



Local authority planning provision for event management in Ireland: A socio-cultural perspective

James Hanrahan & Kelly Maguire

To cite this article: James Hanrahan & Kelly Maguire (2016) Local authority planning provision for event management in Ireland: A socio-cultural perspective, Journal of Convention & Event Tourism, 17:2, 129-158, DOI: [10.1080/15470148.2015.1121418](https://doi.org/10.1080/15470148.2015.1121418)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15470148.2015.1121418>



Published online: 01 Jun 2016.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 5



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)

Local authority planning provision for event management in Ireland: A socio-cultural perspective

James Hanrahan and Kelly Maguire

Department of Marketing Tourism and Sport, School of Business and Social Science, Institute of Technology, Sligo, Ireland

ABSTRACT

The increasing popularity of the event sector in Ireland has had an effect on host communities in a positive and negative manner. This baseline comparative assessment highlights the current level of all 32 Irish local authorities socio-cultural planning provision and guidelines for event management. The research employed a content analysis methodology, which highlighted a lack of local authority social and cultural planning guidelines and indicators. The lessons learned from this study may have international implications for other event destinations and offers an opportunity for improvement by applying best practice socio-cultural indicators in guidelines for event management by local authorities.

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 3 June 2015
Accepted 14 November 2015

KEYWORDS

Event management; event planning; guidelines; Ireland; local authorities; socio-cultural impacts

Introduction

Much research has focused on the economic impacts of events (Baade, Baumann, & Matheson, 2005; Gursoy, Kim, & Uysal, 2004; Holmes, Hughes, Mair, & Carlsen, 2015; Janeczko, Mules, & Ritchie, 2002; Liu, 2013; Mair & Whitford, 2013; Miller, 2007). This is not surprising considering events are an important mechanism for enhancing tourism and economic development in their regions (Arcodia & Whitford, 2008; Dwyer & Spurr, 2011; Fredaline, Jago, & Deery, 2003; Getz, 2008; Quinn, 2009). In contrast to this, the socio-cultural impacts of events have received little academic attention (Ali-Knight, Robertson, Fyall, Ladkin, 2008; Finkel, McGillivray, McPherson, & Robinson, 2013; Fredaline et al., 2003; Quinn, 2009; Ziakas, 2013). This is supported by Reid (2004) who highlights the social and cultural consequences of tourism and events are often overlooked in favor of the economic advantages. Perhaps this too was overlooked in the recent case of the Croke Park stadium concerts (Garth Brooks) in Ireland. This case caused the community residing around Croke Park stadium in Dublin to object, and subsequently, in a drawn out event licensing process, resulted in the cancellation of five nights of sold out (capacity 80,000) concerts in 2014. This apparently resulted in a loss of earnings estimated to be worth around €50 m to the local economy. Therefore, it seems the

CONTACT Kelly Maguire ✉ kelly.maguire@mail.itsligo.ie 📠 Department of Marketing Tourism and Sport, School of Business and Social Science, Institute of Technology, Ash Lane, Ballinodoe Road, Sligo, F91 YW50, Ireland.

© 2016 Taylor & Francis Group, LLC

economic advantages of events are not to be given precedence without the consideration of socio-cultural benefits and costs (Jonsson, 2014) to avoid such implications for other event destinations. In recent years, a growing body of research on the socio-cultural impacts of events has emerged due to the positive and negative impacts on host communities caused as a result of events (Delamere, Wankel, & Hinch, 2001; Fredaline et al., 2003; Mair & Whitford, 2013; Nunkoo & Ramkissoon, 2011; Pugh & Wood, 2004; Sharpley & Stone, 2011; Small, Edwards, & Sheridan, 2005; Wood, 2009). These impacts can have detrimental implications on the society and culture of host locations. As such, the need to address the socio-cultural impacts of events has become a focal point for academics, event organizers, policy makers, and local authority planners in recent years.

The complexity of the relationship between events and host communities is significant. From a positive perspective, events can play a significant role in the lives of communities by enhancing the local community image, maintaining community values, and as a vehicle for improving social relationships (Tassiopoulos, 2005). For this reason, communities have begun to realize the benefits that can be derived from hosting an event (Etiosa, 2012; Nunkoo & Ramkissoon, 2011; Raj & Musgrave, 2009). As a result of this, destinations and communities are increasingly using events as a means of income generation (Page & Connell, 2014; Raj & Musgrave, 2009; Raj, Walters, & Rashid, 2013), infrastructure development (Baumann & Matheson, 2013; Wamblach, Aicher, Riordan, Paule-Koba, & Newland, 2015), community rejuvenation (Malfas, Theodoraki, & Houlihan, 2004; Richards, de Brito, & Wilks, 2013), cultural preservation (Jepson & Clarke, 2015; Raj & Musgrave, 2009), civic cohesion and pride (Holmes et al., 2015; Small, 2007; Raj & Musgrave, 2009; Wood, 2006), and community satisfaction (Nunkoo & Ramkissoon, 2011). Therefore, events contribute a great deal to communities and essentially bring many benefits to a destination. Further to this, events are not only beneficial from a societal perspective; they also have the ability to contribute positively to the economy and the environment (David, 2009; Janeczko, Mules, & Ritchie, 2002). Therefore, with all the positive benefits events bring to destinations, one would ask why communities would object to having events hosted in their localities worldwide. Specifically, it is worth considering why the residents around Croke Park stadium in Ireland objected to the Croke Park stadium concerts which were going to generate €50m in revenue to the Irish economy. This raises the question of whether or not there were socio-cultural guidelines and indicators in place within the local authority event management provisions and guidelines for licensing events and if so were they adhered to for this event? Consequently it is important to focus on what lessons have been learned from this to avoid such socio-cultural implications for other event destinations internationally. It is also important to recognize what has been put in place to mitigate this for communities and future event managers and local authorities who engage in this event planning and licensing process. Subsequently, there is a growing recognition of the existence of negative economic, environmental, and socio-cultural impacts that are often overlooked (Hornsby, 2011; Muhanna, 2006; Reid, 2007). As such,

the socio-cultural consequences created as a result of hosting an event can implicitly affect the sustainability outcomes of a destination and now command increasing attention.

The socio-cultural consequences of events include traffic congestion, crime, vandalism, property damage, overcrowding, littering, and noise (Andereck & Voght, 2000; Gursoy & Rutherford, 2004; Nunkoo & Ramkissoon, 2011; Weaver, 2006) to mention a few. Such tourism developments can lead to a loss of cultural values and identity, access issues and an inequality of wealth between host communities and tourists (Fredaline et al., 2003; Weaver & Oppermann, 2000). This essentially has direct implications on the community quality of life, social satisfaction, attitudes, beliefs, and values of host community lifestyles (Reid, 2007). As such, the socio-cultural impacts of events require a planning and management approach (Sharpley & Stone, 2011) to ultimately manage and mitigate the negative consequences, which have a profound effect on host communities. This can be achieved through the provision of a local authority planning mechanism, such as policies and guidelines. Such policies and guidelines are essential in sustaining the future growth and development of the event industry and preserving traditional cultures and values for societies. However, an understanding of host community perspectives on the impacts of events and the role local authorities play in planning for the socio-cultural impacts of events is first required and is essential in planning, managing, and sustaining the quality and longevity of the event industry in Ireland and other event destinations throughout the world.

Thus in essence, the purpose of this article is to essentially assess the level of all 32 Irish local authorities planning provision and guidelines for the socio-cultural impacts of event management. This study is discussed in the context of current national legislation (Planning and Development Act, 2000 and 2010, and Planning and Development Licensing at outdoor event regulations, 2001) and current theory to provide an assessment on the social and cultural planning priorities of local authority planning for events in Ireland. This baseline comparative assessment utilized a research methodology, which centered on a content analysis approach. This allowed the authors to clearly illustrate, which of the 32 local authorities and city councils assessed, provided socio-cultural planning tools and indicators for event management. This article presents a contribution to knowledge by painting a picture of the current state of socio-cultural planning by local authorities for event management in Ireland. This assessment facilitates an opportunity for further longitudinal research in the area.

Host community perspectives on events

The socio-cultural impacts of events are essentially the outcomes (both positive and negative) of an event (Wale, Robinson, & Dickson, 2010). They refer to how the host community perceives the impacts of events (Delamere, Wankel, & Hinch, 2001; Fredaline, Mules, & Ritchie, 2006; Small, Edwards, & Sheridan, 2005). It has been noted that communities will be likely to support tourism activities and the

development of tourism activities when there are perceived benefits (Dredge & Whitford, 2011; Nunkoo & Ramkissoon, 2011). However, communities are unlikely to support tourism development when there is a negative relationship with the perceived costs of such developments (Dwyer & Forsyth, 2009; Nunkoo & Ramkissoon, 2011). Consequently, it has been noted that the socio-cultural costs of hosting events can far outweigh their net benefit (Dwyer & Forsyth, 2009) and can occur in many areas of hosting events and are evident on both an individual and a community level (Delamere, Wankel, & Hinch, 2001). These impacts can be diverse and widespread throughout the community (Hall & Hodges, 1996) and can adversely affect the lives of host communities (Andereck & Nyaupane, 2010). Subsequently it can ultimately affect the overall community support for tourism developments. However, management strategies, such as consultation and participation of host communities, can assist in avoiding negative socio-cultural impacts associated with events (Arcodia & Whitford, 2008). As a result of this, an understanding of how host communities perceive the benefits and costs of events is critical in enabling local government to effectively plan for the socio-cultural impacts of events.

Socio-cultural impacts of events

The increasing attention commanded by the socio-cultural impacts of events cannot be underestimated or ignored. Planning for the socio-cultural impacts of events requires the consideration of potential socio-cultural changes on the host community (Etiosa, 2012; Small, Edwards, & Sheridan, 2005). It has been previously noted that resident support is essentially based on their evaluation of the benefits and costs resulting from the industry (Andereck, Valentine, Knopf, & Voght, 2005). For this reason, a focus on the socio-cultural impacts of events is essential in planning for event management. This task may fall to relevant stakeholders associated with planning and licensing events such as local authority planners. Importantly, the generation of socio-cultural benefits and costs of events are inevitable at all events, regardless of event size or scale. They can have a profound effect on the community (Delamere, 2001) and are now widely recognized, as is the need to measure these impacts in non-economic terms (Wood, 2006). The socio-cultural benefits of events can include shared experiences, revitalized traditions, community pride, increased community participation, expanded cultural perspectives, improved quality of life, enhanced destination image, support for infrastructure amenities, higher standard of living, increased leisure opportunities, increased access to goods and services, local employment, and decreased social inequalities (Fredaline et al., 2003; Nunkoo & Ramkissoon, 2011; Richards et al., 2013; Wood, 2005). These benefits are significant in bringing increased levels of positivity for developing tourism in a community. However, despite these benefits, events hosted over a prolonged period can implicitly impact community support for events. This was seen in the case of the Croke Park stadium concerts where residents around Croke Park objected to five proposed and sold out concerts on successive evenings. This objection was based on the perceived socio-cultural consequences generated by the proposed events

(*The Irish Times*, 2014) and a condition of a maximum of three concerts to be held in the stadium as allowed for in the planning permission to the stadium (Mulvey, 2014). This resulted in the local authority granting event licenses for only three concerts (as allowed in planning permission agreement), which subsequently resulted in the cancellation of all five concerts. However, had there been planning provisions and guidelines implemented by local authorities prior to this case, event promoters would have avoided the implications of all five events being cancelled and a loss of earnings of over €50 m for the local economy. Therefore, it is essential for planning to take into consideration socio-cultural needs to prevent implications to community support in planning for event management. More significantly, the community quality of life can be adversely affected (Quinn, 2009) in a negative manner by the staging of such events. Negative consequences on host communities can result in community alienation, negative community image, bad behavior, substance abuse, social dislocation, increased social inequality and conflicts, unequal distribution of benefits, crime and vandalism, disruption to lifestyle, crowding, noise, traffic congestion, pollution, loss of identity, displacement of residents, and price inflation (Dwyer & Forsyth, 2009; Dwyer, Mellor, Mistilis, & Mules, 2000; Fredaline et al., 2003; Nunkoo & Ramkissoon, 2011; Small, 2007; Weaver & Oppermann, 2000; Wood, 2005). Such social consequences will lead to resident dissatisfaction unless appropriately managed (Fredaline, Deery & Jago, 2006). This highlights the importance of planning for the socio-cultural impacts of events within local authorities. Therefore, the management of these impacts is critical in achieving sustainability in events (Richards et al., 2013) and can have a remarkable influence on the success or failure of events (Richards et al., 2013). For this reason the socio-cultural impacts of events must be a key factor of consideration in planning and managing events.

Local authority socio-cultural planning

Research into the impacts of events has focused substantially on the economic benefits that events bring to a community, a region, or a nation (Deery & Jago, 2010). This may be partially related to the economic reliance on tourism activities such as events. However, the increasing growth of the event sector calls for a shift in research to now prioritize the socio-cultural impacts of events on host communities, which have become more prevalent. This is significant in an Irish context where the popularity of the event industry has increased dramatically in previous years. Currently, the event sector in Ireland is worth over €450 m in tourism revenue to the Irish economy (Department of Transport, Tourism, and Sport [DTTAS], 2012). As well as this, their popularity now attracts over 300,000 overseas holidaymakers to Ireland each year (Fáilte Ireland, 2014; Ring, 2012). For this reason, events have become an important motivator of tourism (Getz, 2008) and an effective enhancer of destination image (Hall, 1992; Ritchie, 1984). As a result of this, they now figure prominently in the development and marketing plans of most destinations (Getz, 2008). However, this popularity of events has evoked strong positive and negative reactions from community residents (Jackson, 2008; Waitt, 2003) who are essentially impacted by the event

industry. As such, negative social impacts can undermine the key positive impacts that events can deliver for a host community (Deery & Jago, 2010), and can lead to community hostility toward the development of tourism activities such as events (Bahee, Pisani, & Shavakh, 2014; Kregg, 2001; Prayag, Hosany, Nunkoo, & Alders, 2013). Nevertheless, the success of tourism development depends on the active support and participation of the local population (Gursoy & Rutherford, 2004) and local authority planners. Therefore, an understanding of the socio-cultural impacts of events in local authority planning provisions and guidelines and event licensing procedures is important in obtaining and maintaining community support to deliver benefits to local communities while minimizing socio-cultural costs. Perhaps if this procedure were initiated prior to the cancellation of the Croke Park stadium events in Dublin in 2014, event promoters would not have facilitated a sale of tickets for proposed events, which had not yet been licensed. They would also be aware that no more than three concerts on successive evenings could be hosted. As such, the implications of community objections and subsequent cancellations of the proposed events may have been avoided. Furthermore, an understanding of the socio-cultural impacts in planning is critical in developing policies and guidelines for the planning and management of sustaining and enhancing the quality and longevity of the event industry in Ireland.

Local authorities play a crucial role in licensing events under the Planning and Development Act 2000 and 2010 and the Planning and Development Licensing at Outdoor Event Regulations 2001. From a societal perspective, this act outlines the importance of ensuring events are planned and organized in a way that minimizes harm for event stakeholders, including the host community (Department of the Environment, Community, and Local Government [DECLG], 2013). This significant local authority commitment toward festivals and events ensures they are planned causing minimum destruction to host community lives. Additionally, under the Planning and Development Act 2000 and 2010, local authorities in Ireland are legally required to develop County Development Plans (CDPs), and tourism strategies which include objectives for “the integration of planning and sustainable development of the area with the consideration of social, community, and cultural requirements of the area and its population,” (Department of Environment, Heritage, and Local Government [DEHLG], 2007). Subsequent to this, they are responsible for managing and preserving the heritage and cultural assets of destinations (Department of Arts, Heritage, and Gaeltacht, 2014). This outlines the significant importance of the role local authorities should play in socio-cultural planning for a destination. Accordingly, the role of local authorities in the provision of planning for event impacts is of critical importance in achieving sustainability in event management in Ireland. In particular, due to the increasing growth of festivals and events in the developed world, local authorities are now increasingly supporting this development within communities (Pugh & Wood, 2004; Raj et al., 2013; Wood, 2009). As such, their role has become fundamental to the provision of leisure and tourism facilities as they provide an extensive range of services (Pugh & Wood, 2004). Such services

include infrastructure development, planning, building control, car parks, signage, roads, water supply and sewage, waste management, welfare, health, recreation, and amenities. These services all have a relative closeness to local communities. However, the public service provision of entertainment, culture, and arts traditionally remains a non-mandatory requirement (Borrett, 1991). Yet, public planners and decision makers encourage tourism because it brings benefits to the community (Fredaline et al., 2003). In fact, local authorities have begun to use events within their region to achieve a diverse range of economic and social objectives in a community (Wood, 2005). Therefore, it is vital that local authorities take socio-cultural factors into consideration in tourism development decisions when planning for sustainability in the industry. This may be achieved with the incorporation of socio-cultural factors in the development of effective policies and guidelines by local authorities, which can aid the implementation of sustainability in socio-cultural planning for event management. Furthermore, it can facilitate the maximization of benefits to society while minimizing the generation of negative socio-cultural costs. This process facilitated through local authority planning can increase the overall socio-cultural sustainability of event management in Ireland. It can also prevent implications for event promoters, such as facilitating a sale of tickets for events, which are not licensed, community objections, and cancellation of sold-out events for other event localities. However, to do this requires the incorporation of best practice tools and indicators within local authority planning.

Tools and indicators to aid socio-cultural planning

Planning for sustainability in tourism activities has been a focal point for academics, decision makers, and government at regional and local level for a number of years. This has resulted in the development of a number of sustainable planning tools, guidelines, aims, and indicators. These management instruments include the UNEP/UNWTO 12 aims of sustainable tourism (2005), the Global Sustainable Tourism Criteria (GSTC; 2013), the European Tourism Indicator System (ETIS; 2013), and the DIT ACHIEV model of sustainable tourism management (2007). The 12 aims of sustainable tourism are a set of aims used in tourism planning, management, and monitoring processes which can provide accurate results for decision making in local government (WTO & Ministry of Tourism and Environment, 2007). From a socio-cultural context, they incorporate socio-cultural aims such as visitor fulfillment, local control, community well-being, and cultural richness. These aims can be used to develop policies for more sustainable tourism, in particular more socio-cultural sustainable events. They were initially developed to provide governments with guidance and a framework for the development of policies for sustainable tourism (UNEP/UNWTO, 2005) and were based around two principles. The first principle minimizes negative impacts on society, the economy, and the environment; while the second principle maximizes tourism's positive contribution to local economies and the conservation of natural and cultural heritage, as well as the quality of life of hosts and visitors.

The GSTC is a tool for managing sustainability in tourism. It promotes the widespread adoption of global sustainable tourism standards to ensure the tourism industry considers driving conservation and poverty alleviation. It also promotes the use of socio-cultural sustainability in tourism to maximize benefits to communities, visitors, and cultures while minimizing negative impacts. Overall, it strives to achieve best practice in sustainable tourism by adopting universal sustainable tourism principles (Global Sustainable Tourism Council, 2013). The ETIS measures performance and monitors results while enhancing sustainability performance (EC, 2015). It identifies areas of improvement while managing risks effectively and creates benchmarks for performance. Importantly, it encourages tourism development that balances economic, environmental, and socio-cultural impacts while ensuring the longevity of the tourism industry. It can be used by local authorities to obtain improved data for informed policy decision-making.

The DIT ACHIEV model of sustainable tourism indicators, which has also been suggested as a tool for sustainable event management is a management system developed for an Irish context. This model focuses on ensuring a sustainable future for Irish tourism. The key fields of interest in this model involves community and visitors, therefore, it is highly focused on socio-cultural aspects of tourism. This model also aims to attract stakeholder involvement in tourism planning and development (Griffin, Morrissey, & Flanagan, 2010). These four tools are useful and reliable tools for policy makers as they offer an opportunity to measure, monitor, and assess the socio-cultural impacts of events. Moreover, they can be applied in legislation for the development of planning policies and guidelines for event management to prevent implications for event localities worldwide and facilitate effective and sustainable planning that considers socio-cultural issues and concerns. For this reason, the adoption and utilization of such tools and indicator systems within local authority planning provision can aid the implementation and regulation of sustainable planning for the socio-cultural impacts of events. Hence, the consideration of these tools in socio-cultural planning can facilitate a balance between the costs and benefits of events and facilitate the success and longevity of the event industry in Ireland. These aims and indicator sets were incorporated into the content analysis tool to assess, which local authorities, if any, were utilizing or compliant with such management systems.

Research method

This national baseline comparative analysis involved extensive data collection into local authority socio-cultural planning provision and guidelines for event management with a particular focus on socio-cultural indicators for planning and managing events. In particular, the purpose of this study was to assess local authorities in Ireland who have a legal remit for licensing events under the Licensing at Outdoor Event Regulations 2001 and under the planning and development act 2000 and 2010 to plan for the economic, environmental, and most importantly socio-cultural development in their respective regions. In order to determine the level of

local authorities event management planning provision and guidelines, it was necessary to identify the documents to assess for the purpose of this study. The type of documents chosen for analysis analyzed all 32 local authorities event management-planning guidelines. Furthermore, it incorporated all local authorities CDPs, which are required under the Planning and Development Act 2000 and 2010. CDPs are intended to provide a strategic framework and policy context for all planning decisions in respective regions (DEHLG, 2007). They set out strategies for sustainable development giving precedence to environmental, economic, and socio-cultural considerations and objectives. For this reason, a nationwide baseline comparative assessment of local authority event planning provisions and guidelines, along with their compliance with socio-cultural indicators for event management, was the primary focus of this study. Specifically the findings provided a valuable insight into the provision of socio-cultural planning guidelines and policies for event management by local authorities. In order to conduct an examination into the level of socio-cultural planning for event management in Ireland, 36 socio-cultural criteria were compiled, which were used to develop a framework “local authority provision of socio-cultural planning processes” (Table 3). The criteria provided within this framework incorporated the principle guidelines, tools, and indicators from theory and international best practice, for example, UNWTO/UNEP aims of sustainable tourism (2005), the DIT ACHIEV model of sustainable tourism indicators (2007), the GSTC (2013), and the ETIS (2013). This enabled an assessment and examination of the specific level of local authority socio-cultural planning provided in Ireland.

Research instrument

To achieve the aim of this research, a content analysis approach was applied to assess and highlight the variations and gaps on the level of local authority planning provision for socio-cultural concerns of event management in Ireland. The content analysis approach was the primary quantitative analysis tool, as it represents quantification on a limited scale and is still anchored in the quantitative research paradigm. This approach may be considered a kind of reliability of the measures and a validation of eventual findings (Sellitz, Jahoda, Deutsch, & Cook, 1967). Therefore, quantification in content analysis tends to emphasize the procedures of analysis (Berg, 2007). Additionally, quantitative research tools take an analytical approach to understand a number of controlled variables. Therefore, tourism researchers are using content analysis increasingly as a means of critical investigation when faced with textual forms of data, like written documents such as tourism strategies, policies, and guidelines. This approach was considered ideal in examining the level of local authority socio-cultural planning provisions and guidelines for event management in Ireland, as it allowed for a valuable cross-representation of results in relation to the provision of socio-cultural planning provisions and guidelines for event management by local authorities. Additionally, it highlighted the integration of socio-cultural planning priorities in planning guidelines for event management by local authorities. In order to facilitate the constant comparison throughout the research

process and to highlight the variations between local authorities, data were inputted into a content analysis tool. The data from each category were then analyzed and discussed in light of international literature. This particular approach can be applied to all kinds of written texts (Rose, Spins, & Canhoto, 2015), therefore, it was particularly useful in examining local authority planning processes, such as guidelines and policies. The criteria assessed within the content analysis tool are outlined below.

Criteria assessed

Prior to developing a content analysis assessment tool, it was necessary to determine the criteria to be assessed within the content analysis tool. Specifically, the criteria within the framework below was informed and developed using principles from the UNEP/UNWTO aims of sustainable tourism (2005), the GSTC (2013), the ETIS (2013), and the DIT ACHIEV model of sustainable tourism management (2007). This enabled an assessment on the degree of socio-cultural planning provisions and guidelines for event management at a national level in the Republic of Ireland. The analysis centered on 36 criteria based on existing theory and indicators from the tools previously mentioned. The variables assessed are shown in Table 1.

Utilizing a content analysis investigative tool to assess the above variables was a fitting way to accumulate data. This allowed an examination of the socio-cultural planning priorities incorporated in local authority planning processes (Table 3) and results are discussed in light of relevant literature. The socio-cultural planning criteria for event management can be applied to various international countries; yet for the purpose of this study, an assessment of the integration of the above criteria in local authority planning processes such as guidelines and policies in the Republic of Ireland was the primary focus. The 36 criteria outlined are incremental aspects of implementation, which should, ideally, be integrated within local authorities planning processes for event management worldwide.

Sample

In order to achieve comparative nationwide perspectives on the levels of socio-cultural planning for event management by local authorities, the authors identified and analyzed 32 local authorities and city councils in the Republic of Ireland using the above criteria. The current system of local government in the republic of Ireland is comprised of 31 local authorities. There are 26 local authorities responsible for local government in 24 geographical counties including the County of Dublin. County Dublin has three local authorities—South Dublin County Council, Dun Laoghaire-Rathdown County Council, and Fingal County Council. There are two city and county councils who are responsible for local government in Limerick (Limerick City and County Council) and Waterford (Waterford City and County Council). Also, there are three city councils and they are responsible for local government in the cities of Dublin, Cork, and Galway. This study focuses on the 31 local authorities; however, one local authority “Tipperary” is separated into “Tipperary North”

Table 1. Summary of criteria for assessing the socio-cultural sustainability of event management by local authorities.

Assessment criteria
Local authority generic planning guidelines for event management provided
Local authority socio-cultural planning guidelines for event management provided
Local authority event socio-cultural policy in CDP
Guidelines for the provision of basic services
Guidelines for crime and vandalism
Guidelines for crowding
Guidelines for noise
Guidelines for traffic congestion
Guidelines for persons with mobility impairments
Guidelines and policies compliant with UNWTO aims of sustainable tourism (2005)
Guidelines and policies for social equity
Guidelines and policies for local prosperity
Guidelines and policies for visitor fulfillment
Guidelines and policies for local control
Guidelines and policies for community well-being
Guidelines and policies for cultural richness
Guidelines and policies compliant with DIT-ACHIEV model (2007)
Guidelines and policies for community access
Guidelines and policies for community involvement
Guidelines and policies for protecting community quality of life
Guidelines and policies for community beneficiaries
Guidelines and policies complaint with GSTC (2013)
Guidelines and policies for minimizing negative impacts to local community
Guidelines and policies for maximizing positive benefits to local community
Guidelines and policies for community participation
Guidelines and policies for local employment
Guidelines and policies for supporting community development
Guidelines and policies for public rights of way and local access
Guidelines and policies for community opinion
Guidelines and policies for preventing exploitation
Guidelines and policies for Intellectual and cultural property rights considered
Guidelines and policies complaint with ETIS (2013)
Guidelines and policies for equality and accessibility
Guidelines and policies for the protection and enhancement of local identity
Guidelines and policies for protecting community image
Guidelines and policies for protection of cultural and historic sites

Source: Adapted from UNEP/UNWTO (2005), GSTC (2007), EC (2013), and Griffin et al. (2007).

and “Tipperary South.” Therefore, in total, 32 local authorities are assessed, giving a complete population of local authorities and city councils in the Republic of Ireland. This sample was chosen carefully to allow for a constant comparison and analysis of local authority planning.

Analysis

To facilitate the constant comparison of results throughout the research process and to highlight the variations between local authorities, data were inputted into a content analysis tool. This structured approach allowed the authors to clearly identify and illustrate the level of socio-cultural planning provisions provided within local authority planning processes, such as planning guidelines and policies for event management in Ireland. This flexible and unobtrusive approach was also used

Table 2. Example of matrix for assessing local authority guidelines.

	Local authority (LA) provision of planning guidelines (G) and policies (P) for event management																																		
	CW	CN	CE	CK	Cc	DL	D	SD	Dr	F	G	Gc	KE	KK	KY	LS	LM	LK	LD	L	MH	MO	MN	O	R	S	Ts	Tn	WD	WH	WX	WW			
Criteria assessed within LA guidelines	33	47	64	34	22	41	22	12	26	23	62	29	32	27	46	20	29	58	31	36	35	112	29	37	53	47	31	28	56	36	48	27			
LA events financially supported in 2013							x																												
LA planning guidelines provided											x																								
LA S/C planning guidelines provided																																			
LA event S/C policy provision in CDP																																			
G for protecting community image																																			
G for community development																																			

Note: X = local authority provision made.

to determine the degree of recurring data throughout the research analysis process. The analysis primarily centered on the socio-cultural criteria already outlined and assessed their incorporation with local authority planning documents, such as guidelines and policies for event management. The provision of planning guidelines for event management is necessary to provide guidance for event organizers and local authorities in planning for a responsible event industry. Planning guidelines highlight the key areas of consideration essential in planning for event management. It then focuses on the provision of policies for event management within CDPs. Therefore, it is necessary that socio-cultural considerations are integrated within such policies and guidelines to aid the development of responsible and sustainable event industries. As such, the importance of developing policies in CDPs and guidelines detailing essential socio-cultural considerations for event management cannot be underestimated. The analysis of findings from the content analysis approach provided a valuable insight into the provision of guidelines and policies taken into consideration and incorporating socio-cultural variables within planning documents for event management by local authorities. An example matrix of the content analysis framework is outlined next.

The previous table is a brief outline of some of the findings. As can be seen above, the first and last letter of the county they represent abbreviates the local authorities displayed in the matrix. For example, "LK" abbreviates the first and last letter of the county Limerick. Table 2 clearly highlights the comparison between each local authority and how local authorities varied on the categories assessed. For example, the county Limerick had 58 events financially supported by local authorities in 2013, and had provided generic-planning guidelines while no local authority provided socio-cultural planning guidelines. Of those who provided generic planning guidelines, few local authorities incorporated socio-cultural planning criteria (Table 3), while no local authority planning guidelines prioritizing variables such as "protecting community image" or "community development." Additionally, no local authority provided policies within CDPs for the event industry. This lack of planning provision may have implications for the way the event industry will be planned and managed in the future, which in turn may affect community support for such tourism activities. The further comparison of results is discussed further in detail in the context of current theory in the subsequent section.

Results and discussion

This study provided nationwide perspectives on the levels of socio-cultural planning provided by local authorities in Ireland. Local authorities are legally required to license events and ensure events are planned in a way that minimizes harm for event stakeholders, including the local community (Department of the Environment, Community and Local Government, 2010). They are also responsible for planning for socio-cultural developments in their respective regions. This is essential now more than ever before as a result of increased awareness of negative socio-cultural impacts produced as a result of hosting events. As such, practical solutions

and a management approach are required to deal with and mitigate negative socio-cultural impacts of event management and maximize positive socio-cultural benefits. This is necessary if event industries on a global scale are to be sustained and avoid implications to the way events could be planned in future, which may be with little or no thought given to socio-cultural aspects of host communities and destinations. Therefore, the provision and implementation of guidelines and policies by local authorities are needed at a national and local level to manage this process and to facilitate socio-cultural sustainability.

A content analysis approach enabled the authors to examine the 32 local authorities' provision of national planning guidelines and policies for the socio-cultural impacts associated with events. This determined which local authorities incorporated socio-cultural issues within planning guidelines and policies for event management. This, in turn, determined the degree of socio-cultural sustainability in event management. The results are illustrated in [Table 3](#).

Analysis has highlighted the variation of results and revealed the overall lack of local authority socio-cultural planning provisions, guidelines, and policies under the various categories assessed. The variation of results illustrates that socio-cultural planning for event management have not been embraced by local authorities in Ireland. It seems local authorities already have many guidelines and requirements to abide by which may be burdensome to planners. This may constitute local authorities taking an "ad hoc" approach toward implementing socio-cultural planning guidelines and policies for event management. Nevertheless, local authority socio-cultural planning processes cannot be overlooked considering the consequences generated by events, which impact host communities (Raj & Musgrave, 2009). Therefore, socio-cultural planning within local authority event licensing and planning processes should be given priority in national legislative planning, given the significance of using events as catalysts for destination marketing, economic development, community builders, and enhancers. This practical recommendation is not too complicated to be adhered to or implemented within local authority planning provisions and guidelines.

First, the research examined how many, if any local authorities provided generic-planning guidelines for event management in Ireland. Generic planning guidelines provide a baseline for incorporating and prioritizing significant aspects necessary in planning for event management. Results revealed that just four out of the 32 local authorities assessed, provided generic planning guidelines for event management. This is significantly low considering events have become a vital sector to economies worldwide and in particular the Irish economy. As such, the necessity of providing planning guidelines to ensure events are planned and organized in a responsible and safe manner cannot be underestimated. However, a possible reason for local authorities not considering the significance of the need to provide and implement generic planning guidelines for event management may be due to the increase in legislation and "red tape" (health and safety, licensing, fire safety, insurance, environmental health, waste management, and traffic management) surrounding the event industry. Yet, regardless of the regulations surrounding events, the implementation

Table 3. Local authority provision of socio-cultural guidelines.

	Local authority (LA) provision of socio-cultural planning guidelines (S/CPG)																																		
	CW	CN	CE	CK	Cc	DL	D	SD	Dr	F	G	Gc	KE	KK	KY	LS	LM	LK	LD	L	MH	MO	MN	O	R	S	Ts	Tn	WD	WH	WX	WW			
	33	47	64	34	22	41	22	12	26	23	62	29	32	27	46	20	29	58	31	36	35	112	29	37	53	47	31	28	56	36	48	27			
Criteria assessed within LA guidelines																																			
LA events supported in 2013						x																													
LA generic planning guidelines provided																																			
LA S/C planning guidelines provided																																			
LA event S/C policy provision in CDP																																			
The provision of basic services																																			
Crime and vandalism																																			
Crowding																																			
Noise																																			
Traffic congestion																																			
Persons with mobility impairments																																			
G&P compliant with UNWTO aims of sustainable tourism																																			
G&P for social equity																																			
G&P for local prosperity																																			
G&P for visitor fulfillment																																			
G&P for local control																																			
G&P for community well-being																																			
G&P for cultural richness																																			
G&P compliant with DIT-ACHIEV model 2007																																			
G&P for community access																																			
G&P for community involvement																																			
G&P for protecting community quality of life																																			
G&P for community beneficiaries																																			

(Continued on next page)


Table 3. Local authority provision of socio-cultural guidelines. (*Continued*)

	Local authority (LA) provision of socio-cultural planning guidelines (S/CPG)
	CW CN CE CK Cc DL D SD Dr F G Gc KE KK KY LS LM LK LD L MH MO MN O R S Ts Tn WD WH WX WW
G&P compliant with GSTC, 2013	
G&P for minimizing negative impacts to local community (LC)	
G&P for Maximizing positive benefits to LC	
G&P for community participation	
G&P for local employment	
G&P for supporting community development	
G&P for public rights of way and local access	
G&P for community opinion	
G&P for preventing exploitation	
G&P for intellectual and cultural property rights	
G&P compliant with ETIS 2013	
G&P for equity and accessibility	
G&P for protection and enhancement of local identity	
G&P for protection of community image	
G&P for protection of cultural and historic sites	

Source: Adapted from UNEP/INWTO (2005), Griffin et al. (2007), GSTC (2013), and ETIS (2013).

of planning guidelines within local authorities is essential to facilitate responsibility and sustainability in the event sector to ensure its longevity.

Following this, the research set out to determine if any local authorities provided socio-cultural planning guidelines for event management. The development of socio-cultural planning guidelines can provide event organizers and planners with practical advice and suggestions for achieving socio-cultural sustainability in the event industry. They are needed to ensure community views and perceptions of the impacts of events are taken into consideration (Burdge & Vanclay, 1996; Fredaline et al., 2006). It has been noted that the consideration of socio-cultural concerns and impacts can help mitigate community hostility (Kregg, 2001; Pederson, 2002) by taking into consideration the socio-cultural benefits and costs of events (Vanclay, 2003). As such, the provision of socio-cultural planning guidelines in event licensing procedures can provide a baseline for the management of social and cultural issues as well as aid good practice in planning. Results revealed no local authority guidelines have been consistently applied to cater for socio-cultural issues surrounding event management. This lack of planning provision is concerning considering the increasing size and scale of events hosted in communities throughout Ireland. This low level of planning guideline provision is daunting considering local authorities have a legal obligation to ensure events are organized causing minimal harm and disruption to communities (DECLG, 2012). However, it is important to note local authority policies and objectives surrounding the management of the event industry on a global scale require budget and staff to be implemented in order to maximize socio-economic benefits. This is not the case in Ireland with limited provisions of guidelines, budgets, and staffing. This makes it difficult for local authorities to focus on socio-cultural planning and provision of guidelines for event managers. Perhaps the provision of socio-cultural guidelines for event management should be prioritized in legislation for local authority planning in Ireland and globally. Hence, the development of socio-cultural guidelines for event management could be a key planning priority for local authorities.

Additionally, the socio-cultural policy provision for event management in CDPs was assessed. Planning for social and cultural issues is given priority in national legislation through the development, provision, and implementation of CDPs. CDPs set out strategies for planning and sustainable development of the planning authorities region through objectives included in the plan for a 6-year period. Similarly, they address the issues and impacts effecting tourism-related developments, such as events, and take into consideration host communities and how planning and developments affect host communities. Therefore, it was concerning when results revealed that no local authority provided socio-cultural policies for events within CDPs in Ireland. As such, it seems the importance of implementing policies for the socio-cultural impacts of events have not been recognized within local authority planning in Ireland. However, policies for socio-cultural impacts should be adopted and utilized by local authorities for event management now that the popularity of the event sector has become increasingly substantial. Having identified through the research that local authorities are in an ideal position to plan for socio-cultural

sustainable development in event management. It may be beneficial to incorporate socio-cultural indicators in compulsory legislative development plans and documents for event management. This may facilitate socio-cultural sustainability and facilitate the management of the socio-cultural impacts effecting events. The lack of planning policies provided by local authorities may be due to events being used to generate economic advantages. Therefore, socio-cultural concerns may be viewed as minor issues in comparison to economic benefits. Nevertheless, socio-cultural planning in the event industry should be a national priority within guidelines, strategies, and policies and should be implemented and regulated in national legislation to safeguard the protection of host communities and cultural heritage in planning developments and decisions.

In particular the clear need for improvements in relation to event licensing and guidelines provision, was seen in the case of the Croke Park stadium concerts in Ireland in 2014. Event promoters applied for event licenses to host five concerts on successive evenings in Croke Park stadium in Dublin. They subsequently facilitated a sale of tickets for each event prior to local authority licenses being granted. However, Croke Park stadium was allowed to host a maximum of three concerts per year as stated in the planning permission for the stadium. As a result of this and the potential impacts the proposed events may have generated, the residents surrounding Croke Park stadium objecting to the proposed five events. Local authorities agreed with Croke Park residents that five events on successive evenings were too many. Therefore, they granted permission for only three concerts even though all five concerts had sold out for an audience in excess of 80,000 per night. This consequently resulted in the artist cancelling all five concerts. If there had been adequate planning guidelines for event licensing and planning in place for event managers and promoters, this may have been prevented. Moreover, if there was a requirement for event organizations to have local authority and community and public consultations to obtain community opinion and support prior to applying for event licenses, this may have been prevented. Subsequently, this case resulted in a change in event licensing regulations (Planning and Development [Amendment] Regulations, 2015). This change in regulations allows more time to apply for event licenses and a mandatory requirement for event promoters to consult with relevant local authorities and prior to advertising or facilitating a sale of tickets for proposed events.

Integration of indicators within local authority planning guidelines

Upon clarifying the provision of local authority guidelines and policies, the authors assessed the integration of indicators within local authority planning guidelines. Initially, guidelines incorporating indicators, such as the provision of basic services for communities, crime and vandalism, crowding, noise, traffic congestion, and provisions for persons with mobility impairment, was assessed. The examination revealed no local authority provided planning guidelines for the provision of basic services to communities. Yet the importance of providing basic services such as water and

access (Van der Wagen & White, 2010) for example is a critical requirement for host communities considering usage and consumption at events is immense. After identifying the relationship between socio-cultural impacts and events, the key socio-cultural issues of crime and vandalism, crowding, noise, traffic congestion, and provision for persons with mobility impairments were assessed. Results disclosed that just three out of the 32 local authorities assessed, made basic provisions within the generic planning guidelines for issues of crowding, noise, traffic congestion, and persons with mobility impairments. The scarcity in the provision of guidelines for such critical socio-cultural aspects in local authorities is concerning since the generation of crowds at events is inevitable and implicitly has an effect on host communities (Fredaline et al., 2006; Small, 2007; NTLOKO & Swart, 2008). This, in turn, has a knock on effect on noise levels and traffic congestion, which again impacts host community members (Holmes et al., 2015; Yeoman, Robertson, McMahon-Beattie, Backer, & Smith, 2015). For this reason, the local authority responsibilities of crowd management, traffic management, and preventing noise pollution is critical (Callanan & Keoghan, 2003). Prioritizing provisions for people with mobility impairments are equally critical since events are social gatherings for the integration of all social classes (deLisle, 2009). Notably, crime and vandalism was not included within the local authority planning guidelines even though such variables can be inescapable at events. Therefore, it seems adequate provisions for key socio-cultural impacts are not being prioritized. Nevertheless, it is essential for local authorities nationwide to plan for such potential socio-cultural event impacts. The implications of not planning for such issues can affect future community support for events. It can lead to unsafe and consequential impacts as well as affect the longevity of the event sector and prohibit the achievement of local authority socio-cultural objectives. Therefore, the integration of socio-cultural planning issues in local authority planning processes are essential in achieving socio-cultural responsibility in planning for event management in Ireland and thus, sustaining the socio-cultural quality of the event sector. The issues outlined may have influenced the decision of Croke Park residents to object to the Croke Park concerts in Ireland. The potential impacts may be inevitable if not adequately planned for an audience of over 400,000 people over a 5-day period. Therefore, the necessity of developing and providing solutions and guidelines for the socio-cultural problems of events worldwide are not to be underrated.

Subsequently, the integration of sustainable indicators from international best practice within local authority planning guidelines was assessed. The use of sustainable indicators has become particularly important in developing strategies for policy and decision making (Casser et al., 2013) within governments at all levels. Indicators can be applied as a tool for self-regulation and good practice in developing and incorporating sustainability in policymaking and guideline development. First, the socio-cultural aims of sustainable tourism from the UNEP/UNWTO (2005) were assessed. These aims include principles for ensuring the achievement of social equity, local prosperity, visitor fulfillment, local control, community well-being, and cultural richness. They focus on ensuring socio-cultural sustainability and

community support for tourism-related developments. They are essential values necessary in local authority planning for event management. It was found that no local authority provided planning guidelines for any of the above socio-cultural aims. Planning for local prosperity in event management has the capability of maximizing tourism's positive contribution to host communities while social equity can facilitate widespread distribution of economic and social benefits, therefore, creating fairness within host communities (UNEP/UNWTO, 2005). Likewise, community well-being and local control are primary priorities and concerns when hosting events and must be integrated within planning processes as these values aim to maintain and strengthen the quality of life in local communities (UNEP/UNWTO, 2005). They also aim to engage and empower local communities in planning and decision making in relation to future management and developments (UNEP/UNWTO, 2005; Fraser, Dougill, Mabee, Reed, & McAlpine, 2006). Additionally, visitor fulfillment and the preservation of cultural richness are equally as important and require consideration since it is important to produce safe, satisfying, and fulfilling experiences to visitors while respecting and enhancing historic heritage, traditions, and distinctiveness of host communities. Consequently, not prioritizing such socio-cultural impacts can result in unequal distribution of wealth and thus lead to resident exodus and hostility toward tourism and events (Raj & Musgrave, 2009). However, applying these aims to local authority planning and policy making can facilitate more socially and culturally sustainable events. Therefore, the incorporation and compliance of such values in local authority planning guidelines has the ability to set standards in aiding community benefits and involvement while at the same time providing events that are safe and satisfying for communities and visitors which create minimal disruption to host communities.

Furthermore, the integration of indicators from the DIT ACHIEV model of sustainable tourism management was assessed. This indicator system was suggested as a tool for sustainable event management (Griffen, 2009). Indicators from this tool included provisions for community access, community participation, community quality of life, and community beneficiaries. It has been noted that a community's quality of life can adversely be impacted by hosting events (Esmail Zaei & Esmail Zaei, 2013; Etiosa, 2012; Raj & Musgrave, 2009). Yet, no local authority provided planning guidelines for any of the above issues. However, these factors require consideration in planning for event management with community participation and community quality of life being identified as core elements of tourism development. Maganda, Sirima, and Ezra's (2012) claim that community participation is central to the sustainability of the tourism industry, and therefore, cannot be ignored. Additionally, protecting the community quality of life is imperative in preserving community values and cultural heritage of communities, encouraging community participation, and generating community beneficiaries. Similarly, community access can be a major issue when hosting events with increased traffic disruption and congestion being a key concern for local authorities and event organizers. Again these indicators may have been beneficial in the planning guidelines for the Croke Park concerts and may have managed potential socio-cultural impacts, which produce

community hostility and effect community support. Therefore, hosting events in a community setting commands planning that considers and integrates socio-cultural issues and concerns. This, in turn, can have positive outcomes in terms of community support, participation, and beneficiaries. However, neglecting to focus on primary socio-cultural factors in planning for event management has implications for future event planning and host communities whose quality of life can adversely be affected.

The incorporation of indicators from the GSTC within local authority planning guidelines was then assessed. The GSTC and the related performance indicators are tools for managing sustainability in tourism. They can be adopted as a guide to become culturally and socially sustainable. Indicators from this tool were comprised of a number of socio-cultural variables which include maximizing and minimizing socio-cultural benefits and costs, supporting community development, community participation, local employment, public rights of way, community opinion, preventing exploitation, and intellectual and cultural property rights. The examination revealed no local authority provided guidelines focusing on any of the above indicators. However, the necessity of incorporating the above indicators cannot be underestimated considering events at national and local level are reliant on host communities (Choi & Sirakaya, 2006; Saufi, O'Brien, & Wilkins, 2013). As such, planning to maximize the socio-cultural benefits to communities and minimize costs can contribute to sustainable community development (Anstrand, 2006), which can facilitate an improved community image and increased community support and participation (Hockert, 2009). Support for community development is critical in developing tourism in any given destination. However, research has highlighted that communities only support developments when there are perceived benefits to be gained (Choi, 2013). Additionally, community participation has already been identified as a critical component in hosting events. Local authorities and event organizations require community involvement, opinion, and support to ensure events are planned taking into consideration social concerns while offering an opportunity to generate local benefits (Anstrand, 2006). In addition to this, maximizing socio-cultural benefits at a national and local level has the ability to act as a vehicle for economic development (Johnson, 2010) and contribute to employment creation (Ashley, De Brine, Lehr, & Wilde, 2007; Janeczko, Mules, & Ritchie, 2002; Raj et al., 2013; Robinson, 2009). Furthermore, guidelines for the protection of public rights-of-way and intellectual and cultural property rights were assessed. These indicators are fundamental to protect and preserve the property rights of communities and ensure no disruption to community property during the event (GSTC, 2013). Preventing exploitation is another critical aspect with the need for laws to publicly communicate the prevention of exploitation to host community residents. Therefore, planning for such socio-cultural factors has the ability to generate economic benefits to communities while safeguarding social and cultural benefits and mitigating social and cultural consequences. As such, applying indicators from the GSTC in local authority planning guidelines can promote the use of socio-cultural sustainability in event management. It can also minimize negative impacts thus achieving best practice in event

management. More significantly, minimizing the costs of events is a crucial aspect in planning for hosting events. The socio-cultural costs of events have been identified within the theory and can have significant implications for the host community can cause dramatic changes in communities as well as generate crime, vandalism, and increased litter generation (Delamere, 2001; Nunkoo & Ramkissoon, 2011; Small, 2007), which in turn, can affect community support for tourism developments and result in resident exodus. Therefore, the consideration of these costs is required in planning in order to maintain the quality and longevity of the event sector.

Finally, the integration of indicators from the ETIS within local authority guidelines and policies was assessed. The ETIS measures performance and monitors results while enhancing sustainability performance (EC, 2015). It identifies areas of improvement while managing risks effectively and creates benchmarks for future performance. The ETIS indicators can be used by local authorities to obtain improved data for informed policy decision-making. Indicators from the ETIS include provisions for equality and accessibility, protection and enhancement of local identity, protection of community image, and protection of cultural and historic sites. The examination of compliance with the ETIS from the content analysis approach discovered no local authority in Ireland were compliant with any indicators from this tool. However, protecting the community image and identity is a key concern for community members and local authority planners when hosting events (Etiosa, 2012; Nunkoo & Ramkissoon, 2011; Pugh & Wood, 2004). This is due to the fact that community image and identity have become focal points in host event destinations (Wheeler, 2011). Likewise, the protection of historic sites and local identity is key to the cultural heritage of communities and are in many cases primary selling points of a destination and, therefore, should also be managed to preserve community values and beliefs. Additionally equality and accessibility are vital issues in event management due to the fact tourism and tourism activities seeks to break down the barriers to access and ensure equality in access to people with mobility impairments (EC, 2015). As such, providing planning guidelines for such issues can protect the community image, and quality of life, facilitate community support and participation, facilitate equality, and mitigate community hostility, which is vital in planning for socio-cultural sustainability in event management (Ruhanen & Whitford, 2011). Not integrating such important aspects may have detrimental consequences for communities, their beliefs and values due to the increased lack of awareness on their importance. It may also have implications for future event planning processes taking into consideration socio-cultural concerns at a local and national level in Ireland. This may affect future planning provision for other event destinations.

Overall the analysis and findings from this study have found a complete lack of planning by local authorities for the socio-cultural issues of the event industry. However, applying solutions, which integrate such indicators within planning provisions and guidelines for socio-cultural concerns, would be beneficial in aiding sustainability in event management in Ireland. The impacts caused to host communities as a result of hosting an event and the indicators to manage such impacts have not been prioritized in national legislative planning for event management in Ireland. This

low adoption rate is increasingly worrying and has implications for the longevity and support of the event sector in Ireland. This lack of adoption of socio-cultural planning guidelines may also have implications for other event destinations that do not provide socio-cultural planning. Therefore, solutions are required to deal with this issue. Subsequently, if the event industries are to be considered important industries in local communities and destinations worldwide, the consideration of socio-cultural concerns in planning provisions and guidelines cannot be underestimated. Therefore, the adoption and utilization of guidelines within local authorities can facilitate socio-cultural planning in event management. The authors of this article have produced a basic socio-cultural planning checklist for planners to facilitate socio-cultural sustainability in planning for event management. This checklist may be adopted, implemented, and utilized by local authorities at a global or national level in Ireland to aid in the planning and management of the socio-cultural impacts of events. This checklist is shown below in [Table 4](#).

Considering that local authorities have an important role to play in ensuring tourism and events are planned causing minimal disruption to local authorities lifestyles and are responsible for sustainable socio-cultural development in respective localities, the adoption of such guidelines can aid the transition toward socio-cultural sustainable development. The above checklist is compliant with international best practice standards such as the UNWTO/UNEP aims of sustainable tourism, the GSTC, ETIS, and the DIT ACHIEV model of sustainable tourism/event management. The integration of this checklist may be beneficial to local authorities both in Ireland and internationally to plan for and mitigate socio-cultural consequences and generate socio-cultural benefits, provide guidance on how to achieve socio-cultural sustainability in event management and avoid such implications, which occurred in the case of the Croke Park concerts in Ireland in 2014 at a national level and international level for other event destinations. This article forms part of a doctoral research study, which is currently looking at local authorities and the disparity of planning within each local authority. The final doctoral research project

Table 4. Socio-cultural planning checklist for local authorities.

Provisions made for	X	Provisions made for	X
Providing basic services to communities		Community access	
Crime and vandalism		Community participation	
Crowding		Protecting community quality of life	
Noise		Community beneficiaries	
Traffic congestion		Maximizing benefits to communities	
Persons with mobility impairments		Minimizing costs to communities	
Social equity		Local employment	
Local prosperity		Supporting community development	
Visitor fulfillment		Public rights of way	
Local control		Community opinion	
Community well-being		Preventing exploitation	
Cultural richness		Intellectual and cultural property rights	
Protection and enhancement of local identity		Protecting community image	
Protecting cultural and historic sites			

Source: Adapted from UNEP/INWTO (2005), Griffin et al. (2007), GSTC (2013), ETIS (2013).

will address a range of issues as to why local authorities are not taking such planning guidelines into account and whether it may be a lack of funding, staff, education, and awareness or increase in regulations, etc., which may be prohibiting their integration.

Conclusion

This article has examined the problematic relationship in relation to local authority planning for the socio-cultural issues associated with event management in Ireland. Research has shown that hosting events can negatively impact upon host communities. As such, the negative costs and positive benefits of hosting events on host communities have been well documented in this research. The need to measure, monitor, and plan for socio-cultural impacts within local authority planning was also highlighted. The findings revealed that just four out of the 32 local authorities assessed, provided generic planning guidelines for event management. However, the quality of the generic planning guidelines in accommodating socio-cultural concerns is increasingly concerning. Additionally, no local authority provided planning guidelines specifically for socio-cultural impacts of event management.

The implications of not planning for or prioritizing socio-cultural impacts of event management in local authority planning provisions and guidelines may lead to problems to the way events will be planned in future. This may mean events could be planned with little or no thought given to socio-cultural needs and quality of life of host communities. The lack of planning provisions and guidelines for event managers and promoters may mean that there is a chance of reoccurring implications already disclosed in this study in the case of the Croke Park concerts. These implications may occur in other event destinations internationally if not planned for or managed. Therefore, if local authorities fail to plan for potential socio-cultural impacts, they essentially plan to fail. As such, the need for a statewide balanced approach to socio-cultural planning cannot be underestimated. Additionally, the implications and issues identified within this study may have implications for other event destinations that do not plan for or prioritize socio-cultural impacts generated by events. As such, it may be beneficial for municipalities and local authorities worldwide to congregate, develop, and implement guidelines to manage the socio-cultural impacts of events and facilitate effective planning that considers social and cultural aspects of host communities and destinations. Thus, developing and utilizing a checklist, as outlined in [Table 4](#), to ensure socio-cultural impacts are being planned for and abided may be beneficial at an international and national scale. The implications discussed in the study and in particular the implications of the Croke Park concerts could have been avoided had there been planning guidelines provided by local authorities initially. The lessons learned from this study in relation to providing socio-cultural planning guidelines might aid in preventing potential impacts for other event destinations. To ensure a thriving event industry, both nationally and internationally, guidelines must be in place to protect communities and also facilitate promoters and organizers to operate within a level playing field.

In particular, results highlighted that no guidelines sufficiently reflected any international best practice standards, such as the UNEP/UNWTO 12 aims of sustainable tourism, the GSTC, or the ETIS. More significantly, no guidelines reflected the DIT ACHIEV model, which was developed for an Irish context. Consequently this has highlighted the dearth of socio-cultural planning by local authorities in the Republic of Ireland. However, these four tools offer an opportunity to monitor and manage the socio-cultural impacts of events at a global scale. Therefore, the importance and the necessity of developing local authority socio-cultural planning policies and guidelines to reflect international best practice standards for event management globally are essential. This may contribute to sustaining the success and popularity of the event sector at a national and international level. Hence, there is a clear demand for socio-cultural planning in event management to now be prioritized by municipalities and local authorities statewide.

In addition to this, the analysis revealed a lack of adequate socio-cultural policies within local authorities at a national level. It has also highlighted the implications of not having socio-cultural planning provisions and guidelines in place at a national level to avoid socio-cultural implications including community hostility, decreased support, and implications to the community quality of life. Therefore, socio-cultural planning for event management has clearly not been realized in local authority planning in Ireland. The lack of planning policies and guidelines for socio-cultural concerns in event licensing can essentially affect the longevity of the event industry and may also prohibit the achievement of local authority objectives to accomplish socio-cultural sustainability in respective regions. Also, the increase in regulations and red tape surrounding the event industry may be the reason for local authorities and event organizations taking an ad hoc approach to implementing and applying socio-cultural planning provisions and guidelines for event management. Therefore, there is a clear need for statewide changes in legislation and regulations surrounding the event industry to focus on effective and sustainable socio-cultural planning aspects.

In essence, local authorities have acknowledged the benefits of events to achieve a diverse range of objectives. However, they do not realize the need to incorporate socio-cultural objectives into development policies or guidelines. As such, the need for nationwide improvements in relation to sociocultural planning is crucial. Yet, while socio-cultural planning in local authorities is concerning, it offers an opportunity for current practice to be improved by implementing, applying, and utilizing best practice indicators in socio-cultural policies and guidelines for event management in Ireland. This may achieve the maximization of socio-cultural benefits while minimizing socio-cultural costs when planning for event management. Importantly, local authorities have a legal requirement to ensure socio-cultural concerns are catered for to protect and preserve the quality of a destination. However, for this to be achieved, it may need to be implemented within local authority legislative planning. This article provides an opportunity for future research to investigate the absence of socio-cultural planning guidelines for event management, thus facilitating a longitudinal analysis.

References

- Aicher, T. J., Paule-Koba, A. L., & Newland, B. (2015). *Sport facility and event management*. Burlington, VT: Jones and Barrett Learning LLC.
- Ali-Knight, J., Robertson, M., Fyall, A., & Ladkin, A. (2008). *International perspectives of festivals and events: Paradigms of analysis*. Oxford, UK: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Andereck, K. L., & Nyaupane, G. P. (2010). Exploring the nature of tourism and quality of life perceptions among residents. *Journal of Travel Research*, 50(3), 248–260.
- Andereck, K. L., Valentine, K. M., Knopf, R. C., & Voght, C. A. (2005). Residents perception of community tourism impacts. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 32(4), 1056–1076.
- Andereck, K. L., & Voght, C. A. (2000). The relationship between residents attitudes towards tourism and tourism development options. *Journal of Travel Research*, 39(1), 27–36.
- Anstrand, M. (2006). Community based tourism and socio-culture aspects relating to tourism: A case study of a Swedish student excursion to Babati (Tanzania). Retrieved from www.diva-portal.org
- Arcodia, C., & Whitford, M. (2008). Festival attendance and the development of social capital. *Journal of Convention and Event Tourism*, 8(2), 1–18.
- Ashley, C., de Brine, P., Lehr, A., & Wilde, H. (2007). *The role of the tourism sector in expanding economic opportunity*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.
- Baade, R., Baumann, R., & Matheson, V. (2005). *Selling the big game: Estimating the economic impact of mega events through taxable sales*. Retrieved from <http://ideas.repec.org/p/hcx/wpaper/0510.html>
- Bahee, M., Pisani, M. J., & Shavakh, F. (2014). Resident Attitudes towards international tourism: A case of Iran. *Journal of Tourism and Recreation*, 1(2), 1–14.
- Baumann, R., & Matheson, V. (2013). *Infrastructure investing and mega sports events: Comparing the experience of developed and industrialised countries*. Economic department working paper 147. Retrieved from http://crossworks.holycross.edu/econ_working_papers/147
- Berg, B. L. (2007). *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences* (6th ed.). Boston, MA: Allen & Bacon.
- Borrett, N. (1991). *Leisure services UK: An introduction to leisure, entertainment and tourism services*. Basingstoke, UK: Macmillan Publications.
- Burdge, R. J., & Vanclay, F. (1996). Social impact assessment: A contributor to the state of the art series. *Impact Assessment*, 4(1), 59–86.
- Callanan, M., & Keoghan, J. F. (2003). *Local government in Ireland—inside out*. Retrieved from www.ipa.ie
- Cassar, L. F., Conrad, E., Bell, S., & Morse, S. (2013). Assessing the use and influence of sustainable indicators at the European periphery. *Ecological Indicators*, 35, 52–61.
- Choi, H., & Sirakaya, E. (2006). Sustainability indicators for managing community tourism. *Journal of Tourism Management*, 27(6), 1274–1289.
- Choi, J., Lee, A., & Ok, C. (2013). The effects of consumers perceived risks and benefits on attitude and behavioural intentions: A study of street food. *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing*, 30(3), 222–237.
- Damster, G., & Tassiopoulos, D. (2005). *Event management: A professional and developmental approach, 2nd edition*. South Africa: Juta and Company Ltd.
- David, L. (2009). *Environmental impacts of events: Event management and sustainability* (66–74). In Razaq Raj and James Musgrave (Eds.), 1st ed. Oxfordshire, UK: CAB International.
- Deery, M., & Jago, L. (2010). Social impacts of events and the role of anti-social behaviour. *International Journal of Event and Festival Management*, 1(1), 8–28.
- Delamere, T. A. (2001). Development of a scale to measure residents attitudes toward the social impacts of community festivals, part 2: Verification of the scale. *Event Management*, 7, 25–38.

- Delamere, T. A., Wankel, L. M., & Hinch, T. D. (2001). Development of a scale to measure residents attitudes toward the social impacts of community festivals, part 1: Item generation and purification of the measure. *Event Management*, 7(1), 11–24.
- DeLisle, L. J. (2009). *Creating special events*. Champaign, IL: Sagamore Publications.
- Department of Arts, Heritage, and Gaeltacht. (2014). *Statement of strategy, 2011–2014*. Retrieved from <http://www.ahg.gov.ie/en/AboutUs/StatementofStrategy/FinalSOScleared28FebruaryEN%20%282%29.pdf>
- Department of Environment, Heritage, and Local Government (DEHLG). (2007). *Guidelines for planning authorities*. Dublin: Ireland. Retrieved from <http://www.environ.ie/en/Publications/DevelopmentandHousing/Planning/FileDownload,14468,en.pdf>
- Department of the Environment Community and Local Government. (2012). *A guide to planning enforcement in Ireland*. Available from: <http://www.environ.ie/en/Publications/DevelopmentandHousing/Planning/FileDownload31564,en.pdf>
- Department of the Environment, Community, and Local Government (DECLG). (2013). *Guidelines for planning authorities: An Bord Pleanála on carrying out environmental impact assessments*. Available from: www.environ.ie.
- Department of the Environment Community and Local Government. (2014). *Planning and Development Regulations 2001–2013 (unofficial consolidation) updated to 26 January 2015*. Retrieved from www.environ.ie
- Department of Transport, Tourism, and Sport (DTTAS). (2012). *Ring announces €685,000 for 170 local festivals and events across Ireland. Food, music, and fun on the cards for 2013 in hundreds of communities*. Retrieved from <http://www.dttas.ie/press-releases/2012/ring-announces-%E2%82%AC685000-170-local-festivals-events-across-ireland-food-music-and>
- Dredge, D., & Whitford, M. (2011). Event tourism governance and the public sphere. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 19(4) 479–499.
- Dwyer, D., & Forsyth, P. (2009). Public sector support for special events. *Eastern Economic Journal*, 35, 481–499.
- Dwyer, L., Mellor, R., Mistilis, N., & Mules, T. (2000). A framework for assessing tangible and intangible impacts of events and conventions. *Event Management*, 6(3), 175–189.
- Dwyer, L., & Spurr, R. (2011). *Tourism economic summary*. Available from <http://www.t-statsuk.co.uk/VTO/Documents/Stats20and20TSA/TourismEconomicsSummaryWEB.PDF>
- Esmail Zaei, M., & Esmail Zaei, M. (2013). The impacts of tourism industry on host communities. *European Journal of Tourism Hospitality and Recreation*, 1(2), 12–21.
- Etiosa, O. (2012). *The impacts of event tourism on host communities: Case: The city of Pietarsaari*. Retrieved from www.theseus.fi
- ETIS. (2013). *European tourism indicator system for destination management*. Available from ec.europa.eu/growth/sectors/tourism/offer/sustainable/indicator/index_en.htm
- European Commission. (2013). *European tourism indicator system for sustainable destinations*. Available from ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/tourism/sustainable-tourism/indicators/documents_indicators/eu_toolkit_indicators_en.pdf
- Fáilte Ireland. (2014). *As bank holiday arrives, tourism industry hopes for domestic bounce*. Retrieved from www.failteireland.ie
- Fáilte Ireland. (2014). *Shaun Quinn addresses Oireachtas Committee*. Retrieved from <http://www.failteireland.ie/News-Features/News-Library/Shaun-Quinn,-CEO-addresses.Oireachtas-Committee.aspx>
- Finkel, R., McGillivray, McPherson, G., & Robinson, P. (2013). *Research themes for events*. Oxfordshire, UK: CAB International.
- Fraser, E. D., Dougill, A. J., Mabee, W. E., Reed, M., & McAlpine, P. (2006). Bottom up and top down: Analysis of participatory processes for sustainable indicator identification as a pathway to community empowerment and sustainable environmental management. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 78(2), 114–127.

- Fredaline, L., Deery, M., & Jago, L. (2006). *Development of a scale to assess the social impact of tourism with communities*. Retrieved from http://www.sustainabletourisonline.com/awms/Upload/Resource/bookshop/Fredline_SocialimpactsTourism.pdf
- Fredaline, L., Jago, L., & Deery, M. (2003). Developing a generic scale to measure social impacts: Methodological issues. *Event Management*, 8(1), 23–37.
- Getz, D. (2008). Event tourism: Definition, evolution, and research. *Journal of Tourism Management*, 29, 403–428.
- Global Sustainable Tourism Council (GSTC). (2013). *Global sustainable tourism criteria*. Retrieved from www.gstcouncil.org
- Griffin, K. (2007). *Sustainable tourism indicators: Issues and challenges in the development of a sustainable tourism management model*. Dublin, Ireland: Dublin Institute of Technology.
- Griffin, K. (2009). Indicators and tools for sustainable event management. In Razaq Raj and James Musgrave (Eds.), *Event management and sustainability*. Oxfordshire, UK: CAB International.
- Griffin, K., Flanagan, S., & Morrissey, M. (2007). *Achieving sustainable tourism indicators*. Available from dit.ie/dit-achiev/dit-achievmodel/.
- Griffin, K., Morrissey, M., & Flanagan, S. (2010). The DIT ACHIEV Model of sustainable tourism management: The trials and tribulations of indicator models. Chapter 11 In R. Phillips & M. Budruk (Eds.), *Quality of life and community indicators for parks, recreation and tourism management* (pp. 201–229). Phoenix, AZ: Springer.
- GSTC. (2007). *The Global Sustainable Tourism Criteria for Destinations*. Available from www.gstcouncil.org/en/
- Gursoy, D., Kim, K., & Uysal, M. (2004). Perceived impacts of festivals and special events by organisers: An extension and validation. *Tourism Management*, 25(2), 171–181.
- Gursoy, D., & Rutherford, D. G. (2004). Host attitudes toward tourism: An improved structural model. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 31(3), 495–516.
- Hall, C. M. (1992). *Hallmark tourist events: Impacts, management, and planning*. London, UK: Belhaven Press.
- Hall, C. M., & Hodges, J. (1996). The party's great but what about the hangover? The housing and social impacts of mega events with special reference to the 2000 Sydney Olympics. *Festival Management and Event Tourism*, 4(1/2), 13–20.
- Hockert, E. (2009). *Socio cultural sustainability of rural community based tourism: Case study of local participation in fair trade coffee trail*. Lapland, Finland: Lapland University Press.
- Holmes, K., Hughes, M., Mair, J., & Carlsen, J. (2015). *Events and sustainability*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Hornsby, G. (2011). *Social responsibility in events: Reducing and removing the negative impacts of the industry*. Retrieved from scholarworks.umass.edu.
- Irish Times, The. (2014). Garth Brooks: For us it is five shows or none at all. Available from www.irishtimes.com/news/ireland/irish-news/garth-brooks-for-us-it-is-five-shows-or-none-at-all
- Jackson, L. A. (2008). Resident perceptions of the impacts of special event tourism. *Journal of Place Management and Development*, 1(3), 240–255.
- Janczko, B., Mules, T., & Ritchie, B. (2002). *Estimating the economic impacts of festivals and events. A research guide*. Retrieved from www.crctourism.com.au/wms/upload/resources/bookshop/Mules_EcolmpactsFestivals_w6.pdf
- Jepson, A., & Clarke, A. (2015). *Exploring community festival and events*. London: Routledge.
- Johnson, P. A. (2010). Realising rural community based tourism development. *Journal of Rural and Community Development*, 5(1/2), 150–162.
- Jonsson, C., & Lewis, C. (2014). Impacts of hosting a sport event in tourism high season. *Rasaala: Recreation and Society in Africa, Asia and Latin America*, 5(1). Available from <http://journal.lib.uoguelph.ca/index.php/rasaala/article/view/3152/3364>

- Kregg, G. (2001). *The impacts of tourism*. Retrieved from www.seagrant.umn.edu/tourism/pdfs/ImpactsTourism.pdf
- Liu, Y. (2013). Assessing the long term economic impacts of the World Cup as a mega event. *PIT Journal*. Retrieved from www.pitjournal.unc.edu.
- Mair, J., & Whitford, M. (2013). An exploration of event research, event topics, themes, and emerging trends. *International Journal of Event and Festival Management*, 4(1), 6–30.
- Malfas, M., Theodoraki, E., & Houlihan, B. (2004). *Impact of the Olympic Games as mega events*. Proceedings of the Institute of Civil Engineers, 209–220.
- Miller, S. R. (2007). *Quantifying the economic impacts of community events*. Presented at MSU Extension Conference. Michigan State University. Retrieved from www.cea.msu.edu/uploads/files/44/event%20impacts.pdf
- Muganda, M., Sirima, A., & Ezra, P. M. (2012). The role of local communities in tourism development: Grassroots perspectives from Tanzania. *Journal of Human Ecology*, 41(1), 53–66.
- Muhanna, E. (2006). Sustainable tourism development and event management for developing countries. *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, 4(2), 14–30.
- Mulvey, K. (2014). Recommendations on concerts at Croke Park. A report prepared by Kieran Mulvey of the Labour Relations Commission. Available from www.hoganstand.com/ArticleForm.aspx?ID=219277
- Ntloko, N. J., & Swart, K. (2008). Sport tourism event impacts on the host community: A case study of red bull big wave Africa. *South African Journal for Research in Sport, Physical Education and Recreation*, 30(2), 79–93.
- Nunkoo, R., & Ramkissoon, H. (2011). Developing a community support model for tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 38(3), 964–988.
- Page, S. J., & Connell, J. (2014). *The Routledge handbook of events*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Pederson, A. (2002). *Managing tourism at World Heritage sites: A practical manual for world heritage site managers*. Retrieved from whc.unesco.org/uploads/activities/documents/activities-113-2.pdf
- Prayag, G., Hosany, S., Nunkoo, R., & Alders, T. (2013). London residents support for the 2012 Olympic Games: The mediating effect of overall attitudes. *Tourism Management*, 36, 629–640.
- Pugh, G., & Wood, E. H. (2004). The strategic use of events within local government: A study of London borough councils. *Event Management*, 9, 61–71.
- Quinn, B. (2009). Festivals, events, and tourism. In T. Jamal, & M. Robinson (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of tourism studies* (pp. 483–503). London, UK: Sage.
- Quinn, B. (2013). *Key concepts in event management*. London, UK: Sage Publications.
- Raj, R., & Musgrave, J. (2009). *Event management and sustainability*. Oxfordshire, UK: CABI.
- Raj, R., Walters, P., & Rashid, T. (2013). *Event management principles and practices* (2nd ed.). London, UK: Sage Publications.
- Reid, S. (2004). *The social consequence of rural events: The Inglewood olive festival*. Retrieved from www98.griffith.edu.au/dspace/bitstream/handle/10072/47967/55931_1.pdf
- Reid, S. (2007). *Identifying social consequences of rural events*. Retrieved from www98.griffith.edu.au/dspace/bitstream/handle/10072/28650/55718_1.pdf?sequence=1
- Richards, G., de Brito, M. P., & Wilks, L. (2013). *Exploring the social impacts of events*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Ring, M. (2012). *Minister of state for tourism and sport: "Doing the Business for Irish Tourism."* Retrieved from <http://www.failteireland.ie/NewsFeatures/NewsLibrary/Doing-the-Business-for-Irish-Tourism.aspx>
- Ritchie, J. R. B. (1984). Assessing the impacts of hallmark events: Conceptual and research issues. *Journal of Travel Research*, 23(1), 2–11.
- Robinson, P. (2009). *Operations management in the tourism industry*. Oxfordshire, UK: CABI International.

- Rose, S., Spinks, N., & Canhoto, A. I. (2015). *Management research: Applying the principles*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Ruhanen, L., & Whitford, M. (2011). Indigenous sports events: More than just a game. *International Journal of Event Management Research*, 6(1), 33–50.
- Saufi, A., O'Brien, D., & Wilkins, H. C. (2013). Inhibitors of host community participation in sustainable tourism development in developing countries. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* 22(5), 801–820.
- Sellitz, C., Jahoda, Deutsch, M. & Cook, S. W. (1967). *Research methods in social relations*. New York, NY: Hoslt, Riveharat, & Winston.
- Sharpley, R., & Stone, P. R. (2011). Socio-cultural impacts of events: Meaning, authorized transgression, and social capital. In S. Page, & J. Connell (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of events*. Chapter 23. London, UK: Routledge.
- Small, K. (2007). Social dimensions of community festivals: An application of factor analysis in the development of the Social Impact Perception (SIP) scale. *Event Management*, 11, 45–55.
- Small, K., Edwards, D., & Sheridan, L. (2005). A flexible framework for evaluating the socio cultural impacts at small festival. *International Journal of Event Management Research*, 1(1), 65–77.
- UNEP/UNWTO. (2005). *Making tourism more sustainable: A guide for policy makers*. Retrieved from www.unep.fr/shared/publication/pdf/DTIx0592xPATourismpolicyEN.pdf
- Vanclay, F. (2003). Social impact assessments: International principles. Retrieved from www.iaia.org/publicdocuments/special-publications/sp2.pdf?AspxAutoDetatCookieSupport=1
- Van der Wagen, L., & White, L. (2010). *Event management: For tourism, culture, business, and sporting events* (4th ed.). Australia: Pearson.
- Waite, G. (2003). Social impacts of the Sydney Olympics. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 30(1), 194–215.
- Wale, D., Robinson, P., & Dickson, G. (2010). *Event management*. Oxfordshire, UK: CAB International.
- Wamblach, K., Aicher, T. J., Riordan, J., Paule-Koba, A. L., & Newland, B. (2015). *Sport facility and event management*. Jones and Bartlett Learning.
- Weaver, A., & Oppermann, M. (2000). *Tourism management*. Brisbane, Australia: John Wiley & Sons.
- Weaver, D. (2006). *Sustainable tourism: Theory and practice*. Abingdon Oxon, UK: Elsevier Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Wood, E. (2006). Measuring the social impacts of local authority events: A pilot study for a civic pride scale. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 11(3), 165–179.
- Wood, E. H. (2005). Measuring the economic and social impacts of local authority events. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 18(1), 37–53.
- Wood, E. H. (2009). An impact evaluation framework: Local government community festivals. *Event Management*, 12, 1–17.
- WTO and Ministry of Tourism and Environment. (2007). *Sustainable tourism indicators and destination management*. Regional Workshop Kolasin, Montenegro. Retrieved from sdt.unwto.org/sites/all/files/pdf/finrep.pdf
- Yeoman, I., Robertson, M., McMahon-Beattie, U., Baker, E., & Smith, K. A. (2015). *The future of events and festivals*. London: Routledge.
- Ziakas, V. (2013). *Event portfolio planning and management: A holistic approach*. New York, NY: Routledge