

Research Paper

Risk Issues of the 29th SEA Games

Khairiah Ismail, Nadia Adros and Sharon Linang Jimbun
Taylor's University, Malaysia

© The Author(s) 2018. This article is published with open access by Taylor's Press.

Abstract: While prior studies have studied extensively about mega-sports events, not many have explored on the risk issue. This study identifies the risk issues perceived by the spectators of the 29th SEA Games and examines the effect of the perceptions on their decision to attend future events organised by the same organiser. The perceptions of spectators were gathered through observation at the event venues as well as through semi-structured interviews. The data obtained from seven participants with diverse background were then examined using thematic analysis. The results revealed three themes on risks, namely security, safety and communication. These findings suggest that the 29th SEA Games organiser should improve risk management in the planning and organisation of sports events by taking into account the raised issues. This is further valuable as it would impact attendees' decision to attend any future event of similar status.

Keywords: Risk issue, safety, security, communication, 29th SEA Games

Suggested citation: Ismail, K., Adros, N. & Jimbun, S. L. (2018). Risk Issues of the 29th SEA Games. [Special Issue]. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Innovation in Hospitality and Tourism*, 7, 53–67.

Introduction

The study explores risk issues of the 29th SEA Games from the perspective of spectators and how they impact on their decision to be a repeat attendee. As this is the first sports-mega event hosted by Malaysia since the Commonwealth Games in 1998, the risk issues raised were different in nature due to the rapid changes that have taken place in technology, facilities and services. This would be Malaysia's fifth time hosting the games, which has been held in 1965, 1977, 1989, and 2001 before this. Since the last hosting, the Malaysian sports scene has seen many significant changes, including some ups and downs in sports event organising.

Correspondence: Khairiah Ismail, Taylor's University, Malaysia. Email: Khairiah.Ismail@taylors.edu.my

However, sports fans continue to ardently support events organised locally. In 1959, the first ever Southeast Asian Games or SEA Games was held in Bangkok and saw the participation of over 27 athletes in 12 sport events. Hosts for the Games are selected on a rotation basis and the selected country must be prepared to carry out this honour. According to Chi (2017), even if host rotation is done according to the alphabetical order, if the selected country is not ready to host, it will then be passed on to the next National Olympic Committee (NOC).

Back in 1977, when Malaysia hosted the games, there were only eight participating countries which were Cambodia, Indonesia, Myanmar, Philippines, Singapore, Thailand, and Timor-Leste compared to 2017 when Brunei, Laos and Vietnam agreed to join. In 2017, Malaysia created history when it was ranked third in all-time SEA Games medal with 1,248 gold medals followed by Indonesia (second ranking) with 1,751 and Thailand (first ranking) with 2,162. This achievement was made all the more memorable as it took place in August when Malaysia celebrates her independence day. For the 29th SEA Games, each country was given the flexibility to choose any 38 events from the 405 finalised by Olympic Council of Malaysia (OCM) compared to only 12 events in 1959. Due to the increased number of events, there were also increased risks compared to past Games. In addition, some of the events were held across the nation in several states such as Wilayah Persekutuan, Selangor, Putrajaya, Negeri Sembilan, Terengganu and Kedah. Thus, there is always the risk of untoward or dangerous accidents at the venues mentioned. The many benefits accrued from hosting mega-sports events such as SEA Games, for example, reputation, tourism, enhanced image as well as social and economic impacts (Bull & Lovell, 2007), can be diminished by such incidents or accidents even if the sporting event had been successful (Ellert, Schafmeister, Wawrzinek & Gressner, 2015).

It should be noted that sport events held in the past in Malaysia have not really courted any major controversies regarding risks. For example in 2001, no issues were raised regarding facilities as the events were held at a mix of new and existing facilities from the 1998 Commonwealth Games. Interestingly enough, it had been difficult finding related source materials that examined risk issues for past sport events; possibly due to the nature of technology available then. Moreover, there has been limited studies in Malaysia that looked at risks in the context of event management. As a result, the perceptions of spectators regarding risks in the 29th SEA Games were procured from various sources such as word of mouth, online postings, news and some limited channels due to the political issues in Malaysia. Nevertheless, this study seeks to identify risk issues related to the Games from the perspective of spectators and determine their intention to re-attend this event in the future.

Literature Review

For some countries, organising and attending mega-sports events is a rare occasion that not many of its citizens get to experience in their life. However, the people involved in working towards the successful hosting of a sport events are exposed to many forms of risk. All parties including team managers, athletes, government agencies and the private sector players join forces to uphold the country's good name in hosting any large-scale sports event. The excitement and anticipation of citizens and spectators alike to see their country in the eyes of the world can be infectious for the whole nation.

According to Getz (2009), as cited in Moyle, Kennelly and Lamont, (2014), large-scale events are vulnerable to a broad spectrum of risks due to the nature of its execution and it is critical that efficient responses to unforeseen incidents are planned ahead. Leopkey and Parent (2009) agreed that it is crucial to assess all possible risks for an event and its stakeholders by strategically anticipating and planning responses to prevent or minimise those identified risks. Identifying these risks can help organisers to plan and organise more effectively towards a successful event.

However, one must first understand the notion of risk. People engage in some form of dangerous activity every day and it is vital to comprehend how people understand risk. For events, risks are inevitable and as such, should always be taken into account at the planning stage. All risks have one element in common; a distinction between reality and possibility (Sjoberg, Moen & Rundmo, 2004). Risk can be defined as "a situation or an event where something of human value (including human themselves) is at stake and where the outcome is uncertain". Similarly, Bowden, Alden, O'Toole, Harris and McDonnell (2006) described risk as "any future incident that will negatively influence an event". Thus, it can be summarised that any threat or harm posed to humans can be considered as risk.

Many researchers agree that risks can be found in every field ranging from tourism to sport events. In the context of sport events, risk is perceived by stakeholders such as organisers, sponsors, athletes and attendees alike. To date, researchers have identified risks in the form of terrorism and security (Glaesser, 2003; Faulkner, 2001; Toohey & Taylor, 2008); ticket sales, sponsorship services, athlete safety and services, hospitality, operation management, concessions, finance, support services, media relations, promotions, advertising, insurance and unforeseeable events such as weather (Chappelet, 2001; Getz, 2002). Further to this, Leopkey and Parent (2009) identified other risks such as infrastructure, legacy, human resources, political factors, threats, environment, participation and visibility.

Fuller and Drawer (2004) strongly believed that outdoor events have considerable exposure to risks. A risk exclusive to sports events is adverse weather conditions (Getz, 2002). This is reiterated further by Dawkins and Stern (2004) who highlighted that the right kind of weather can influence many facets of an event from attendance to revenue generation and in extreme cases, if the event takes place or not - for example,

Ironman New Zealand 2012 was cancelled due to adverse weather conditions (Moyle et al., 2014).

Many previous studies have explored extensively risk management from the perspective of stakeholders such as event organisers and participants (Bourassa, Doraty, Berdahl, Fried & Bell, 2016; Hanstad, 2012; Reid & Ritchie, 2011). However, very few studies have explored the spectators' views on risks and it is imperative to note that they are becoming more sophisticated, discerning and more inclined to complain as well as easier to change loyalties and seek alternatives when their needs are not met (Thwaites & Chadwick, 2005). Thus, this paper aims to identify the risk issues of the 29th SEA Games from the perspective of spectators and examine their impact on the spectators' repeat attendance.

Methodology

The present study examined the risk issues of the Games from the experience of spectators and how this affects their decision to attend the next mega event organised by Malaysia Organising Committee (MASOC). This study adopted an interpretive-constructivist approach where the researcher seeks for the meaning of a situation from the perspective of participants (Creswell, 2014). Merriam (2009) explained that "qualitative research is interested in understanding how people interpret their experiences, how they construct their world, and what meaning is attributed to their experiences". Due to this reason, a qualitative approach was considered the most appropriate method for this study as it would help the researchers to collect rich data from interview sessions and observations. According to Creswell (1994), qualitative research involves the induction process where data collected from sources like interview sessions is analysed using specific coding to reveal emerging themes. For this study, the researchers conducted the same process to identify emerging themes.

Primary data were collected from in-depth interviews. A total of 20 spectators were approached but only 7 were available for the interviews. The demographics of the participants varied by nationality, age, race and occupation. There were Malaysians, Indonesians and Koreans aged 24 to 60 years old. 70% of them were females and the remainder males. Five of them worked in the private sector while the other two were from the public sector. Several one-hour sessions of semi-structured interviews were conducted and each participant received the same series of questions that reflected the research objectives and questions of this study. The questions were mainly open-ended and in English. Based on Lafores' recommendation (2009), each interview session was planned with an introduction, content and conclusion. The introduction asked some general questions about the Games while the content focused on the research questions which sought to identify the risk issues from their perspective as well as investigate any effect in their decision to attend future events organised

by the same organiser. For the conclusion, the researchers asked the participants to summarise and provide suggestions for the organiser of the Games.

It is worth noting that two of the participants had the experience of attending mega events held in other countries, namely Australia and South Korea. Another five of them had no experience of attending mega-sports events but they had experience in attending smaller scale sports events. All of the participants were aware about the importance of risk management and were deemed suitable to be interviewed for this study.

In addition, the researchers also conducted participatory observation of the event to collect secondary data to support the primary data from the interviews. According to Mackellar (2013), this method requires the researcher to be a part of the process or setting to experience the phenomenon being studied. There are five types of participation, which are complete, active, moderate, passive and non-participation (Spradley, 1980). For this study, the researchers employed the moderate approach whereby they participated as spectators of the Games and experienced the event. Moderate participation is the involvement of researchers as spectators whereby they experience the event and observe the behaviour of other spectators (Mackellar, 2013). Thus, the present study researchers attended the Games and observed the behaviour of other spectators.

As the sporting events of the 29th SEA Games were conducted at various venues, the researchers visited a few to experience the Games. The venues visited were Stadium Bukit Jalil, National Aquatic Centre, Stadium Axiata and Equestrian Park, Putrajaya. Each observation session lasted three hours. The complete experience included taking public transportation (train) to the venue, enjoying the various food and activities made available, entering the venues and strolling around them. These experiences were captured through photographs and field notes.

The data obtained from the interview session were analysed based on open coding before being subjected to a thematic analysis. The qualitative approach was guided by thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2013) and participants were encouraged to describe their views, and hence, themes were derived from their narrative (Jafari, Taheri & Vom, 2013). The thematic analysis process was dynamic as the codes were modified or altered as ideas developed and the results of the coding process along with sample coded interview transcripts were shared between the researchers to enhance the validity of the qualitative data (Jafari et al, 2013). The thematic analysis began with familiarisation of the data, and included generating initial codes, gathering data for each theme, reviewing the themes, identifying the name for each theme and producing a report.

Results and Discussion

The study aimed to identify the risks of the 29th SEA Games as perceived by spectators and the effect on their decision to attend future mega events organised by

the same organiser, MASOC. There were three themes that emerged throughout the thematic analysis process, namely security, safety and communication.

Results of the Interview Session

Security

Most of the participants mentioned about security which plays an important role on the overall safety of the Games. They commented on security personnel, access control and crowd control as illustrated by the following statements:

“One thing that I notice while trying to do survey on that day...it was fully crowded ...small crowds of Thai here and there...majority are all Malaysians... so...the Thais suddenly start with the dance...passing through the way...showing flags and all that...I was, look at it and think ...where is the police? What happened if the crowd become wild...I move away...if anything happen...but people just kept quiet...I could see some resentment from certain Malaysians during that time...” (Participant 3)

“We went to Empire city for preliminary round... basically you can just walk in...so...the ice skating rink itself was surrounded with vendors outlet...so you don't need to buy ticket...so we don't see any security at all...having said that...um...I...I went on the finals...so final this time we saw 1 or 2 ... those black armies...they actually hold rifles...” (Participant 2)

“There was no...what the person called...traffic personnel...like direct traffic and said there's a bus coming or anything as guidance for the pedestrian...so on that day...it was midnight...I was with students walking back ...it was very dangerous...really...I really felt like ...I could have just died...because the bus just next to me...the bus just honked...I never seen anybody visible there...I think it was at night people want to go back...It happened during the games...” (Participant 1)

“During the opening ceremony of SEA GAMES...there were so many people trying to enter the stadium...normal practice is that...the security officer will check each person who enter the stadium...but at that time they were too many people...and create congestion at the entrance...in the end people just pass through the scanning without detailed check-up ...I find it that they were not doing well with that...” (Participant 4)

Safety

All of the participants also touched on the issue of safety. Each of them had a different opinion on the safety of the Games. Four of the respondents highlighted food safety while another three mentioned about the facilities offered at the event venues as narrated by the following statements:

“Most of them from the food and beverage...venue that is available...is not proper for the seller to sell their food...after the event it look so messy...cause there is no place for us...the customer...to eat...other than that ...they do not know where to throw the stuff after they use it..” (Participant 5)

“In the SEA Games 2017... there were incidents involving team bus accidents...robbery...safety concerns for fans and constant change of timings...the risks are mostly ...are mostly...impact the foreign fans who come to support their national teams...there were bus accidents where the athletes got injured...furthermore...fans were injured while attending the football event and also made to sit outside of the stadium to wait for the game...” (Participant 6)

“Food trucks...I do not know...um...how long the food were kept...for certain food truck la...out of the train station...I did tell to the students to be careful...so...don't buy food that is left out open...the other thing is...the areas for the food truck...it was actually quite slippery...it is because of the oil...for the next day...because nobody wash it...there is grease and become sticky...so it is hard to walk...” (Participant 2)

“..Basic things like toilet...we cannot easily access the toilet...they need to enter the stadium but do not have the ticket...so they can't enter...the public toilet are not enough...and it's hard to find them...” (Participant 7)

“It was after the opening ceremony ended...you see...we can't park the car close to the stadium...there is designated parking space...and we were required to ride on bus...so after the event...we need to wait for the bus...there are limited...it was not enough...everyone try to get into the bus...because they were tired...” (Participant 4)

“Of course waste management...all the bins...is wrongly labelled ...and people get confused...in the end they just dump everything in one place...” (Participant 2)

Communication

The participants also singled out communication risk which occurred throughout the Games and included written, aural, visual and electronic. The following are responses provided by them:

“Malaysia’s signage very poor...people come asking me...where is gate A... gate B...because I had the tag they were confused...so I tell them to refer to the other person...hahaha...no ushers...so you see...they did not have proper signage...it’s confusing...” (Participant 3)

“Sea Games Apps...there were a lot of error...the Apps supposed to show a frequent updates...on how many medals?...it was supposed to give you the medal tally immediately...for example...swimming competition result...it supposed to be updated at least 30 minutes later...but after 2 days still not updating...” (Participant 2)

“In terms of country...is really bad...it’s not the flag in the booklet...there are 2 cases...one is Indonesian flag and ...Brunei flag...it’s really like ‘Malu lah’ (embarrassing)...it looks pathetic...” (Participant 1)

“There were so many change...the schedules...this causes problem in preparation for the events...for the athletes...” (Participant 6)

In addition, during the interview session, participants were asked if they would attend any future mega events hosted by MASOC. Three of them were positive that they would attend while one gave a negative response. The remaining three responded that they were unsure and that they would look at factors before deciding. The responses as stated below:

“Of course I will go again because I am a sports fan...what makes me to join again because of my spirit of patriotism. I will go for the event because I want to cheer our country team...” (Participant 4)

“Yes...of course. I will go again... I am not looking at who the organiser is... it’s just a big event that we should be proud of...and support our country who fight during the tournament or competition...I believe the organiser will try their best to improve it...” (Participant 7)

“Yes... I will... the organiser needs to improve their service for the next event...they need to review what happened during KL SEA games and make it better for the next one...” (Participant 5)

“After what I saw the SEA Games 2017 ... of course no... I personally do not think it would be worth going as it will be the same again and again...”
(Participant 6)

“hahahahaha ...cannot see the eagerness... You know... I won't say no... there would be certain condition that I will look at la...” (Participant 2)

“To me ...there must be something in there for me ...it should be a win-win situation...” (Participant 3)

“hmm...I will still give it a try actually...I still give hope la...not entirely no more...but I still give hope...but um...most of the time is because of the event not the organizer...I will look at which event that they will handle...from there I will make my decision” (Participant 1)

The results show that the main risk issues that are of concern to spectators are security, safety and communication themes. These themes are discussed further in relation to the research objectives.

1) Security

Most of the participants mentioned about security at some venues like Bukit Jalil Stadium, Melawati Stadium and Empire City. There are three different aspects highlighted by the participants for this theme. Firstly, the crowd. The loud cheering of sports fan crowds can at times contribute to an uncomfortable feeling among some spectators, especially considering that there were diverse athlete teams and nationalities at the venues. Thus, it is possible that a provocation can be triggered during the event. Such an incident took place at a football match between Singapore and Malaysia at Shah Alam Stadium when Singapore football fans were angered by the provocative chanting of ‘Singapore dogs’ by Malaysia football fans (Wong, 2017).

Second, traffic personnel. As this is our second SEA Games since the last one which took place 16 years ago, many stakeholders were eager to be a part of this prestigious sports event. Many of these stakeholders worked hard with many late nights to ensure a successful Games. Thus, they had high hopes for efficient traffic control and management to minimise traffic congestion and to avoid any untoward incidents and accidents involving any stakeholders or spectators.

Third is the event entrance. Apart from Bukit Jalil Stadium, the participants could see the extent of insufficient security at other venue entrances especially when there is no restriction access or ticket required to enter the venue. This is in reference to Empire City where only two security personnel were on duty to protect the overall ice skating games from any potential untoward incidents.

In contrast, at Putrajaya Equestrian Park, another venue which the researchers observed, there were a lot of security personnel on standby.

It should be noted that the event was attended by Malaysian and Brunei dignitaries and their families. In addition, tight security at the entrance was only at the start and end of the event. This practice was also observed at the badminton matches at Axiata Arena and the closing ceremony at the Bukit Jalil Stadium, where tight security check was evident from the long queues that were seen at the entrance. However, 30 minutes after the matches started, any visitor without a pass could easily enter the venue as no security personnel can be seen on duty. At this juncture, it is safe to say that there was no standardised policy or standard operating procedures (SOP) on entry restriction prepared by the organiser for all the event venues. Consequently, the participants felt that this might contribute to risks related to security.

2) Safety

For the safety theme, two items raised by the participants were food and facilities. Risks related to food safety were mainly on the way vendors handled, prepared and stored food to prevent food contamination. The participants believed that the organisers did not conduct any health inspection visits on the food outlets and thus they kept reminding their friends to be careful when eating at these outlets. Apart from that, the vendors' lack of cleanliness and rampant number of flies seen disgusted the spectators. The floor at the food vendors' area was also slippery due to cooking oil spillage.

The next item identified by the participants in the safety theme was facilities offered at the venues. A number of them stressed that the number of toilets at many venues was not enough to cater to the number of spectators. Other than that, poor waste management was also observed whereby many spectators simply dumped rubbish instead sorting them for 3R (reduce, reuse and recycle) due to wrongly labelled bin covers.

3) Communication

The participants talked about written, aural, visual and electronic communication under the communication theme. One of the issues highlighted was the Indonesian flag blunder in the souvenir booklet. The gaffe sparked anger among Indonesians and the hashtag '#shameonyoumalaysia' went viral on social media. As a result, some spectators became worried for their safety while attending the Games. The same situation was faced by Indonesians when a similar blunder committed by the Indonesian organiser during the 2011 SEA Games became viral on social media. Apart from this, the participants also criticised the Games application which is known as KL2017 app. This app was meant to be compatible with all devices to disseminate information on games schedule, results, medal tally, and athletes' list. However, those

who accessed this application reported problems such as result errors and delay in updates. This poor communication means might have caused miscommunication, injury or property damage.

With regard to attending future mega-sport events, only three participants gave a positive response. This was in line with them being ardent sports fans and their way of showing their patriotic spirit for their country. However, they also hoped that the organisers would improve on the shortcomings highlighted, in particular those that carry risks. The other four participants have their reservations on their future attendance as they feel that the same incidences might occur again. This feedback is related to the Indonesian flag blunder, football ticket fiasco, failure to broadcast live football matches and many others as mentioned in the analysis. Additionally, the participants questioned as to why were there repeat incidents like this. This strengthened their resolve further to not attend any future mega-sports events in Malaysia.

Observation

Observation data made up the other part of analysis for this study as it sheds light on the strengths and weaknesses (Mackellar, 2013) of the Games. As mentioned earlier, the researchers carried out observations at several venues namely the Axiata Arena Bukit Jalil (badminton), the National Aquatic Centre Bukit Jalil (aquatic), the Equestrian Park Putrajaya (polo) and the Stadium Bukit Jalil (closing ceremony). During these observation sessions, the researchers acted as spectators and took descriptive notes about the venue as well as the behaviour of other spectators. The observations are described below:

Venue	Observation
National Aquatic Centre, Bukit Jalil	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We were not allowed to enter the venue as there were no identification tags provided. • In fact, there was no clear signage at the entrance which required spectators to show their tags or tickets before entering the venue. We could see that the security officer kept on explaining this requirement to the spectators.
Axiata Arena, Bukit Jalil	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Similar to the above situation, we did not have any tags or tickets to enter the venue. • However, 30 minutes after the event started, we managed to enter the venue without any tag or ticket checks by security. Spectators were only reminded to leave their umbrella, helmet and camera selfie stick.

- At this point, we were not able to gather any information on security procedure for venue entry as the security personnel refused to be interviewed.
 - When we entered the venue, announcements were made to remind spectators to refrain from using camera flash as it might distract the focus of badminton players. However, there were still some who ignored this instruction.
-

Equestrian Park, Putrajaya

- We obtained prior permission from MASOC to conduct our data collection throughout the event. However, we were shocked when the venue provider informed us that no media personnel were allowed to conduct interviews with spectators, volunteers or athletes. This hindered us from conducting any interviews as we did not have any tags or related documents to convince the venue provider that we were not from the media.
 - The polo matches were attended by many VIPs as well as dignitaries such as the Prince of Brunei and the then Minister of Youth and Sports, YB Khairy Jamaluddin. On a positive note, the police and security personnel carried out their duties well in ensuring no unforeseen incidents took place.
 - However, there were some potential risks noted during the event.
 - i) Cable wires were seen lying haphazardly on the floor of the VIP seating area and some spectators were simply walking on it.
 - ii) Accessibility between parking area and venue. A few spectators slipped and fell down the hilly slope when they tried to pass the road divider from the parking area to the venue. Obviously, there was no proper signage provided regarding safe pathway from the parking area to the venue.
-

Stadium Bukit Jalil

- The closing ceremony of the Games were handled very well by the organiser in the most professional way. However, some things need to be improved further:
-

-
- i) Facilities – Insufficient prayer space for Muslims.
 - ii) Food and beverages – High risk of food poisoning caused by bacteria or poisonous chemical as most of the food trucks did not cover or wrap their food. Moreover, some food trucks had improper installation of drain cover and floors were slippery due to spillage of cooking oil and water. It was also inconvenient to eat because there was no designated eating area for patrons.
 - iii) Event entrance – Similar to Axiata Arena, there was very tight security checks at the entrance before the actual ceremony started. However, one hour into ceremony, we observed that anyone could enter easily without the need for any ticket or security check.
-

The findings from the observation data corroborate with the findings from the interview data in highlighting similar themes, i.e. security, safety and communication. With regard to security, the researchers experienced different security procedures at different venues. The security protocol for different venues were different based on the types of games and spectators. The most popular events such as badminton matches, polo matches and closing ceremony had a systematic and strict entry protocol in place. The whole process involved scanning machines, police personnel, and volunteers to ensure smooth flow into the venue. Meanwhile, the less popular events did not receive the same treatment. The safety element was observed at the polo games at the Equestrian Park, Putrajaya when some spectators slipped down on the hilly slope as they made their way from the parking area to the polo arena due to the insufficient signage on directions.

Other than that, the findings also show high risk of food poisoning for spectators and accidents due to slippery floor (caused by careless and irresponsible food truck vendors as well poor sanitation management by organiser). Finally, the communication element which is related to the insufficient and unclear signage provided at venues as observed. Thus, there is a strong corroboration between the findings of the interviews and the observations.

Conclusion

By identifying the risk issues of the 29th SEA Games which provides an insight into the spectators' perspectives, the findings can provide a guide for better

implementation of large scale sports events in the future. Based on the responses given for the three issues of safety, security and communication as narrated by spectators, it appears that they are motivated to attend this event not only as sports fans but as a gesture of their patriotic spirit to support their national team. However, their sense of patriotism and sportsmanship does not necessarily translate into repeat attendance and support. As confirmed by the findings of the present study, risk issues perceived by spectators can influence their desire to attend similar future events.

The study's limitations include restrictions to observe at some event venues and the small number of interviewees. As some venues barred interviews of staff and volunteers, data could not be collected to be analysed. Additionally, loud noise and other disruption also prevented researchers from collecting responses from spectators.

The findings also suggest some future research directions. Firstly, instead of spectators, future research can explore the perspectives of a wider range of stakeholders so that more risk issues can be recognised. For example, the views of organisers, venue providers and athletes alike can provide rich data and new insights. Furthermore, the risk issues identified can be supported by more robust data sources as well. Secondly, future research should seek to interview spectators on the event day itself so that a more accurate description of their experience pertaining to risk issues could be recorded. As this is an exploratory study that examined the risk issue in Malaysian context, the findings will help to inform the field of sports event management in the country.

Open Access: This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC-BY 4.0) which permits any use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author(s) and the source are credited.

References

- Bourassa, M., Doraty, K., Berdahl, L., Fried, J., & Bell, S. (2016). Support, opposition, emotion and contentious issue risk perception. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 29(2), 201–216.
- Bowden, G., Allen, J., O'Toole, W., Harris, I. & McDonnell. (2006). *Events management*. London: Routledge.
- Braun, V. & Clarke, V. (2013). *Successful qualitative research: A practical guide for beginners (1st ed.)*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Bull, C., & Lovell, J. (2007). The impact of hosting major sporting events on local residents: An analysis of the views and perceptions of Canterbury residents in relation to the Tour de France 2007. *Journal of Sport & Tourism*, 12(3–4), 229–248.
- Chappelet, J. (2001). Risk management for large-scale events: The case of the Olympic Winter Games. *European Journal for Sports Management*, 8, 6–21.
- Chi, S. K. (2017). Brief history of the SEA Games. Retrieved from <http://www2.mncf.org.my/images/stories/2017/briefhis.pdf>.

- Creswell, J.W. (1994). *Research design: Qualitative & quantitative approaches*. US: SAGE Publications.
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *A concise introduction to mixed methods research*. Sage Publications.
- Dawkins, S. S., & Stern, H. (2004, June). Managing weather risk during major sporting events: the use of weather derivatives. In *2nd International Workshop on Climate, Tourism and Recreation, Orthodox Academy of Crete, Kolimbari, Crete, Greece* (pp. 8–11).
- Ellert, G., Schafmeister, G., Wawrzinek, D., & Gassner, H. (2015). Expect the unexpected: New perspectives on uncertainty management and value logics in event management. *International Journal of Event and Festival Management*, 6(1), 54–72.
- Faulkner, B. (2001). Towards a framework for tourism disaster management. *Tourism Management*, 22(2), 135-147.
- Fuller, C., & Drawer, S. (2004). The application of risk management in sport. *Sports Medicine*, 34(6), 349-356.
- Getz, D. (2002). Why festivals fail. *Event Management*, 7(4), 209-219.
- Glaesser, D. (2003). *Crisis management in the tourism industry*. Oxford: Butterworth Heinmann.
- Hanstad, D. V. (2012). Risk management in major sporting events: A participating national Olympic team's perspective. *Event Management*, 16(3), 189-201.
- Jafari, A., Taheri, B., & vom Lehn, D. (2013). Cultural consumption, interactive sociality, and the museum. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 29(15–16), 1729–1752.
- Lafores, J. (2009). Guide to organising semi-structured interviews with key informant. Retrieved from www.crpspc.qc.ca/guide_entretien_versionWEB_eng.pdf.
- Leopkey, B., & Parent, M. M. (2009). Risk management issues in large-scale sporting events: A stakeholder perspective. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 9(2), 187–208.
- Mackellar J. (2013). Participant observation at events: Theory, practice and potential. *Journal of Event and Festival Management*, 4(1), 56–65.
- Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons.
- Moyle, B., Kennelly, M., & Lamont, M. (2014). Risk management and contingency planning in events: Participants' reactions to the cancellation of Ironman New Zealand 2012. *International Journal of Event Management Research*, 8(1), 94–106.
- Reid, S., & Ritchie, B. (2011). Risk management: Event managers' attitudes, beliefs, and perceived constraints. *Event Management*, 15(4), 329–341.
- Sjöberg, L., Moen, B. E., & Rundmo, T. (2004). *Explaining risk perception. An evaluation of the psychometric paradigm in risk perception research*. Norway: Rotunde.
- Spradley, J. P. (1980). *Participant observation*. New York: Wadsworth Thomson Learning.
- Thwaites, D., & Chadwick, S. (2005). Service quality perspectives in sport tourism. *Sport in Society*, 8(2), 321-337.
- Toohey, K., & Taylor, T. (2008). Mega events, fear, and risk: Terrorism at the Olympic Games. *Journal of Sport Management*, 22(4), 451–469.
- Wong J. (2017, August 22). SEA Games: Organisers urge fans to improve their behaviour at the Games. *The Straits Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.straitstimes.com/sport/football/sea-games-organisers-slam-singapore-dogs-football-chant>.

