageable capacity for expected tourism growth, and revitalizing the economy by stimulating money and goods mobility (Ministry of Land, Infrastructure, Transport and Tourism, 2014b).
4 Methodology

In this chapter, the method used to find the answer to the main research question, “What elements affect host city residents’ perceptions of tourism development in the context of hosting the Tokyo Olympic Games 2020?” and its logic of the research design will be described.

4.1 Survey Target

As mentioned in Chapter 2, the effects of overtourism on people in a particular area are closely related to their daily lives and to the way the tourist’s mobility area overlaps with permanent residents’ living area. Not only the local residents but also people who regularly commute into the Tokyo area are expected to be impacted by the large crowds of tourists visiting the Olympics. Therefore, the sample of respondents is extended to also include commuters from the same prefecture.

4.2 Research Area

This study’s research area is selected based on the placement of Tokyo Olympics venues and on the expected commuting area. Since the core of the main question is to determine how residents in the Tokyo area would perceive ‘overtourism’ caused by the Tokyo Olympics, we only focus on Tokyo. As is shown in Figure 5, the games are organized over a widespread area: in 43 locations and facilities spread over 9 prefectures (The Tokyo Organizing Committee of the Olympic and Paralympic Games, 2018). Out of the 43 locations, 25 are located in Tokyo prefecture (ibid.). This number shows that 60% of games are organized in the Tokyo area. Because of the high concentration of game venues in the prefecture, it is estimated that the Olympics will attract approximately 7.8 million visitors, while the Paralympics is expected to attract approximately 2.3 million visitors to the Tokyo area (ibid.). Additionally, 920,000 people are estimated to move around in the Tokyo area every day during the game season (The Nihon Keizai Shimbun, 2013). Therefore, visitor and mobility management challenges are already clear to the involved parties, including the consideration that Tokyo prefecture is already a very densely populated area. Since the Tokyo Olympics will be held in Tokyo or and nearby large cities, the impact on the population is expected to be widespread. Therefore, it is useful to collect data from a wide area, not merely focusing on Tokyo’s specific area.
4.3 Survey Operation

The data collection process is dedicated to collecting empirical data from stakeholders such as people who live in or within commuting distance of Tokyo in order to show residents’ perception towards hosting the Olympics. This part is achieved through an online survey. While contemplating the best way of collecting data from residents and commuters in the Tokyo area, it was clear that taking advantage of an online platform to get in touch with respondents is the most effective and economical option for the author. Plus, during the period of conducting this research, the COVID-19 virus outbreak affected the entire research procedure as well as the mobility of people involved. Since it was not a reasonable option for the author to visit Japan and collect data due to the risk personal and participants’ safety, it made more sense to choose a method that does not require physical human contact.

The empirical data is collected through an online survey conducted between 29th September and 29th October 2020. The respondents were reached out to via social media platforms such as Facebook. The questionnaire was shared in social media groups related to tourism with the expectation that people with interest in the industry are more willing to participate in the survey. Fortunately, two private groups, “The inbound tourism newest update summary group” and “Network for master’s student and researchers in Tourism Studies”, agreed to share the questionnaire on their
private feed. In addition to the online approach, the data was collected by using snowball sampling, in which researchers gather participants through referrals created by individuals who share a specific characteristic of research interest (Crouse & Lowe, 2018, p. 1532). In this way, the respondents were recruited through the author’s community, family, friends, and respondents’ networks. By applying this method, the recruitment process is expected to be cost-effective and timesaving.

Respondents were asked to indicate their support or opposition to the Tokyo Olympics and to its possible effects on a five-point-Likert-scale with 1 referring to ‘strongly disagree’ and 5 referring to ‘strongly agree’. Also, the questionnaire includes multiple-choice questions in which respondents can choose multiple answers that suit their situation, and open questions for respondents to express their opinions more freely. At the beginning of the survey, respondents were notified that the participation is voluntary, and at any point of the survey, they were free to discontinue the questionnaire. Respondents were given an opportunity to win five euro worth of gift cards to encourage participation.

The questionnaire was designed by adapting pre-existing questionnaires used in previous similar research (see Rasoolimanesh et al., 2015; Oviedo-Garcia et al., 2008). Since researchers have created questionnaires to assess residents’ support for tourism development and factors influencing their perception, the variables considered in their questions were sufficiently similar to apply to the case for a mega-event such as the Olympics. In addition to the two previous studies, cues were also taken from an earlier questionnaire designed to measure public opinion of the Tokyo Olympics at an earlier stage (NHK Broadcasting Culture Research Institute, 2018).

The questionnaire comprises 34 questions categorized into five sections. The first section of the questionnaire assesses the level of residents’ support for the Tokyo Olympics. The second and third sections present questions to evaluate the residents’ perception and experience of the Tokyo Olympics’ positive and negative impacts. In the fourth section, the variables suspected to influence residents’ decision-making process, community attachment, and local community participation in event management are investigated on a deeper level. The last section is designed to collect respondents’ demographic information such as age, gender, occupation, etc. (see Appendix A).

4.4 Method of Analysis
Throughout the online distribution of the survey, the total number of respondents reached 328. Once the primary data was collected, it was carefully double checked for missing values. It is important to respect respondents’ freedom of participating survey with their own will, the survey was designed that the respondents were allowed to move on to next questions without filling the survey completely.
After removing questioners which were missing values and clean primary data, the data analysis was carried out. The result of statistical analysis will be introduced in the next chapter “5 Result”. The chapter starts with descriptive analysis with a frequency table of the characteristics of sample (N=222). The section is followed by comparison of mean value of each question to elaborate the degree of positive impacts perceived by respondents. The second part of the chapter is consisted of multiple regression analysis with all 20 items which measure positive impact, negative impact, community attachment, and community involvement. The regression analysis is tested again with only variables which turned out to be statistically significant. In the last, the analysis is finished by cross-tabulation analysis and Chi-square test with items created to measure negative impacts of the event. Cross-tabulation and Chi-square test is employed in the last step of analysis chapter since it is not uncommon to deal with Likert-scaled variables as if they are interval-scaled variables. But since Likert-scaled variables are of course strictly at best ordinal variables, I investigated the association between the variables also by means of the Person’s Chi-square test for the association between categorical variables. All analyses were conducted with the help of the SPSS statistical analysis software.

4.5 Data Operationalization

Data operationalization is the reconstruction of phenomena in a particular dimension. To be more specific, operationalization in the preparation process means setting a clear definition of each variable.

In statistics, a dependent variable is a type of variable affected by changes in independent variables (Field, 2018). Therefore, it is called also an ‘outcome variable’ (Laerd Statistics, 2020). In other words, knowing the relationship between dependent variables and independent variables will eventually allow researchers to explain the targeted phenomena in their research.

The dependent variable in this research is the general perception of residents towards hosting the Tokyo Olympics. The variables are operationalized by measuring with a five-point scale.

The dependent variable, the residents’ perception towards the Tokyo Olympics, is determined with two questions (Q1 and Q2). The first question asks respondents to what extent they agree with the government organizing mega-events in the Tokyo area in the future. The second question asks what kind of image of the Tokyo Olympics the respondents have. These two straightforward questions show where respondents stand when supporting hosting mega-events such as the Tokyo Olympics. These two variables are then mapped onto a newly created variable ‘perception of residents towards hosting the Tokyo Olympics’ by taking the average of the two underlying variables.
Among the independent variables, we distinguish between different areas of effects, which might be expected to be perceived by the respondent. These areas comprise economic, socio-cultural, and environmental factors. Also, community attachment and community involvement are added to the independent variables since these factors are expected to be important influences on residents’ perception. Economic, socio-cultural, and environmental factors are segmented into two subsections, positive and negative impact. Finally, each subsection comprises two sub subsections; positive impact is further divided into individual and collective benefit, while negative impact is divided into individual and collective loss. In summary, each factor is divided into four variables. The reason for dividing one factor into two categories (individual and collective) is that the previous papers related to resident’s support on tourism showed that the difference in the types of benefits residents received make a difference in one’s perception of tourism development. Also, comparing one’s opinions on individual benefit and collective benefit can bring up various observations since individual benefit tends to focus more on personal experience and specific characteristics of one’s life than the one explaining collective benefits. Community attachment and community inclusion are used as individual variables. A diagram illustrating the structure described above can be found in Figure 6. In the following sections, a more detailed description of the factors of the questioner are introduced.

Figure 6 Illustration of the relationships of variables. Note that Economic, socio-cultural, and environmental factors are organized in the same way.
4.5.1 Economic Factor

The economic factor was operationalized using the items related to economic impact (Questions 3-6). All of the four questions related to economic impact focus on positive effects the respondents think the Olympic Games will bring. As mentioned in the introductory part, positive economic impact is divided into individual benefit and collective benefit.

The questions are designed to match each independent variable’s characteristics to measure individual benefit and collective benefit separately as independent variables. For example, the question on individual benefit in economic factor includes questions such as Question 4: “The increasing number of tourists by the Tokyo Olympic Games causes the increase in the household income”. This question is heavily focused on measuring the individual level of economic impact by asking the household income. By comparison to Question 4, Question 5 (“The increasing number of tourists caused by the Tokyo Olympic Games improves Japan’s economic situation”) asks respondents about the collective benefits by focusing on the national level of economic impact.

In addition to the Questions 3-5, respondents are also asked questions regarding the negative impact on the economic factor. For example, the question asking about expected individual cost brought by the Tokyo Olympic Games is formulated as Question 14: “The changes caused by the Tokyo Olympic Games (the increase of product price in touristic areas or inflating in land price) negatively impact on household finances”. Also, the question for collective cost is formulated as Question 15: “the Tokyo Olympic Games causes more public expenses rather than gain”.

4.5.2 Socio-cultural Factor

Following the same structure of the questions for economic impact, the socio-cultural factor has two separate groups of questions to measure individual benefit and collective benefit. In Questions 7-10, from the perspective of socio-cultural benefits, respondents are asked about the expected positive gain attained through social interaction with visitors, such as contribution to personal skills. In terms of collective benefits, respondents are asked to what extent they think hosting the Olympics would increase the appreciation of their own culture in the Japanese society and contribute to the improvement of the country’s image.

On the other hand, Question 16 measures the expected negative impact in socio-cultural aspects, based on the tourists’ congestion and the overtourism effect. The collective cost is measured with Question 17, which asks about the level of the deterioration of Japan’s national image on the global stage.
4.5.3 Environmental Factor

The positive environmental impact was operationalized by asking questions about the expected benefits of improving living spaces. For example, with Question 11, respondents were asked to what extent they believe the Olympics will lead to the construction of facilities that people will use personally. Asking about the Olympics’ positive contribution to the respondents living environment is a direct way of measuring personal benefit for the environmental factor. For collective benefit, with Question 12, respondents are asked to what extent they believe the Olympics will improve Japanese society’s infrastructure as a whole.

The negative impact on environmental factors on an individual level is conceptualized with Question 18 by asking that if residents feel the Tokyo Olympics might threaten personal health. The negative impact on the collective level is measured with Question 19 by asking that if residents think the Tokyo Olympics worsens Japan’s environmental issues.

4.5.4 Community Attachment

Why is it practical to examine a resident’s perception through community attachment? Community attachment is conceptually defined as “the extent and the pattern of social participation and interaction into the community and sentiment of effect towards the community” (McCool & Martin, 1994, pp. 29-30). This touches upon the concept of community attachment in the context of tourism development as a one assessment tool for social impacts of tourism. In a way, community attachment directly concerns the quality-of-life parties involved in tourism development. Therefore, adding the community attachment factor fits nicely with the goal of determining resident perceptions.

Only a small number of research projects regarding the relationship between community attachment and tourism development have been conducted in the past. McCool and Martin (1994) claim that the increase in the level of community attachment elevates both the positive perception towards tourism development, as well as interest in the impact that the development brings to the community. Their research aims to clarify whether there is a causal relationship between the sentiment of community attachment and tourism development. Their results show that in heavily tourist-dependent areas, residents with high community attachment feelings tend to rate the positive dimensions of tourism highly compared to less attached residents. Their research outcome shows community attachment positively influence on residents’ support for tourism development in some way. Hence, it is beneficial to include community attachment in the questionnaire as one factor that impacts resident’s perceptions.
In this study’s questionnaire, the level of community attachment is measured with Questions 21 and 22 by asking how much emotional attachment respondents feel to the hosting of the Olympics in Tokyo.

4.5.5 Community Involvement

Local community participation is an element often discussed together with community attachment in the study of tourism development. Study suggests that local authorities should encourage locals to participate in tourism activities and emphasize the importance of community involvement as a means to optimizing residents’ support for tourism development (Yuan, Song, Chen, & Shang, 2019, p. 5151). The importance of local community attachment in the tourism development process is recognized in the sense that a tourism development plan with local community consultations will prevent the unequal distribution of tourism benefits among involved parties. Therefore, it is worth looking into what role the local community participation plays in hosting the Olympics.

In the questionnaire, community involvement is conceptualized with Questions 23 and 24 by asking the level of perceived participation in the decision-making process of the Tokyo Olympics, and the level of influence the respondents’ opinion carries.
5 Results

Described in the chapter are both the data resulting from the collection of survey responses, and the methods applied to determine statistically significant relations between various factors in that data. The goal of the analysis is to assist in the confirmation of rejection of the hypotheses established at the start of this thesis.

5.1 Data Description

First, the whole sample’s characteristic is checked to ensure there is no unbalance in the collected data. Throughout the online distribution of the survey, the total number of respondents reached 328. After filtering the responses by removing incomplete answers, 222 usable responses remain (N = 222.). Table 1 shows the division of respondents into self-reported categories. The percentage of respondents is almost equally separated between male and female. The age group under 25 and 26-45 makes up most respondents (26<: 45%, 26-45: 40.1%). When it comes to the purpose of visit, the percentage of people who live in Tokyo and people who commute into Tokyo shares an almost identical number (Resident: 45.5%, commuter: 43.2%). The majority of respondents turns out not to have a tourism-related job (77%).

5.2 Descriptive Analysis

In order to indicate the distribution of the collected data, descriptive analysis was conducted. Descriptive statistics illustrate the basic characteristics of the collected data and provide a summary of the sample. Participants’ mean score of residents’ perceptions is 3.30 (see Appendix B.1). This may make us think that in the eyes of the local population, the impact of hosting mega-event in the living space is not an object of concern. It may also be reasonable to expect fewer complaints since the event has not taken place yet.

5.2.1 Resident Perception

To investigate if there are any differences in residents’ perceptions, the mean value of gender, age, the purpose of visit, and relation to tourism industry groups were compared. Among the data obtained, special mention should be made of the fact that excluding the very oldest age group, younger age group tend to have higher support for hosting mega-event (see Appendix B.1). The mean value of
most senior group scored highest. However, this information has to be interpreted with caution since only two respondents belong to the group of age between 65 and 85.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>47.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>51.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 &lt;</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-45</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>40.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-65</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66-85</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose of visit</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I live in Tokyo</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I commute into Tokyo</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewife/ homemaker</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil service administrative officer</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate executive</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate employee</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>46.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relation to tourism industry</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>77.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 Descriptive statistics of filtered respondents

5.2.2 Economic, Socio-cultural, and Environmental Benefit

As we compare the mean value of independent variables, the scores tell us how much effect respondents perceive from the Tokyo Olympics. By using descriptive analysis, the mean value of each independent variable is presented in the last table of Appendix B.1.
If we focus on the categories of individual benefit and collective benefit of each factor, it is shown that the collective benefits have a higher mean value in all factors, indicating that on average, respondents perceive more collective benefits compared to individual benefits. Questions 3 and 4 have the aim of measuring individual economic benefit. The mean scores are 2.83 for Question 3 and 2.49 for Question 4, which are below the average score of 3.0. Besides, the mean value of both questions is lower than any other items. This outcome indicates that individual economic benefit is the least-perceived factor by respondents. This might be simply because there are not many respondents who have a tourism-related job. Alternatively, this might be because of other causes rather than the characteristics of respondents. For instance, the survey has, due to the timing of the research, necessarily been conducted before the actual event. Therefore, it might be hard for respondents to feel economic benefit, since the benefits associated with the tourism industry are closely linked to the purchasing behavior of tourists in tourist destinations. It makes sense that respondents have not experienced positive economic impacts before tourist’s arrival.

Furthermore, another reason why the individual economic benefit is the least-perceived factor could be the limited opportunities for the general population to profit from the Tokyo Olympics compared to other factors. For instance, regarding the benefit from socio-cultural impact and environmental impact, people do have wider opportunities to gain benefits, since these benefits are heavily intertwined in people’s lives. People can embrace these benefits by gaining skills through communication with foreign tourists or by experiencing individual benefits by seeing improvements in the infrastructure. However, when it comes to economic benefit, the chances are more constrained to the people who have a tourism-related job or those who benefit from tourism expenditure.

Contrary to individual economic benefit, the mean value of collective environmental benefit scores highest among independent variables. The mean value scored 3.95, meaning that people perceived collective environmental benefit the most from the Tokyo Olympics.

Both cases of the lowest and highest mean value are logical as we consider the size of the Olympics. Since the event is organized at a national level, it could be a big reason for individual citizens not to feel the direct gain or benefit on an individual level. On the other hand, the national-level event expedites the process of improving infrastructure. Therefore, it makes sense that respondents felt most collective environmental benefit as an advantage of hosting the Tokyo Olympics. These results may indicate that increasingly large tourism-related events have decreasingly low involvement by locals. This may be due to the lack of a bond that locals will feel to the event, given its large scale, as well as the perception that it is more difficult for a single person to make a meaningful impact on an event of such a scale.
5.2.3 Distribution of Responses in Environmental Benefit

Special focus has been paid to the questions that measure environmental benefit since they showed irregular distribution of responses compared to the rest of the questions. On the one hand, the distribution pattern is similar for each variable, and for most variables, answers 4 or 5 received the highest frequency of answers (for all distributions, see Appendix B.2). On the other hand, the answers are almost equally distributed in Question 11. Compared to other questions we cannot observe any meaningful difference when it comes to the frequency of the responses. This pattern of answers indicates that each of respondents have different opinions on the individual environmental benefit generated by the Tokyo Olympics. Additionally, this data also can be interpreted in such a way that for some people individual environmental benefit is strongly perceived, but for others it is not. Compared to other factors, there is no clear public opinion. Hence, it could be argued that the individual environmental benefit is still a relatively unknown benefit for the society.

![Distribution of answers for Question 11](image)

*Figure 7 Distribution of answers for Question 11, which measures individual environmental benefit.*

Meanwhile, collective environmental benefit is recognized by the public as having a strongly positive impact. A large majority of respondents chose answer 4 or 5, a much stronger pattern than for other questions. This could be the result of major public promotion of Olympic legacy. In 1964, significant developments for infrastructure were achieved as the preparation for Tokyo Summer Olympics and Olympic legacy (e.g., bullet train, Yoyogi national stadium). The technological improvement in infrastructure gave a strong impression to the people, and still strongly support Japan’s economic activities on a daily basis. Hence, the pattern in the Question 12 could be quite reasonable based on the strong association between the Olympics and collective environmental benefits.
5.2.4 Community Attachment and Community Involvement

The mean value of community attachment turned out slightly lower than 3.0. Most of the respondents answered Question 21 and 22 with either 3 (neutral), or 1 or 2 (disagree). However, the mean value of community involvement was 1.56 for Question 23 and 1.48 for Question 24. This is quite interesting data that proves that respondents do not feel that they are included in the process of decision-making. The data also shows that almost 88% of respondents do not feel their involvement in the decision-making process during the Olympics preparation. When it comes to the national event size of events such as the Olympics, it is understandable that it is more difficult for each individual to feel that they are taking part in making critical decisions related to event organization. This data reflects the fact that Japanese citizens are not given any means to communicate their opinion on event management and actually impact the event organizing process with their opinions.
5.3 Multiple Regression Analysis

Identifying residents’ complaints at this time could be presented as trying to identify and tackle problems early before they grow more. Therefore, multiple regression analyses are conducted with the perception (to be explained) as a dependent variable and a number of different possible causes as independent variables.

5.3.1 Multiple Regression with All Variables (Model 1)

A multiple regression model was created in order to measure the relation between perceived positive impact and residents’ perceptions (see Appendix C.1). The result of the multiple regression analysis...
with twenty explanatory items (Questions 3-12, 14-19, and 21-24) indicates that Model 1 successfully predicts resident perception scores ($F(20, 201) = 14.976, p < 0.001$). Model 1 accounts for 55.8% of the variance in residents’ perceptions.

Only the questions that measure collective economic benefit, collective socio-cultural benefit, collective environmental benefit, and community attachment, so only four out of twenty items, showed a statistically significant effect on residents’ perceptions. Hence, it turns out that most variables are not statistically significant and as such not suitable for predicting residents’ perceptions. Hypothesis 1 predicted that the people who perceive benefits from the Tokyo Olympics tend to have higher support towards the Tokyo Olympics compared to those who do not. Model 1 confirms this by showing a positive correlation between some of the perceived positive benefits and residents’ perceptions. Therefore, in conclusion, Hypothesis 1 is partially confirmed in terms of a positive correlation between collective economic benefit, collective socio-cultural benefit, collective environmental benefit, community attachment, and residents’ perceptions.

Community involvement turned out not to be a suitable predictor for residents’ perceptions. This might be a logical outcome since most of the respondents do not perceive community involvement according to the answer distributions of Questions 23 and 24. Hence, what is more important in this finding is that respondents are not given opportunities to contribute their opinions to event management, and that there seems to be no clear correlation between community involvement and support for mega-event. Hypothesis 5 predicts that participants who feel community involvement tend to have more favorable opinions on hosting the Tokyo Olympics compared to the other groups with different benefits. Based on the information from Model 1, Hypothesis 5 is rejected.

### 5.3.2 Multiple Regression with Statistically Significant Variables (Model 2)

As we redo the multiple regression analysis with only the items which turned out to be statistically significant, the outcome is shown in Appendix C.2. The beta coefficient score of the four included independent variables indicates that these items and the dependent variable have positive effects. Naturally, Model 2 successfully predicts dependent variable ($F(4, 217) = 66.289, p < 0.001$) and accounts for 55% of the variance in residents’ perceptions. This indicates that people who believe the Olympics contribute to positive gains in any way also react positively to the question regarding their support for hosting the Tokyo Olympics.

In order to see which independent variables have more impact on dependent variables, we need to pay attention to the standardized beta coefficient. If we compare the standardized regression
coefficients, we see that community attachment has the strongest (ceteris paribus) affect standardized coefficient $b = .407$. The effect of community attachment is shown to be more than three times as large as collective environmental benefit, namely the independent variables with the least perceived impact in Model 2. It is an interesting observation that the support of mega-event is enforced by a sense of community rather than any other benefits. Especially, the fact that community attachment is more influential than the economic factor is a noteworthy outcome of this research. Hypothesis 4 predicts that the group in which people perceive community attachment has more support for mega-event. The data of multiple regression analysis support the statement of Hypothesis 4, and as a result it is accepted.

The comparison of standardized beta coefficient provides information that is relevant to Hypothesis 3. This hypothesis concerned with the intuition that the group which perceives economic benefit tends to have a better perception towards hosting the Tokyo Olympics compared to other benefits. As one may expect, the higher the estimated economic positive impact, the higher the support for the Olympics. However, interestingly, the individual economic benefit could not be proven to be a suitable predictor of residents’ perception. The outcome contradicts other tourism development research, in which individual economic benefit is a good motivator for an individual to support tourism development. Hypothesis 3 was created based on the findings from earlier research, namely that people who perceive individual benefits tend to have higher support for tourism development (see Oviedo-Garcia et al., 2008). However, we have to bear in mind that, in the case of the Tokyo Olympics, people are prone to perceive fewer individual benefits than collective benefit, as was shown in the descriptive analysis. Moreover, in the case of tourism development research, people have wider opportunities to gain individual benefits from the tourism industry as we look at tourism development in general.

Meanwhile, collective economic benefit has been proven as a suitable predictor for residents’ perception. However, the impact on residents’ perception is surpassed by community attachment, therefore Hypothesis 3 is rejected.

### 5.3.3 Individual Benefit versus Collective Benefit

Investigating Model 1 and Model 2 enables us to determine which variables are a more suitable predictor for residents’ perceptions. From the significance of the variables, we can eliminate multiple independent variables from the equation. If we look at the independent variables which remain from the selection process, what we notice is that all independent variables measuring individual benefit
are eliminated. The result brings us to the conclusion that there is no clear indication of a causal relationship between individual benefits and the increase of residents’ perceptions, at least not at this point in time in the organization process (pre-event).

*Model 2* indicates that in the case of the Tokyo Olympic Games, the relationship between the respondents’ support for the Olympic Games and their personal interests cannot be established. On the other hand, a positive correlation between the interests of the group and the support for the Olympic Games is demonstrated (As illustrated in Figure 11). If we revisit the idea of SET, the underlying idea is that a partnership between two individuals is formed through the process of a cost-benefit analysis. Unlike the concept of SET, in the case of the Tokyo Olympics, we cannot find the positive correlation between individual benefit and support for the event. From this finding it may be inferred that in the case of hosting mega-event, individuals do not consider their relationship to the event as an individual but as a society as a whole.

This information can be quite valuable for policymakers and practitioners who are aiming to achieve “the beneficial Olympics for everyone”. Considering the outcome of this research, it may be useful to focus on policies which would bring more collective benefit rather than individual benefit.

*Figure 11: Investigation of the perceived benefits show a correlation between collective benefit and support to the event, but no correlation between individual benefit and support for the event.*

In Hypothesis 2, it is hypothesized that participants who feel individual benefit tend to have more favorable opinions on hosting the Tokyo Olympics compared to the groups which feel different benefits. Based on the result of this section, Hypothesis 2 is rejected. Similar to the reason confirmed for Hypothesis 3, we cannot fully compare tourism development and the case of the Tokyo Olympics in terms of limited opportunities for gaining individual benefit. For this reason, Hypothesis 2 is rejected.
5.4 Cross-Tabulation of Expectations and Perceptions

The multiple regression analyses prove that all negative impacts are not a suitable predictor for residents' perceptions. However, there is much more interesting information in the responses regarding respondents’ perceptions towards negative impact from the Tokyo Olympics and their support for the event, which cannot be seen just with regression analysis.

The most interesting finding is that the assumption towards negative impacts caused by the event and support for mega-events does not have a negative correlation necessarily. It is quite natural for one to assume that if people expect higher risk, their support for the events would be lower. However, the result from cross-tabulation tells us that it is not always the case when it comes to the case of Tokyo Olympics.

In order to create the categorical variables, the respondents are divided into three groups corresponding to High (4-5), Middle (3), and Low (1-2) score. As one of the examples of the irregular outcome of the relationship with the expectation for negative impact and support for mega-event, the data related to collective economic loss is presented.

First, we look into the distribution of respondents’ opinions on the expectation for collective economic loss caused by the Tokyo Olympics. More than 50% of respondents answer that they believe the Tokyo Olympics would cause economic loss for society (1-2: 13.5%, 3: 35.6%, 4-5: 50.9%).

Given that the expectation of the respondents is negative to a major degree, it is reasonable to expect the correlation between expectation for negative impact and support for an event to be negative. However, as we compare the number of respondents who scored high and low in the category of people who scored high for residents’ presentations, the data shows that more respondents show their support for the Tokyo Olympics compared to the rest of the groups as they are highly expecting negative economic impacts on a collective level (see Table 2).

Figure 12 shows the comparison between the group of people who score high and low on the expectation of collective economic loss. Data suggests that people who highly expect negative impacts on the economy on a collective level also score 4.0 or above for resident perception.
The same pattern can be seen in the independent variables for individual socio-cultural loss and Individual environmental loss. A Chi-Square test of the individual socio-cultural loss and individual environmental loss variable shows that they are not statistically significant (Individual socio-cultural loss: p= 0.174, Individual environmental loss: p= 0.120, see Table 3 and 4). This means that the data cannot be applied to a bigger sample such as the whole population, yet these observations are still relevant information to share here.
### Chi-Square Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>6.354*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>6.584</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>222</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.22.

*Table 3 Chi-square test of Individual socio-cultural loss group*

### Chi-Square Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>7.318*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>7.459</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>222</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.22.

*Table 4 Chi-square test of Individual environmental loss group*

Given this information, we can conclude that negative expectation for a certain aspect of event management does not discourage residents’ support for mega-events. This can be an interesting additional fact for Hypothesis 1. This hypothesis was earlier confirmed, as it was proved that there is a positive correlation between perceived positive benefits and residents’ perceptions. The findings from cross-tabulation add to this that there are cases in which people show support for the Tokyo Olympics regardless of their anticipation of negative impacts. This outcome is suspected to be caused by the fact that people are expecting even bigger gains from the Tokyo Olympics, and hope that bigger positive gains overcome the expectation for negative impacts.
6 Conclusion

This final chapter will set out each research question and include a concise answer to make it easier to return to them in a coherent manner. Following the answers to the research questions, the limitations of the presented research will be discussed, and suggestions will be given for future research directions.

6.1 Research Summary

This research has attempted to determine if there is any correlation between residents’ support towards hosting mega events and the benefits which residents experience from such events. This research was specifically focused on the case of Tokyo Olympics, by examining preventive solutions to overtourism-related issues the Japanese government expect during the event. The research was conducted with the expectation that people who gain benefits from the Olympic Games will have stronger support for hosting the event.

This expectation was formed based on the Social Exchange Theory, which states that exchange between two parties can be observed in the context of cost-benefit analysis. Based on this theory, the relationship between residents and the event was hypothesized to cause respondents who perceive benefits to tend to have stronger support for the event.

To test the hypothesis, quantitative research was conducted through an online survey to collect data regarding of residents’ perception and potential variables which are suspected to influence on residents’ opinions. In order to examine the correlation between those factors and residents’ perception, the collected data was analyzed by employing multi-regression analysis and cross-tabulation.

For the purpose of answering the main research question stage by stage, three sub-questions were formulated. In the next section, each of sub-questions will be answered.

6.2 Research Sub-Questions

1. In the past research what has been identified the relation between tourism development and residents’ perception in the destination?

In the early stages of tourism development, when society was celebrating the benefits of tourism, the negative impacts of tourism on the destination were not given much attention and a clear definition
was not provided. However, as the negative impact of tourism can no longer be ignored due to the high level of tourism activity, the definition of the carrying capacity of the destination was created and it led to the establishment of the concept of overtourism.

The definition of overtourism led to the study of the negative impacts of tourism in tourist destinations, and according to Doxey’s Index of Resident Irritation, as the development of tourist destinations progresses, residents’ attitudes towards tourism and tourists deteriorate.

As research progressed, it became clear that there is a close relationship between resident satisfaction and resident support for tourism development, and that resident satisfaction is an import factor in achieving sustainable tourism development as a solution to overtourism. This has led to a shift in the study of the residents of tourist destinations from the being viewed purely as victims, to being viewed as a solution to problems of tourism development.

2. **What are the stakeholders involved in the Tokyo Olympics?**

As the main constituents of Olympic movement, IOC, JOC and TOCOG are listed. These administrative committees are categorized in Olympic family which spread a fundamental principal of Olympics to accomplish the perfect execution of the Games.

In the private segment, business organizations exist as sponsors and organizations that play a fundamental role in establishing the basis for the Olympic preparations. In addition, the companies that support the Olympic Games as sponsors are the ones that have the greatest impact on the Olympic Games. Citizens form the bottom layer of the structure of Olympic movement. Their existence constitutes a significant role for the Olympics Games by enabling the Games with their contribution though public funding, volunteering, and sharing living space with competition venues.

By illustrating the stakeholders that make up the Olympic movement, it became clear that there is a large gap between the residents and the Olympic movement, and that despite the fact that they are an important part of the Olympic movement in terms of their financial support and meaning of holding the Olympics, they are positioned the furthest away from its decision-making processes. The large distance from the event reduces the sense of ownership of the event.

3. **What initiatives do the authorities take to reduce the negative impact on residents as hosting the Tokyo Olympics?**

The literature review revealed that tourism pollution is still not perceived as a major problem for tourism development in Japan. However, in relation to the Olympic Games, concerns about tourism pollution have been raised and efforts have been made to address these issues.
The main tourism pollution concerns focused on congestion during the event. The first method observed was to solve the problem by enhancing the infrastructure, such as increasing transport capacity by building new runways at airports. In addition, new transport roads have been built in the Tokyo Bay area, where logistical congestion is expected during the event.

In order to reduce congestion during the event, software has proposed a solution to control the flow of people by encouraging people to minimize their movements. In terms of accommodation, it was found that the problem of shortage was solved by relaxing the regulation of non-professional home rental services and by using existing accommodation facilities.

### 6.3 Main Research Question

“What elements do affect host city residents’ perceptions of tourism development as hosting the Tokyo Olympic Games 2020?”

Community attachment was found to be the most influential factor determining local residents’ support for the Olympic Games. Furthermore, contrary to expectations, personal gain was not an appropriate predictor of residents’ perceptions. This suggests that in the relationship between the Olympic Games and the local population, the local population perceives benefits not in terms of the relationship between the individual and the event, but in terms of the relationship between society and the event. In addition, the hypothesis that residents who perceive economic benefits tend to have higher support for mega-events, as predicted, has a positive correlation with the collective economic benefit impact, and is the second most influential dependent variable amongst all independent variable, following community attachment. Personal economic benefit did not prove to be an appropriate predictor of residents’ perception.

The reason respondents did not perceive individual benefits compared to collective benefits from the Olympics, in general, could be because the event is organized at a national level, and individual citizens do not feel the direct gain or benefit personally. Moreover, the fact that there is a significant distance between the event management and individuals makes it more difficult for individuals to make a meaningful impact on an event of such a scale.

With regard to the cases of negative impact, there were cases in which respondents showed high support for hosting the Olympics even though they expected a high negative impact. This suggests that respondents expected a negative impact would be outweighed by other benefits, and support the Olympics was based on their overall judgment.
6.4 Reflection on Research Limitations

First, as a limitation of this research, the inconvenient structure of questionnaire can be pointed out. For the investigation, it was critical to collect as much data as possible to observe the opinion of involved people in the Tokyo area. Therefore, it was very fortunate that more than 220 completed responses were collected in the end. However, it is unfortunate that there are quite many incomplete responses which could not be included in the analysis. Even though initially 328 were received, 106 of those has to be discarded due to the lack of a full set of answers. This might be because of the way the questionnaire was presented to the respondents. For instance, it was designed with the option to skip questions so that the participants could decide which questions to answer with their own will. This might have increased the chances that respondents miss some of the questions, which wasted a large amount of collected information. To avoid this mistake, there is a need to utilize functions in Qualtrics and to carefully choose the structure of questionnaire.

Second, as a limitation of this research, the limited number of questions asked should be mentioned. Respondents were asked questions with the aim of determining their perceptions of different variables. Even though the number of questions was decided by considering a task load that does not discourage respondents from completing the questionnaire, one or two question(s) might not be enough to measure variables and might lack variability. For future research, I would recommend adding more questions to ask for determining each variable or formulating questions by emphasizing keywords so that it is easy for respondents to sense what factors are being asked about in each question.

Finally, this study heavily relied on the respondents’ imagination when it came to measuring the impact of the Olympic Games, since the research was carried out before the Tokyo Olympics Games period. Therefore, the level of respondents’ perceptions of the overtourism effect is not as accurate as during the event. Moreover, it must be hard for respondents to imagine the overtourism effect as a genuine concern at the pre-Olympic time. Therefore, I would like to emphasize the importance of continual research, conducting research during and post-Olympics on the same topic in order to overcome the weakness of this research. By conducting a continuous during and post-event survey in the future, it will be possible to find out how the perceptions of the respondents have changed and to find out whether there has been a change in the factors that are important in determining the residents’ opinions before and after the event.
6.5 Suggestions for Future Research

First, as a suggestion for future research, I would like to comment on the way of determining the research sampling area. In this research, the sample was collected from all over the Tokyo area by including both residents and commuters in the Tokyo area. However, during the Olympics, some areas are more expected to experience congestions (e.g., near Olympic village, etc.). This time, it was not feasible to conduct research with a specific area since there were not enough means to collect information of participants in the specific area, but the data collection focusing on the residents in these areas might bring different results than that of this study.

Second, focusing on participants from specific backgrounds might add more depth to the results that were collected in this research. The percentage of respondents engaged in the tourism industry was relatively small in the sample. However, it can be expected that an increase in the percentages of respondents from the tourism industry will cause a different result. By focusing only on the tourism professionals, it is possible to identify what tourism professionals’ value in organizing events and what benefits can increase the support to hold events despite the event’s adverse effect. By alternating the target of respondents, this study can also be applied intensively to a specific group of people who may want to be investigated.

Third, from the perspective of SET, the relationship between residents and the Tokyo Olympics is more of a "society versus event" rather than "individual versus individual". As the experimental results showed, the relationship between individual benefits and support for the event could not be proven, whereas there was a relationship between overall benefits and support for the event. This data supports the previously mentioned perception of the relationship between residents and events through SET.

Moreover, it is essential to remember that events can deliver negative impacts as well as positive impacts to the host community. In this study, we mainly focused on the positive impacts generated by the Tokyo Olympics. However, as it became clear through the experiment, the expected individual negative impacts are not necessarily inversely proportional to residents' support for the event. The result may be because the other (individual/collective) positive impacts outweigh the negative impacts. This suggests that future research should investigate the relationship between residents and events from an "individual versus individual" basis and a "society versus event" basis.

6.6 Future of the Residents’ Involvement in Tourism Development

Finally, I would like to lay out my speculation for the change in residents’ involvement in tourism development in the future. I suspect that the situation surrounding the Olympic Games caused by
COVID-19 could be the pivotal moment for residents to revisit their attitude of how they are going to be involved in tourism development from now on. Even with less than two months to go before the event, the situation regarding event organization is changing by the day, and there is no firm prospect of the Olympic Games taking place yet. On the news, the increased amount of information about the economic losses associated with the postponement or impossibility of holding the Olympic Games is more often shared than the event's positive outcome. With the third declaration of a state of emergency just before the Olympic Games, public opinion has become increasingly suspicious of the feasibility of hosting the Games (Illmer, 2021). It would be no overstatement to say that these events provide an opportunity for the residents to rethink their passive way of participating in events by blindly accepting higher authorities' decision, and to re-examine their right to manifest their opinion on tourism development. Subsequently, reclaiming the right of the residents to decide on the tourism development will not be limited to the field of mega-events but will spread to a wide range of areas of tourism-related activities.
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A. Local Resident Questionnaire

The Survey of Perception of Residents towards Overtourism Effects (the case of the Tokyo Olympics)

Introduction
It is widely known that hosting the Olympics has many positive impacts on the host city. However, on the other hand, it is also true that hosting the Olympics can bring negative impact by attracting more tourists than the host city has the capacity to handle. It is also in the news for the cause.

In previous host cities, it is reported that the quality of life for local residents has been deteriorated due to the increase of tourist visits to the city (e.g., increasing land prices because of high demand during events, congestion in the public transportation network, problems with tourist etiquette, abuse in environmental and cultural resources, deterioration of public safety, etc.).

The purpose of this survey
As a part of University research, this survey is conducted to find out what the opinion of the residents and commuters into Tokyo on the possible effects of such a mega-event is so that your opinion can be taken into account, for this and future events.
The participation requirement

Because of the purpose of this research, if you are happened to be residents in Tokyo or commute into Tokyo area, we would like to invite you to take a survey for this research.

A small contribution for participation in the survey

Since we are happy that you are willing to participate in this survey, we want to express our gratitude by offering you the opportunity to win a gift card (amazon gift card 5 euro worth), which will be allotted among all participants. If you wish to sign up for the reward, please also fill in the information asked for after the completion of the survey.

*This survey takes approximately 5 minutes to finish.
*This survey is conducted voluntarily and anonymously. You can stop answering the questions whenever you like during the survey. However, it would, of course, be most helpful, if you complete the survey fully. There are no right or wrong answers to the questions.

In this section, you will be asked your opinion on support for mega-events such as the Tokyo Olympic Games. Please choose the answer which is most suitable for your opinion.


Q1 政府は今後、東京にさらにメガイベントを誘致するべきだ。(The government should organize more mega-events in Tokyo in the future.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. そう思わない (Strongly disagree)</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3. どちらともいえない (Neutral)</th>
<th>4.</th>
<th>5. そう思う (Strongly agree)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q2 東京オリンピックに対してポジティブなイメージを持っており、東京での開催に賛成している。(I have a positive image about the Tokyo Olympic Games and support hosting the event in Tokyo.)
このセクションでは、東京オリンピックでおこりうる好影響に関する質問が問われます。それぞれの質問の適切な箇所に○をつけてください。
*評価スケール: 1. そう思わない, 2. どちらともいえない, 3. そう思う

Q3 私は個人的に何らかの形で東京オリンピックから経済的恩恵を受けている、又は受けると思う。（In some way I gain economic benefits from the Tokyo Olympic Games.）

Q4 東京オリンピック関連の観光客が増加することにより、世帯収入が増加した、又は思うと思う。（The increasing number of tourists by the Tokyo Olympic Games causes the increase in the household income.）
**Q5** Tokyo Olympic Games caused an increase in tourists, which contributes to Japan's economic situation.

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

**Q6** Tokyo Olympic Games create many desirable employment opportunities for Japanese society.

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

**Q7** Tokyo Olympic Games enable more active cultural exchange between visitors and residents.

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

**Q8** Tokyo Olympic Games provide opportunities to improve individual skills such as communication skills through volunteering or enrichment in an understanding of other cultures.

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

**Q9** Tokyo Olympic Games offer opportunities to improve individual skills such as communication skills through volunteering or enrichment in an understanding of other cultures.

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

(Example: Volunteering activities through communication skills.)
Games bring positive impacts on the cultural identity to the Japanese society (e.g. enhancing the sense of unity as a community)

Q10 東京オリンピックは、国のポジティブなイメージの普及に貢献している、又はすると思う。
(The Tokyo Olympic Games contribute to promoting a positive image of the country.)

Q11 東京オリンピックは、自分が個人的に利用しそうな公園やレジャー施設の開発の奨励に貢献している、又はすると思う。
(The Tokyo Olympic Games encourage the creation of parks and leisure areas which I might use personally)

Q12 東京オリンピックが行われることによりインフラの整備が促進されている、又はされると思う。
(The Tokyo Olympic Games improve the infrastructures (public transportation, water supply, electricity etc.), which contributes to the whole society's convenience.)
Q13 東京オリンピックが日本社会と個人の利益に貢献していると思う項目を全て選んでください。(Please choose all items you think that the Tokyo Olympic Games contribute to the benefits for an individual or the society)

○ 平和と国際協力の推進 (Promoting peace and international cooperation)
○ 経済の活性化 (Stimulating economy)
○ 国のポジティブなイメージの普及 (Promoting the positive image of a country)
○ 世界市場における観光地としての宣伝 (Promoting Japan as a touristic destination in the global market)
○ 日本国民主体の一体感の強化 (Enhancing the sense of unity among the citizens)
○ インフラ整備の充実 (Development of infrastructure)
○ 雇用機会の創出 (Creating job opportunities)
○ 特に無し (None)
○ その他 Other

Q13-1 would be displayed if the respondent chose “Other” in Q13

Q13-1 で与えられた選択肢以外に、東京オリンピックが日本の社会や個人にプラスの影響をもたらしていると考えられるものは何ですか。(Other than the option you were given in Q13, what can you think of the Tokyo Olympic Games contributes to the Japanese society or yourself?)

このセクションでは、東京オリンピックでの起こりうる悪影響に関する質問が問われます。それぞれの質問の適切な箇所に○をつけてください。
*評価スケール: (1. そう思わない、2. どちらかというとそう思わない、3. どちらともいえない、4. どちらかというとそう思う、5. そう思う)

In this section, you will be asked your opinion on the expected negative effects of the Tokyo Olympic Games. Please choose the answer which is most suitable for your opinion.

Q14 東京オリンピックによる変化は、家計にマイナスの影響を与えている、又は与えると思う。 (例: 観光地での商品価格の高騰等) (The changes caused by the Tokyo Olympic Games (the increase of product price in touristic areas or inflating in land price) negatively impact on household finances.)

1. そう思わない (Strongly disagree) 2. 3. どちらともいえない (Neutral) 4. 5. そう思う (Strongly agree)

Q15 東京オリンピックでは、公的支出が利益を上回ると思う。 (The Tokyo Olympic Games causes more public expenses rather than gain.)

1. そう思わない (Strongly disagree) 2. 3. どちらともいえない (Neutral) 4. 5. そう思う (Strongly agree)

Q16 東京オリンピックによる観光客の増加は、東京都在住者・通勤者としての生活の質に悪影響を及ぼしている、又は及ぼすと思う。 (例: 公園や遊歩道の混雑等) (The increase of tourists caused by the Tokyo Olympic Games will affect the quality of life in Tokyo as local residents/ commuters.)

1. そう思わない (Strongly disagree) 2. 3. どちらともいえない (Neutral) 4. 5. そう思う (Strongly agree)

Q17 東京オリンピックを開催することは、東京都の評判に悪影響を与えている、又は与えると思う。 (Organizing the Tokyo Olympic Games will negatively affect the reputation of the Tokyo area.)

1. そう思わない (Strongly disagree) 2. 3. どちらともいえない (Neutral) 4. 5. そう思う (Strongly agree)

Q18 東京オリンピックを開催することにより、環境汚染やパンデミックリスクが増え、個人の健康に影響が及ぶリスクが高まっている、又は高まると思う。 (The increase of
environmental pollution because of the Tokyo Olympic Games preparation makes me concerned about personal health.)

Q19 東京オリンピックにより日本社会全体の環境問題が悪化している、又はすると思う。
(The Tokyo Olympic Games worsens the country's environmental issues.)

Q20 東京オリンピックが日本社会や個人に負の影響をもたらしていると思う項目を全て選んでください。 (Please choose all times you think that the Tokyo Olympic Games contributes to the disadvantages for individual or the society.)

- 公共交通機関の混雑 (Congestion in public transport)
- 物価の上昇 (Inflating good price)
- 治安の悪化 (Worsen public safety)
- 景観の劣化 (Deteriorate public scenery)
- 観光客が行う破壊行為 (Vandalism by tourists)
- パンデミックの危険性 (Risk for pandemic)
- 特に無し (None)
- その他 (Other)

Q20-1 would be displayed if the respondent chose “Other” in Q20.

Q20-1 間 20 で与えられた選択肢以外に、東京オリンピックが日本の社会や個人にマイナスの影響をもたらしていると考えられるものは何ですか (Other than the option you were
given in Q20, what disadvantages can you think of the Tokyo Olympic Games brings to the Japanese society or yourself?)

Q21 東京オリンピックが東京で開催されることは、私にとって重要なことだ。(The fact that hosting the Tokyo Olympic Games in Tokyo is important to me.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.そう思わない (Strongly disagree)</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.どちらともいえない (Neutral)</th>
<th>4.</th>
<th>5.そう思う (Strongly agree)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q22 東京オリンピックを東京で開催するという事実に思い入れがある。(I have an emotional attachment to the fact of hosting the Tokyo Olympic Games in Tokyo.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.そう思わない (Strongly disagree)</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.どちらともいえない (Neutral)</th>
<th>4.</th>
<th>5.そう思う (Strongly agree)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q23 東京オリンピックに関する意思決定のプロセスに自分が関与していると感じている。(I feel that I have been involved in the decision-making process regarding the Tokyo Olympic Games.)
Q24 我认为我的意见已经在东京奥运会的策划和运营中得到了反映。
(I feel that my opinion has made an influence on planning and management for the Tokyo Olympic Games.)

Q25 我认为个人从东京奥运会中获得的利益超过了个人付出的代价。
(I consider that the personal benefits from the Tokyo Olympics outweigh the personal expenses generated by the Tokyo Olympics.)

Q26 我认为社会从东京奥运会中获得的利益超过了个人付出的代价。
(I consider that the benefits to society as a whole from the Tokyo Olympics outweigh the personal expenses generated by the Tokyo Olympics.)
Q27 東京オリンピックの開催に伴う、マイナスの影響を受けることは避けることはできないと思う。(I believe that it is inevitable to receive negative effects as we host the Tokyo Olympic Games.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.そう思わない (Strongly disagree)</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.どちらともいえない (Neutral)</th>
<th>4.</th>
<th>5.そう思う (Strongly agree)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q28 東京オリンピック開催に関与している人々(開催者、地域住民等)は、オリンピック開催によるマイナスの影響に耐える必要があると思う。(I think that the people involved in organizing the Tokyo Olympics (organizers, local residents, etc.) need to bear the negative effects of hosting the Olympics.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.そう思わない (Strongly disagree)</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.どちらともいえない (Neutral)</th>
<th>4.</th>
<th>5.そう思う (Strongly agree)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

このセクションではあなたの情報に関する質問が問われます。それぞれの質問の適切な箇所に○をつけ、情報を入力してください。

In this section, you will be asked for your personal information. Please choose the answer which is most suitable for your case.

Q29 年齢 (Age)
- ○ -25
- ○ 26-45
- ○ 46-65
- ○ 66-85
- ○ 86+

Q30 性別 (Gender)
- ○ 男性 (Male)
- ○ 女性 (Female)
- ○ その他 (Other)
Q31 職業 (Occupation)
- 経営者・会社役員 (Corporate executive)
- 会社員 (Corporate employee)
- 自営業 (Self-employed)
- 公務員 (Civil service administrative officer)
- パート・アルバイト (Part-time employment)
- 専業主婦・主夫 (Housewife/ Homemaker)
- 学生 (Student)
- 定年退職 (Retired)
- 無職 (Unemployed)
- その他 (Other)

Q31-1 would be displayed if the respondent chose “Other” in Q31.

Q31-1 職業を具体的に記入してください。(Please specify your job title.)

Q32 自分が収入を得ている職業は観光産業と関係がありますか？(アルバイトを含める) (Is your occupation from which you gain your income related to the tourism industry? * Including part-time job)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>はい (Yes)</th>
<th>いいえ (No)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q33 東京に来た目的は何ですか？(What is the purpose of your visit to Tokyo?)
- 東京に住んでいる (I live in Tokyo.)
- 東京に通勤・通学をしている (I commute into Tokyo.)
ギフトカード抽選への参加をご希望の方は、氏名・メールアドレスを記入してください。当選者に選ばれた際に連絡をさせていただきます。(Please write your contact information so that we can inform you if you win the rewards.)

○ 氏名 (Name) ________________________________________________
○ Email address ________________________________________________
### B. Descriptive Statistics

#### B.1 Tables with Means and Standard Deviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residents’ perceptions</td>
<td>3.3041</td>
<td>1.19430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid N (listwise)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

##### Resident’s perception by gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q30 Gender</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.3868</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>1.23690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.2304</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>1.15904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.3041</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>1.19430</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

##### Resident’s perception by age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q29 Age</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26&lt;</td>
<td>3.4900</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.05644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 – 45</td>
<td>3.1517</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>1.26447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 – 65</td>
<td>3.0968</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1.36882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66 - 85</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.3041</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>1.19430</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Resident’s perception by purpose of visit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q33 Purpose of visit</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I live in Tokyo</td>
<td>3.3020</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>1.20847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I commute into Tokyo</td>
<td>3.3125</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>1.15223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>3.2800</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.33915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.3041</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>1.19430</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Resident’s perception by income relation to tourism industry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q32 Relation to tourism industry</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3.3039</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1.34565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3.3041</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>1.14965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.3041</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>1.19430</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Descriptive Statistics by question

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q3 Ind. E. benefit</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>1.476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4 Ind. E. benefit</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>1.355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5 Coll. E. benefit</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>1.118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6 Coll. E. benefit</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>1.298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7 Ind. SC. Benefit</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>1.329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8 Ind. SC. Benefit</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>1.310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9 Coll. SC. Benefit</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>1.228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10 Coll. SC. Benefit</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>1.185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11 Ind. En. Benefit</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12 Coll. En. Benefit</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>1.172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q14 Ind. E. loss</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>1.137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Value 1</td>
<td>Value 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15 Coll. E. loss</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>1.187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q16 Ind. SC. Loss</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>1.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17 Coll. SC. Loss</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>1.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18 Ind. En. loss</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>1.126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q19 Coll. En. Loss</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>1.222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q21 CA</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>1.423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q22 CA</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>1.457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q23 CI</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q24 CI</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>.870</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B.2 Plots of Answers Distribution per Question

Q3 In some way I gain economic benefits from the Tokyo Olympic Games.

Q4 The increasing number of tourists by the Tokyo Olympic Games causes the increase in the household income.
Q6 The increasing number of tourists caused by the Tokyo Olympic Games improves the economic situation of Japan.

Q6 The Tokyo Olympic Games create many desirable employment opportunities for Japanese society.

Q7 The Tokyo Olympic Games enable more active cultural exchange between visitors and residents.
Q8 The Tokyo Olympic Games provides me with opportunities to improve individual skills such as communication skills through volunteering or enrichment in an understanding of other cultures.

Q9 The Tokyo Olympic Games bring positive impacts on the cultural identity to the Japanese society (e.g. enhancing the sense of unity as a community)

Q10 The Tokyo Olympic Games contribute to promoting a positive image of the country.)
Q11 The Tokyo Olympic Games encourage the creation of parks and leisure areas which I might use personally.

Q12 The Tokyo Olympic Games improve the infrastructures (public transportation, water supply, electricity etc.), which contributes to the whole society's convenience.
Q21 The fact that hosting the Tokyo Olympic Games in Tokyo is important to me.

Q22 I have an emotional attachment to the fact of hosting the Tokyo Olympic Games in Tokyo.
Q23 I feel that I have been involved in the decision-making process regarding the Tokyo Olympic Games.

Q24 I feel that my opinion has made an influence on planning and management for the Tokyo Olympic Games.
C. Statistical Models

C.1 Linear Regression with All Independent Variables

### Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.774*</td>
<td>.598</td>
<td>.558</td>
<td>.79359</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ANOVA*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>188.639</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9.432</td>
<td>14.976</td>
<td>.000 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>126.587</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>.630</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>315.226</td>
<td>221</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a. Dependent Variable: ResidentsPerceptions*

### Coefficients*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>1.176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q3 Ind. E. benefit</td>
<td>-.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q4 Ind. E. benefit</td>
<td>-.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q5 Coll. E. benefit</td>
<td>.202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q6 Coll. E. benefit</td>
<td>-.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q7 Ind. SC. benefit</td>
<td>.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q8 Ind. SC. benefit</td>
<td>.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q9 Coll. SC. benefit</td>
<td>-.086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10 Coll. SC. benefit</td>
<td>.209</td>
<td>.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11 Ind. En. benefit</td>
<td>-.084</td>
<td>.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12 Coll. En. benefit</td>
<td>.120</td>
<td>.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q14 Ind. E. loss</td>
<td>-.066</td>
<td>.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15 Coll. E. loss</td>
<td>-.032</td>
<td>.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q16 Ind. SC. loss</td>
<td>-.097</td>
<td>.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17 Coll. SC. loss</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18 Ind. En. loss</td>
<td>-.024</td>
<td>.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q19 Coll. En. loss</td>
<td>-.077</td>
<td>.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q21 CA</td>
<td>.245</td>
<td>.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q22 CA</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q23 CI</td>
<td>-.015</td>
<td>.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q24 CI</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.087</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: ResidentsPerceptions
### C.2 Linear Regression Model with Selected Independent Variables

#### Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.742</td>
<td>.550</td>
<td>.542</td>
<td>.80857</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: ResidentsPerceptions

b. Predictors: (Constant), Q21Collective economic benefit, Q5 Collective Socio-cultural benefit, Q12 Collective environmental benefit, Q10 Community attachment

#### ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>173.355</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>43.339</td>
<td>66.289</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>141.872</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>.654</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>315.226</td>
<td>221</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: ResidentsPerceptions

b. Predictors: (Constant), Q21Collective economic benefit, Q5 Collective Socio-cultural benefit, Q12 Collective environmental benefit, Q10 Community attachment

#### Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.236</td>
<td>.228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q5 Coll. E. benefit</td>
<td>.251</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>.235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q10 Coll. Sc. benefit</td>
<td>.209</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>.207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q12 Coll. En. benefit</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q21 CA</td>
<td>.342</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.407</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: ResidentsPerceptions