



Sport Mega-event, Long-term Benefits and Urban Development in Cities: Case of Kuala Lumpur Malaysia

M. Barghchi¹, D. Omar², M. S. Aman³

¹Dept. of Town and Regional Planning, Architecture Engineering Faculty, Khavaran Higher Education Institute, Mashhad, Iran; ²Faculty of Architecture, Planning & Surveying, Universiti Teknologi MARA (UiTM), Shah Alam, Malaysia; ³Sports Centre, Universiti Malaya (UM), Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, mbarghchi_2002@yahoo.com, maassoumehbarghchi@gmail.com

Reference Number: 6-1-11-8442

Name of the Presenter:

Abstract

Sport mega-events have gained increasingly popularity and influence among cities. Currently there is universal construction boom developing sports facilities either for hosting sports events or for smaller scale activities. However, the development of sports facilities requires vast amounts of money for construction, ancillary amenities and a high cost of maintenance. In addition, high construction costs, high maintenance cost and under-utilisation of facilities post event are considered as possible negative impacts for hosting sports events. On the other hand, there are some examples where large-scale events are considered as a catalyst for urban restructuring, embodying more general trends in urban development and planning. Furthermore, the new generation of sports facilities is considered to have a role in shaping new cities or regenerating decaying areas of old cities. Malaysia in 1998 hosted the 16th Commonwealth Games, which necessitated the construction of the Bukit Jalil National Sports Complex. This paper contributes to this area of research to stimulate new development as experienced in Malaysia. It used semi-structured in-depth interviews and sourced relevant documents in the form of approved layout plans, official reports, land use and master plan for the territory within the Bukit Jalil City Area. The research was aimed to examine the long-term benefits of the National Sports Complex on the surrounding urban development and whether it has contributed to any significant impacts to spur development at the Bukit Jalil Kuala Lumpur. However, it could provide better justification for public investment. It concludes by making recommendations for the benefits to be maximised in the future developments.

Key words: Sports facilities, sport mega-events, long-term benefits, urban development, Malaysia

1. Introduction

Currently there is a universal construction boom developing sports facilities (Fried 2005), either for hosting sports mega-events or for smaller scale activities. Sport mega-events have gained increasingly popularity and influence among cities. This global focus on sports and sports facilities, on the other hand, has increased the pressure on cities to adopt an entrepreneurial stance to attract mobile global capital, has changed modern sports facilities. In the recent years, sports facilities are considered to have a role in shaping new cities or regenerating decaying areas of old cities. Malaysia hosted the 16th Commonwealth Games in 1998. Hosting the games necessitated the construction of the National Sports Complex in Kuala Lumpur (Muda 1998). This study was aimed to examine the long-term benefits of the National Sports Complex on urban development in the area of Bukit Jalil Kuala Lumpur. It is structured as follows. The next section provides a brief overview of the development of the Bukit Jalil National Sports Complex. It is followed by theoretical background of the study in section three and four. However, indicators of development are discussed in section four and it was applied for this study. The next, section five, presents the research findings, which is contribution of the National Sports Complex to urban development at the Bukit Jalil. The conclusion is explained in the final section.

2. Malaysia and the 16th Commonwealth Games

The growing concern, particularly among developing countries, that the Commonwealth Games were becoming monopolised by the most developed countries in the Commonwealth prompted the Malaysian decision to enter the bidding for the Commonwealth Games. However, it was prohibitively expensive for most of the developing countries to host the Games (Matheson & Baade 2004). The intention to build the sports complex began in 1989 when Malaysia wanted to become host of Commonwealth Games in 1998 (Government of Malaysia 2009b). The National Olympic Council of Commonwealth countries visited the existing sports facilities and the site of the proposed Games Complex at Bukit Jalil Kuala Lumpur in December 1991. Approval of the bid to host the 16th Commonwealth Games in 1998 necessitated the construction of the National Sports Complex in Bukit Jalil, Kuala Lumpur (Muda 1998; Westhuizen 2004).

The National Sports Complex, or *Kompleks Sukan Negara*, is located at Bukit Jalil, 20 km south of Kuala Lumpur. The National Sports Complex comprises the following main elements: 1) National Stadium, 2) National Aquatic Centre, 3) Putra Stadium, 4) Hawker Centre, 5) Information Centre, 6) Covered walkways, 7) landscape, 8) VIP entrance, 9) transport infrastructure, 10) car parks and 11) Commonwealth Games Village (Government of Malaysia 2010b). Kuala Lumpur, the capital of Malaysia, is by far the largest city in the country and home to an estimated 1.72 million people of both local and foreign origin (Government of Malaysia 2010a). Bukit Jalil is one of the four planning units of the New Growth Areas proposed in the Kuala Lumpur Structure Plan (KLSP) 1984 to decentralise the local and regional levels of activities and services. From the outset it was recognised that a master-plan would be needed to meet the many functional requirements of the site. The initial master-plan concept was prepared in 1986. Some modifications were made over the next few years prior to its approval by the Prime Minister in 1994. The overall aim of the master-plan was to provide an integrated centre for sports within an environment of exceptional quality with excellent sporting facilities at its hub. Although, the slow progress of development at Bukit Jalil is identified as an issue for new growth areas in the KLSP 2020 (Government of Malaysia 2004).

3. Sport Mega-event and Urban Development

International sporting events, classifying as mega-events (Jafari 1998), are one-time events that exist on an international scale (Jago & Shaw 1998). These events are major (mega) in size in terms of attendance, target market, level of financial involvement from the public, and construction of facilities. On the other hand, hallmarks events are “major one-time or recurring events of limited duration rely for their success on uniqueness, status, or timely significance to create interest and attract attention” (Ritchie 1984, p. 2). Mega-events and hallmarks events are both produce different impacts and outcomes for host communities (Kim & Chalip 2004). They have the potential to generate tremendous tourism, media coverage, recognition, and economic benefits for the host country (Bowdin et al. 2002; Chalip 2007). On the other hand, hosting mega-events is extremely costly for cities, and is not possible without large public subsidies. Substantial expenditure is also required for infrastructure and security, and such developments critically depend, therefore, on public subsidisation (Baade & Matheson 2004). However, there are some examples where large-scale events are considered not just as a one-off event but as a catalyst for urban restructuring, embodying more general trends in urban development and planning. According to Magdalinski and Nauright (2004), one of the most common and successful strategies of the late twentieth century has been to rely on hosting ‘hallmark’ or ‘mega events’, in order to drive tourism as well as public investment in infrastructure.

Sports facilities construction at international level, infrastructure and housing or games village construction are mentioned as long-term benefits of hosting sports events (Kasimati 2003; Preuss 1998). On the other hand, high construction costs of sporting venues and related other investments in particular in transport infrastructure are negative possible impacts. Furthermore, underutilised elite sporting facilities after the event considered as possible negative impacts to hosting such events (Gratton et al. 2005). However, the development of sports facilities requires vast amounts of money for construction, almost certainly with substantial public investments, and often involving much more money than is justified by cost benefit analyses (Atkinson et al. 2008). There is also a need for construction of ancillary amenities that are often built at public expense with every provision of a new facility. In addition, there is a high cost of maintenance and according to John et al. (2007) sports facilities require public subsidies. According to Matheson and Baade (2003), high infrastructure development costs (the lack of existing infrastructure); under-utilisation of facilities post event; and high opportunity cost of capital (the money can be used for more pressing needs) are reasons that hosting events not provide positive influence on developing countries.

4. Indicators of Development

Catalyst or flagship projects spur investment and consumption in their surrounding areas (Bianchini et al. 1992; Symth 1994), designed to serve visitors over residents (Eisinger 2000; Swyngedouw et al. 2002). However, according to Attoe and Logan (1989), buildings are not just valuable in their own but as spur to further building activity. Sternberg (2002, p. 31) defines catalysts as “facilities – usually buildings – that generate urban development, thereby meriting community support, possibly in the form of public subsidies.” There are such as stadiums and arenas, convention centres, performing arts centres, hotels, museums, aquariums, office and retail complexes, government buildings, transportation terminals and department stores. There are different terms used to similar effect, including anchor, magnet, activity generator, and critical mass (Sternberg 2002). Robertson (1995)

provides a framework for assessing the catalytic abilities of the Special Activity Generator (SAG) projects. However, SAG strategy is centred on the idea that large facilities that generate special activity within a district, such as stadiums, arenas, convention centres and aquarium can anchor redevelopment within that district by drawing visitors and suburbanites for events. The influx of people can provide the critical mass necessary to support restaurants and other retail establishments in the district (Sternberg 2002). The three central objectives underlying the SAG strategy outlined by Robertson (1995) consist of: 1) generate spill-over spending benefits for the surrounding district; 2) generation of new construction in the district; and 3) rejuvenation of a blighted area.

The bricks-and-mortar approach equates economic development with new construction and generated activity in different districts of the city. This approach started in the United States, centred on entertainment, tourism, culture and the arts (Frieden & Sagalyn 1989; Rosentraub 1997). Over the past two decades, the single most popular city centre redevelopment project to emerge in urban America has been the sports stadium (Chapin 1999). Following the objectives of SAG as set out by Robertson, Chapin (1999) identified three hypothesised impacts to focus on in his study to assess the ability of three widely praised sports projects in the United States to generate activity in their respective areas. The impacts include: 1) new spin-off business in existing buildings; 2) new development/construction to house new business; and 3) a substantially altered neighbourhood character. In addition, Chapin (2004) derived three indicators of urban redevelopment to examine sports facilities in the context of his study. These consisted of: 1) the reuse of vacant buildings; 2) new construction within the surrounding district; and 3) emergence of a new entertainment or sports district.

Sternberg (2002), who focused on cultural (sports and entertainment) catalysts, suggested concepts through which facilities can be assessed for their catalytic potential in order to facilitate design for greater catalytic impact. Generally, the commercial area should directly link to the catalyst it will serve, taking into account walking distances, exit and entry points, crowd flow, and land uses. Creating vital street life that sustains nearby commerce should be the primary aim (Sternberg 2002). He suggested that the ability of the catalyst to spur surrounding physical development can be achieved in five ways: 1) by generating comings and goings; 2) through the mediation of builders and architects; 3) a building may serve as an amenity, affecting passers-by and attracting them, even if they do not enter the buildings; 4) a building's presence may shape investors' perceptions, increasing confidence and promoting additional investment and 5) the building's signification may reinforce, or detract from, the surrounding area's thematic features.

From all the above objectives, this research attempted to assess the ability of the National Sports Complex to impact development through a consideration of the following: 1) generate new construction and stimulated development in the district; 2) increase land values; 3) promote land use changes, 4) necessitate zoning changes; and 5) substantially alter the character of the neighbourhood or development concept of the planning unit.

5. Research Methodology

The National Sports Complex was selected as a case study for this research to examine the long-term benefits of sports facilities on urban development. Firstly, the Bukit Jalil National Sports Complex was built to host the 1998 Commonwealth Games. Furthermore, the Bukit Jalil National Sports Complex is the largest sports complex in Malaysia. Since this research aims to look at the impacts of the development of sports facilities on urban development, which is complex with many issues to consider, a large sports facility is more likely than smaller facilities to reflect the entirety of what could happen. The size of the National Sports Complex provided the opportunity for a rich case study for the research.

According to Yin (2009), the case study inquiry relies on multiple sources of evidence, with data needing to converge in a triangulating fashion. Several sources were used to provide information for the case study of the National Sports Complex. In the first stage, information on the Bukit Jalil urban area was gathered from Kuala Lumpur City Hall (KLCH) by direct interviews and several contacts with the key officers at the Master Plan Department and the Planning Department in KLCH. Through these meetings, it was possible to obtain documents, plans, strategies on the development process and progress of the Bukit Jalil, especially after the construction of the National Sports Complex. However, to examine the impacts of the National Sports Complex on the surrounding urban development, it was necessary to have a plan showing all the new developments that have occurred and proposed new developments from 1998 until 2010. While there was no written and planned data on the history and development process for Bukit Jalil, it was possible to obtain information on development layouts approved by KLCH. This information was used in the next stage which was interviewing planning officers to identify new land uses and new developments which have come about due to the direct impact of the National Sports Complex. However, there are also new developments which have nothing to do with the National Sports Complex and plans for more projects. The interviews with the planning officers were conducted personally by the researcher in an unstructured manner based on a set of questions formulated to the particular circumstances of each of the officers.

In addition, several interviews were held with the manager and personnel in the National Sports Complex to provide background information. All the information gathered was assembled for analysis to decide whether the National Sports Complex has contributed to any significant impacts on the development of the surrounding areas. The research was intended to determine the contribution of the National Sports Complex and the impacts it has had on development. The measures must be developed to determine whether or not this has occurred. The research findings are presented with accordance to the indicators of development discussed in the previous section.

6. Assessing the Development Impacts

In consideration of the first indicator, the generation of new construction and stimulated development in the district, the National Sports Complex can be considered to have stimulated only residential development. Additionally, its presence hastened the infrastructure development consisting of new highways and the LRT service. It also contributed to the location of the LRT service. There has been significant development and construction in this area. For example, in 1994 the major land use in the Bukit Jalil Planning Unit was rubber plantations. In just over 10 years the

undeveloped land use has decreased from 59.4% in 1998 to 39.92% in 2010. Although compared to development in other new growth areas throughout Kuala Lumpur Federal Territory, Bukit Jalil's development is relatively modest and has been identified as an issue for new growth areas in the KLSP 2020. The Bukit Jalil planning unit is in the early stages of growth with respect to residential development, cultural development and high tech industrial development, and its district centre has yet to be properly developed (Government of Malaysia 2004). However, it should be remembered that, as mentioned in KLSP 1984, it was the least developed Planning Unit compared to other areas in the Federal Territory. As explained by interviewee:

The function of the National Sports Complex is not only to serve at the local level, but also to serve at the national level, but the direct impact to the surrounding area is certainly on residential schemes. However, commercial development is quite slow compared to residential development. What type of residential development [is planned] depends on the market, depends on the developer. Most of them are high rise residential developments like condominiums and apartments (Director of Urban Planning Dept. KLCH, 2010).

Officers interviewed were cautious about attributing the stimulation in construction solely to the National Sports Complex. However, based one expert commented as follows:

Assuming you are staying [in Bukit Jalil] as an owner or you rent from somebody else. Why do you think you need to stay there? Is it because of the National Sports Complex? I don't think so. Because these condominium schemes normally have their own facilities within the development. Why do you think this sports complex stimulates development? It is stimulated but that doesn't mean 100 percent direct impact on the development; meaning, because of that sports complex the demand for residential development is there, no. For me, it is no more than 20, 30 per cent. That's my personal opinion, because the sports complex is not used very much by the public. It [the sports complex] needs more programmes. The organiser says they have an event every week, but is that enough, once a week or three times a week? What kind of level of use are we talking about? I think it is still open to discussion (Director of Urban Planning Dept. KLCH, 2010).

It terms of development, there is nothing much to see except for the sports complex there. Apart from that, it is more or less a white elephant; something that we have finished with and then it is not profitable. A lot of development has come up in this area, but it is not within the sport centre area. The developments are somewhere around there (Town Planner of Urban Planning Dept. KLCH, 2010).

One reason that was mentioned by interviewees was the lack of programmed regular events and inability to attract a large number of people. It was also explained:

The National Sports Complex is not being used for meaningful events; only once in a while, when they have concert or when they have national event and other things (Town Planner of Urban Planning Dept. KLCH, 2010).

In addition, this inability to attract large numbers of people has an impact on commercial development. In terms of type of stimulated development it has not impacted on commercial activities. It was mentioned by one of the interviewees that:

This complex was actually constructed there to be functional, to organise national events, at that level. This means you will pull a large crowd, perhaps once a week. So the commercial sector will be encouraged because we pull a lot of people to come here, and then maybe those people will enjoy the facilities that are provided in the commercial block. But residents in the area don't want large crowds because of congestion.

For commercial development probably [there has been an impact], but possibly not [so much] because the commercial functions here cater to the local people, the type of services you can get in any residential area. Carrefour, which is considered new and other businesses here are also operating at the local level. So let's say I come to Bukit Jalil for an event, do you think I would spend money in these commercial areas, because these areas are similar to what's available at my place? The services are the same. So I come here [to Bukit Jalil]; after attending the event, I go home (Director of Urban Planning Dept. KLCH, 2010).

There have been proposals for commercial developments since 1990s in this area but the projects are still not developed. As explained by an officer at the Urban Planning Department:

They have been discussed in the last few meetings with the committee members, but just in terms of concept development for the area and they have not been approved yet. Because if you actually develop the commercial area then who is going to go there. Naturally they develop the residential properties first, then only you are able to develop the commercial area (Town Planner of Urban Planning Dept. KLCH, 2010).

Therefore, in terms of commercial activities, there is no establishment of commercial development higher than local level in this area. According to an expert interviewed, there are not sufficient numbers of people to stimulate the commerce. The people in this area still go to Sri Petaling to get all their services, which is the only service centre at the neighbourhood level. The Bukit Jalil district centre has not developed yet. But, the development of highways and LRT service which were completed before the Games contributed to the accessibility of the area. This accessibility directly affects stimulation of residential development. On the other hand, this concentration of infrastructure development surrounding the National Sports Complex, can be considered quite distant from the planned district centre for the Bukit Jalil new growth area which, as mentioned, is still undeveloped. The research suggests that if the location of the National Sports Complex was integrated to the planned district centre, they could support each other. It could help to provide better impacts to spur development in the area and make a better contribution to the local community.

For the second indicator, land value changes, the research findings revealed that, although there is uncertainty of the scale and extent of the impacts, the National Sports Complex has so far had positive impacts on land values in the surrounding areas. Although the officers interviewed were reluctant to attribute improvements in the housing market to the National Sports Complex, there was a general agreement that there has been an improvement in the local housing market since 1998 in this area and it is still rising. The uncertainty expressed by interviewees in linking the Sports Complex to increased land values was due to the presence of other stimulations in the area, such as the construction of new highways and improved transportation. Thus, it was difficult to isolate the impacts of the National Sports Complex from other developments in the surrounding area. One indicator that the National Sports Complex has impacted positively on the residential market was

the visibility and image of the area. The National Sports Complex is a national level facility and considered to be one of the landmarks in Kuala Lumpur. It was suggested that when people know the area and come to the area, they are more likely to invest in their property, enhance the desirability of the area and stimulate increased demand for property in the longer term.

For the third indicator of urban development, land use changes, there has been an increase of residential, commercial, institutional, educational and open spaces since 1998 in the Bukit Jalil Planning Unit area. Educational land use has shown the highest rate of increase, 30 times, from 0.04% (1.066 acres) in 1998 to 1.2% (27.84 acres) in 2010, followed by institutional land use and residential land use. Further, undeveloped land decreased significantly from 59.4% in 1998 to 39.92% in 2010. Nevertheless, the majority of proposed potential sites in Local Plan 1995 have not yet been developed, which confirms the slow process of development in the Bukit Jalil new growth area. In addition, no incentive facilities have been developed that would encourage people to stay and spend time and money in this area.

As for criteria number four, zoning changes, the area has been affected by the National Sports Complex. Some specific areas have been converted to residential land use in the period from the proposed zoning plan of the Local Plan 1995 to the future zoning plan of 2020. One of these areas has a connection to the National Sports Complex. It is an area of 40 acres located adjacent to the Commonwealth Village. The Commonwealth Village also was zoned for recreational purposes in the 1995 Zoning Plan. However, the land belonged to the National Sports Council. It was developed as the Games Village to serve the athletes during the Commonwealth Games, and afterwards these apartments were sold to members of the public. More residential housing developed after 1998 in this area. There are several reasons that enhanced the demand for housing in this area. First, the development of the National Sports Complex enhanced the visibility of this area. More people visited the area and became familiar with the new development area. Secondly, transportation improved due to the LRT service and highways. The other area that has been converted from industrial land use to residential land uses is located almost 8 km from the National Sports Complex and cannot be considered to have been influenced by the National Sports Complex.

As for the final indicator of urban development, the establishment of an entertainment or sports district, the National Sports Complex has experienced very limited success. Although it provides national level sports facilities and is considered as one of the landmarks of Kuala Lumpur, these facilities have not made the list of must-see attractions for visitors to the country, or even to the city. The majority of Malaysians know about the Bukit Jalil National Sports Complex but they never visit this sport facility. As explained by an interviewee:

Certainly they [the general public] know [about it] because this is one of the landmarks and a national level facility. The government promotes the facilities; they are even run by government. The level of function of facilities can cater for national events and at the same time they promote the area. I think every Malaysian knows about the National Sports Complex, but probably they don't know how to go there. They never go there (Director of Urban Planning Dept. KLCH, 2010).

The National Sports Complex has not attracted visitors at a sufficient rate to stimulate commerce and other incentive facilities in the surrounding areas to link and motivate movement. It has not produced the regular flow of people to generate pedestrian density or to establish a critical mass.

However, urban planners often advocate public investment in a facility because they believe it will contribute to a critical mass of commercial activity. But critical mass is only achieved when a set of establishments collectively generates vibrant activity that reinforces all its constituent members (Sternberg 2002).

7. Conclusions

Although there has been a considerable amount of development and construction in the Bukit Jalil Planning Unit area, the Bukit Jalil district centre has not yet been developed and the area has failed to achieve a sustained rate of growth. For this reason, the slow progress of development at Bukit Jalil was identified as an issue for new growth areas in the KLSP 2020. The research findings suggest that although at the beginning the sports complex brought people to the area and help raise the visibility of the area, it has not led to the emergence of the area as a sports or entertainment district, and has not achieved the specialised function planned for it. Several factors appear to contribute to this situation:

- 1) Inability of the sports complex to provide regular programmed events
- 2) Inability to attract large numbers of people
- 3) Not able to establish commercial development (higher than local level)
- 4) Not able to shape the pattern of pedestrian traffic at entrance and exiting points
- 5) Not able to link with other incentive facilities (e.g. commercial activities) to motivate movement
- 6) Not able to attract a sufficiently large number of visitors to stimulate commerce
- 7) Not able to produce the rate of flow of people to generate pedestrian density

The research findings revealed, therefore, that the sports complex alone is not enough to spur development. While the district centre of the Bukit Jalil Planning Unit is still undeveloped and slow growth in Bukit Jalil remains a matter of concern to planning authorities, the findings suggest it is due to concentration of infrastructure and transportation surrounding the National Sports complex. It is possible that if the location of the National Sports Complex was integrated to the planned district centre, the facilities could complement each other. This could help to provide better impacts to spur development in the area and better contribute to the local community.

Acknowledgements

The authors gratefully acknowledge the support of the Research Management Institute (RMI) of the Universiti Teknologi MARA (UiTM).

References

- Atkinson, G., Mourato, S., Szymanski, S., & Ozdemiroglu, E. (2008). Are We Willing to Pay Enough to “Back the Bid”? : Valuing the Intangible Impacts of London’s Bid to Host the 2012 Summer Olympic Games. *Urban Studies*, 45 (2), 419-444.
- Attoe, W., & Logan, D. (1989). *American Urban Architecture: Catalysts in the Design of Cities*. Berkeley, CA, USA: University of California Press.
- Baade, R. A., & Matheson, V. (2004). The Quest for the Cup: Assessing the Economic Impact of the World Cup. *Regional Studies*, 38 (4), 343-354.

- Bianchini, F., Dawson, J., & Evans, R. (1992). Flagship Projects in Urban Regeneration. In P. Healy, S. Davoudi, M. O'Toole, S. Tavsanoğlu, & D. Usher, *Rebuilding the City: Property-led Urban Regeneration*. London, UK: E&FN Spon.
- Bowdin, G., McDonnell, I., Allen, J., & O'Toole, W. (2002). *Events Management*. Oxford, UK: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Chalip, L. (2007). Towards Social Leverage of Sport Events. *Journal of Sport and Tourism*, 11 (2), 1-19.
- Chapin, T. (2004). Sports Facilities as Urban Redevelopment Catalyst. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 70 (2), 193-209.
- Chapin, T. (1999). *Urban Revitalisation Tools: Assessing the Impacts of Sports Stadia at the Microarea Level*. Washington, USA: University of Washington, PhD Thesis.
- Eisinger, P. (2000). The Politics of Bread and Circuses: Building the City for the Visitor Class. *Urban Affairs Review*, 35 (3), 316-333.
- Fried, G. (2005). *Managing Sport Facilities*. Boston, USA: Human Kinetics.
- Frieden, B. J., & Sagalyn, L. B. (1989). *Downtown Inc: How America Rebuilds Cities*. Cambridge, UK: MIT Press.
- Government of Malaysia. (2010a). *Department of Statistics Malaysia*. Retrieved from <http://www.statistics.gov.my/portal/index.php?lang=en>.
- Government of Malaysia. (2010b). *National Sports Complex*. Retrieved from <http://www.stadium.gov.my/english/>
- Government of Malaysia. (2009b). *National Sports Complex, Malaysia*.
- Government of Malaysia. (2004). *Kuala Lumpur Structure Plan 2020*.
- Gratton, C., Shibli, S., & Coleman, R. (2005). Sport and Economic Regeneration in Cities. *Journal of Urban Studies*, 42 (5/6), 985-999.
- Jafari, J. (1988). Tourism mega-events. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 15 (2), 272-273.
- Jago, L. K., & Shaw, R. N. (1998). Special events: a conceptual and definitional framework. *Festival Management and Event Tourism*, 5 (1), 21-32.
- John, G., Sheard, R., & Vickery, B. (2007). *Stadia: A Design and Development Guide*. Germany: Architectural Press.
- Kasimati, E. (2003). Economic Aspects and the Summer Olympics: a Review of Related Research. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 5, 433-444.
- Kim, N. S., & Chalip, L. (2004). Why Travel to FIFA World Cup? Effects of Motives, Background, Interest, and Constraints. *Tourism Management*, 25 (6), 695-707.
- Magdalinski, T., & Nauright, J. (2004). *The Commercialisation of the Olympics*. In: *The Commercialisation of Sport*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Matheson, V. A., & Baade, R. A. (2004). Mega-Sporting Events In Developing Nations: Playing The Way To Prosperity?. *Economic Society of South Africa*, 72 (5), 1085-1096.
- Muda, M. (1998). The Significance of Commonwealth Games in Malaysia's Foreign Policy. *Round Table*, 346 (1).
- Preuss, H. (2004). *The Economics of Staging the Olympics: A Comparison of the Games 1972-2008*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.
- Ritchie, J. R. (1984). Assessing the impact of hallmark events: conceptual and research issues. *Journal of Travel Research*, 23 (1), 2-11.
- Robertson, K. (1995). Downtown Redevelopment Strategies in the United States: An end-of-the-century Assessment. *Journal of American Planning Association*, 61, 429-437.

Rosentraub, S. M. (1997). *Major League Losers*. New York, USA: Basic Books.

Sternberg, E. (2002). What Makes Buildings Catalytic? How Cultural Facilities Can be Designed to Spur Surrounding Development. *Journal of Architectural and Planning Research*, 19 (1), 30-43.

Swyngedouw, E., Moulaert, F., & Rodriguez, A. (2002). Neoliberal Urbanisation in Europe: Large-scale Urban Development Projects and the New Urban Policy. *Antipode*, 34 (3), 542-557.

Symth, H. (1994). Marketing the City: *The Role of Flagship Developments in Urban Regeneration*. New York, USA: Routledge.

Westhuizen, J. (2004). Marketing Malaysia as a Model Modern Muslim State: the Significance of the 16th Commonwealth Games. *Third World Quarterly*, 25 (7), 1277-1291.

Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case Study Research: Design and Methods* (4 ed.). USA: SAGE.