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ABSTRACT

Residents are considered key role-players in the tourism industry as tourism happens in and around communities. The success of a mega-event such as the FIFA 2010 World Cup is to a certain extent dependent on the attitudes of residents towards the event. South Africa went to great lengths to create positive attitudes towards the FIFA 2010 World Cup and prepared South Africans for the effects and impacts. It is, however, important to determine residents’ perceptions of the impacts as this information can assist in managing future events. It is therefore the aim of this paper to determine residents’ perceptions of the impacts of the event and to explore the differences between gender, age and education level on the identified tourism impacts. Quantitative research was conducted by means of a survey in June 2010 in four host cities resulting in 1 055 questionnaires. The factor analysis revealed four impacts, namely Positive community impacts, Negative community impacts, Trade impacts and Visible impacts. An ANOVA was done and significant differences were found between gender, age and occupation and the various factors, but no significant differences were found on education. It is therefore clear that certain positive and negative impacts exist and that the perceptions of tourism impacts can be influenced by certain demographic characteristics.
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1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

Over recent years, various studies have been performed on residents’ perceptions of tourism impacts (Andereck, Valentine, Knopf & Vogt, 2005; Chen, 2001; Fredline & Faulkner, 2002; Kim & Petrick, 2005; Ohmann, Jones & Wilkes, 2006; Williams & Lawson, 2001). However, very little is known about the impacts of events on host communities (Eraqi, 2007; Gu & Ryan, 2008; Jackson, 2008), especially mega events in South Africa (Ntloko & Swart, 2008). With South Africa entering and developing events as major attractions, it becomes important to understand the perceptions of the local communities since they interact most with the tourists and considered as a key stakeholder. Destinations have to plan for optimal tourism development but minimal impact on the residents (Jackson, 2008:240).

Successful sport mega-events, such as the FIFA 2010 World Cup, can create various positive impacts for local communities, such as image enhancement, opportunities to enjoy the matches, development of infrastructure, to name but a few (Kim & Petrick, 2005:25). These events can also lead to negative impacts such as noise, environmental damage, loss of authenticity and misallocation of funds (Slabbert, 2004:59). Understanding residents’ perceptions will inform event practitioners and assist them in
developing better strategies for service delivery and community involvement (Chen, 2001:235). Host communities need to support the event, as successful events may lead to a better quality of life for residents. The purpose of this study is to assess significant tourism impacts of the 2010 World Cup held in South Africa during June 2010, as perceived by host city communities, as well as to analyse the influence of certain socio-demographic variables thereon. This is done by firstly determining the impacts and secondly exploring the relationships between socio-demographic characteristics and the impacts.

2. METHODOLOGY

To achieve the objectives of the study, quantitative research was conducted by means of a survey in June 2010 in 4 host cities. This survey resulted in 1 055 questionnaires. On-site surveys were performed in areas close to the stadiums as these residents were supposedly more aware of tourism impacts related to the FIFA World Cup. One respondent per household was requested to complete the survey. A pool of 31 items covering residents’ perceptions of the impacts of the 2010 World Cup in South Africa was selected from previous studies on the impacts of events (Delamere, 2001; Fredline, Jago & Deery, 2003; Viviers, 2009). The responses to the items were measured on a 4-point Likert-type scale where 1 = Totally disagree and 4 = Totally agree. The data concerning the surveys were analysed, using the Statistical Programme for Social Sciences (SPSS 17.0). The 31 items were subjected to factor analysis, and the t-tests and ANOVA were performed to determine differences between socio-demographic variables and the factors.

3. DISCUSSION

The discussion will include a brief discussion on the demographic profile of residents, the factor analysis of the tourism impacts and the comparison of residents’ perceptions of the factors for different socio-demographic variables.

3.1. DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE

Fifty-two percent of the respondents were female and 48% male, which is a fairly even distribution regarding gender. The respondents were on average 56 years of age and 45% had matric (grade 12), whereas 35% either had a diploma or a degree. Thirteen percent of the respondents were unemployed, followed by 11% in sales positions or self-employed respectively, and 10% in educational positions.

3.2. FACTOR ANALYSIS OF TOURISM IMPACTS

A Principal Axis factor analysis with Oblimin rotation was undertaken. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy was 0.932, which is highly acceptable. The Bartlett test was also found to be significant (p <.00001). The 31 items yielded four factors with eigenvalues greater than 1.0. These factors explained 48% of the variance and were labelled: Positive community impacts, Negative community impacts, Trade impacts and Visible impacts. The factor loadings of the 31 items were higher than 0.259. The variables were also subjected to reliability (Cronbach alpha reliability test) to check the internal consistency of items in each dimension and were higher than 0.79 with the exclusion of Factor 4 with 0.53, which is still acceptable.
Positive community impacts include aspects such as maintenance of public facilities, improvement of the economy and public transport. Negative community impacts included aspects such as damage to the environment, crime levels and excessive drinking. Trade impacts refer to aspects such as opportunities of local businesses, turnover of local businesses and employment opportunities. Visible impacts include aspects such as traffic congestion, prices of some goods and services as well as interactions between tourists and residents. The component correlation matrix indicates medium correlations between factors; therefore the factors can be seen as relatively dependent on one another.

3.3. COMPARISON OF RESIDENTS' PERCEPTIONS ON THE IMPACT FACTORS AND SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHICS

A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to explore the differences between gender, age and education level on tourism impacts as determined in the factor analysis above. Gender revealed no significant differences, which differs from what Kim and Petrick (2005:32) found, namely that women rated the positive impacts higher than males. Age revealed significant differences where residents between 41 and 50 years of age differ from residents between 51 and 60 years of age regarding factor 1 (Positive community impacts). Residents between 41 and 50 years of age agree to a greater extent with the positive community impacts than the residents between 51 and 60 years of age. Residents between ages 41 and 50 years differ with residents between ages 61 and 70 years, regarding the statement that the festival leads to more positive community impacts, with the younger visitors agreeing with it. Similarly, Kim and Petrick (2005:31) found that age influences perceptions of tourism impacts where the younger visitors are more sensitive to negative economic impacts. Regarding occupation it was found in this study that factor one differs between occupation groups. People in professional occupations were more positive towards the tourism impacts. This differs from the FIFA 2002 World Cup event. Kim and Petrick (2005:34) revealed that housewives reported the highest score. No significant differences were found between education and the identified factors.

4. MAIN CONTRIBUTIONS

This study provides insight into the residents’ opinions regarding mega-events in South Africa. It was also clear that in this case socio-demographic variables did not influence resident behaviour significantly. However significant differences were found in other mega event studies. It is important to increase residents’ positive experiences by taking this type of research into account and by planning an event with the variables in mind. This research adds to the body of knowledge concerning residents’ perceptions of mega-sport events, which is limited. Residents seem to be more tolerant regarding mega events which are well planned and marketed. Residents therefore know what to expect and adapt accordingly. The survey instrument was adapted from research studies focusing on the impacts of tourism development and smaller events on communities – an instrument measuring the impacts of mega-events on residents is important.

5. CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this study was to assess significant tourism impacts of the 2010 World Cup, held in South Africa during June 2010 as perceived by host city communities, as well as to analyse the influence of certain socio-demographic variables thereon. The results revealed four tourism impacts, namely positive community impacts, negative community impacts, trading impacts and visible impacts.
These results confirmed impact factors identified in previous research studies. It is clear that various things should be done to keep the community positive and that they should be involved in and prepared for mega-events in SA. Even though these results differ from other studies, it was found that age, gender and educational level did not reveal significant differences between the groups. Occupation, however, did reveal differences regarding positive community impacts.
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