

## HOST CITY AND NON-HOST CITY RESIDENT PERCEPTIONS OF THE 2010 SOCCER WORLD CUP

**Elmarie Slabbert**

PhD, North West University, Socio-Economic Impacts of Tourism, South Africa

[elmarie.slabbert@nwu.ac.za](mailto:elmarie.slabbert@nwu.ac.za)

**Peta Thomas**

PhD Student, North West University, Socio-Economic Impacts of Tourism, South Africa

[12999318@nwu.ac.za](mailto:12999318@nwu.ac.za)

### ABSTRACT

Various role players have an influence on tourism development and tourism products such as mega events. South Africa hosted the 2010 Soccer World Cup which influenced various communities and the country as a whole. However the perceptions exist that host community residents received more benefits from this event than non-host community residents. This study therefore investigated host community and non-host community resident perceptions of the impacts of the 2010 Soccer World Cup. The survey was conducted in June 2010 where Port Elizabeth was selected as host city and Bredasdorp as non-host city. Fieldworkers collected 306 questionnaires in Bredasdorp and 300 questionnaires in Port Elizabeth by means of on-site surveys. Using a Principal Axis Factoring method for extraction and Oblimin rotation with Kaiser normalisation, 5 factors were identified for Bredasdorp, and a similar 5 were identified for Port Elizabeth. The factors were labelled as: Factor 1 is Community Services, Factor 2 is Community Problems, Factor 3 is not labelled, Factor 4 is Community Economy and Factor 5 is Community Life. Cross-tabulations were done to compare the two destinations according to demographic and behavioural characteristics and a t-test for Equality of Means were calculated to determine significant differences for both cities on the extracted factors. The host city residents were in general more positive and involved in the World Cup and bought on average 2.53 tickets whereas residents of the non-host city bought 0.18 tickets to matches. The results indicated that even though both cities experienced the tourism impacts of the soccer event as positive, host-city residents experienced the World Cup highly positive and participated to a greater extent.

### KEYWORDS

Host City, Non-Host City, Residents, Community, Factor Analysis.

### 1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

Mega events such as the 2010 Soccer World Cup held in South Africa impacts upon the whole country. South Africa was the first African nation to host the world's most-watched sporting event and it was a great success. Minister Van Schalkwyk indicated that The World Cup was never about the hosting of the tournament, but rather about building a legacy in terms of infrastructure, economic growth, skills development, job creation, nation building and brand awareness. The event therefore led to various benefits and costs created by the event that are based on economic, social and environmental impacts. These impacts were especially experienced by the community. Various researchers indicated that residents support for mega events depends on the perceived benefits and

costs from the event (Deccio & Baloglu, 2002). Mega events lead to economic impacts such as tax revenues, employment, and sources of income (Ritchie, Shipway & Cleeve, 2009). These mega events also generate a large amount of attention, increase economic activity and enhance international awareness (Deccio & Baloglu, 2002). Negative impacts include aspects such as reduction of quality of life, an increase in crime, noise and rowdiness and disorderly behaviour to name but a few (Fredline, 2005; Kim, Gursoy & Lee, 2006). Resident perception studies are therefore an integral part of the mega event cost-benefit analysis. It is, however, not only the host communities that will be affected by the mega event; peripheral communities might also experience spill-over effects of the event. Long-term benefits might be created long after the event has taken place (Ritchie & Aitken, 1985).

Very limited research exists that has studied non-host community perceptions of mega events as most of the research to date focused on the perceptions of host community residents. The aim of this paper is to compare host community and non-host community resident perceptions of the impacts of the 2010 Soccer World Cup held in South Africa. The results have certain marketing and management implications for organisers of these types of events and for host and non-host cities of mega events.

## 2. METHODOLOGY

To achieve the objectives of the study, quantitative research was conducted by means of a survey in June 2010 in Port Elizabeth as host city and Bredasdorp as non-host city. Three hundred and six questionnaires were distributed in Bredasdorp (non-host city) and three hundred in Port Elizabeth (host city). On-site surveys were performed in both areas to measure residents' perceptions of tourism impacts related to the FIFA World Cup. One respondent per household was requested to complete the survey. A pool of 34 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. Questions related to demographic information, attendance to the games and motivations to visit the games were also included. The data concerning the surveys were analysed, using the Statistical Programme for Social Sciences (SPSS 17.0). The 34 items were subjected to factor analysis, and the cross-tabulations and t-tests were performed to determine differences between host and non-host communities regarding demographic and behavioural variables as well as the extracted factors.

## 3. DISCUSSION

### 3.1. DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

**Table 1: Demographic information of residents**

VARIABLE	CATEGORIES	BREDASDORP (N=306)	PORT ELIZABETH (N=300)
<b>Gender</b>	Male	37%	45%
	Female	63%	55%
<b>Age</b>	<20 years of age	2%	7%
	21-30 years of age	32%	57%
	31-40 years of age	20%	17%
	41-50 years of age	19%	14%
	51-60 years of age	18%	2%
	>60 years of age	9%	3%
<b>Occupation</b>	Professional	8%	10%
	Manager	13%	6%

	Self-employed	19%	6%
	Technical	5%	6%
	Sales positions	21%	8%
	Administrative	10%	7%
	Unemployed	2%	19%
	Other	22%	38%
<b>Educational level</b>	No School	2%	4%
	Matric	48%	43%
	Diploma/Degree	30%	31%
	Post Graduate	6%	9%
	Professional	5%	6%
	Other	9%	7%
<b>Effect on personal quality of life</b>	Very negative	4%	1%
	Negative effect	3%	6%
	No effect	38%	36%
	Positive effect	39%	35%
	Very positive effect	16%	22%
<b>Effect on the community in general</b>	Very negative	3%	1%
	Negative effect	3%	3%
	No effect	21%	29%
	Positive effect	52%	42%
	Very positive effect	22%	26%

The demographic profiles of the residents of the two cities are very similar. However, residents from Port Elizabeth were younger. Unemployment was very high in the Port Elizabeth sample compared to the Bredasdorp sample. In a question related to the effect of the World Cup on residents' personal quality of life, 38% of the residents from Bredasdorp indicated that the event had no effect; 39% indicated a positive effect and 16% a very positive effect on their personal quality of life, whereas 36% of the residents from Port Elizabeth indicated no effect, 35% indicated a positive effect and 22% a very positive effect. In response to the question related to the effect of the World Cup on community life in general, 52% of the residents from Bredasdorp indicated a positive effect and 42% of the residents from Port Elizabeth. It was thus clear that residents perceived more positive effects for the community in general than for their personal lives.

### 3.2. FACTOR ANALYSES

A list of 33 perceptions was provided to respondents and they were requested to indicate the importance of each impact related to perceptions of the economic, social and environmental impacts. Factor analyses for the impacts of the events were done on each of the two data sets to identify smaller sets of explanatory composite factors that define the fundamental constructs assumed to underlie the original variables. Only those factors with an eigenvalue equal to or greater than 1.0 were considered. Using a Principal Axis Factoring method for extraction and Oblimin rotation with Kaiser normalisation, 5 factors were identified for Bredasdorp explaining 62% of the variance. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy was 0.941, which is highly acceptable. The Bartlett test was also found to be significant ( $p < .00001$ ). Factors were labelled as follows: Factor 1 is Community Services, Factor 2 is Community Problems, Factor 3 is not labelled as only one item loaded on Factor 3, Factor 4 is Community Economy and Factor 5 is Community Life.

**Table 2: Factor analysis: Bredasdorp (Non-host city)**

Factor label	Factor 1: Community services	Factor 2: Community problems	Factor 3: Not labelled	Factor 4: Community economy	Factor 5: Commu nity life
public transport has improved	.850				
the maintenance of public facilities has improved	.793				
public money is well spent	.761				
interactions between locals and tourists have increased	.718				
entertainment opportunities have increased	.689				
trading in the area has increased	.689				
infrastructure in the area has improved	.688				
the appearance of the area has improved	.657				
the economy of the area has improved	.636				
the economy has improved in general	.624				
opportunities for shopping have increased	.623				
parking availability in the area has increased	.623				
the rights and civil liberties of local residents have increased	.592				
the pride that residents have in area has improved	.557				
tourism in and around this area has increased	.501				
public funding for community activities has increased	.466				
there is opportunities for people to have fun with family and friends	.349				
rowdy and disruptive behaviour has increased		.805			
damage to the environment has increased		.657			
excessive drinking and/or drug use has increased		.504			
litter in the area has increased		.379			
noise levels in the area have increased		.261	.425		
traffic congestion in the area has increased				.673	
employment opportunities in the area have increased	.328			.528	
the image of the city/town has improved				.509	
opportunities for local business have increased	.373			.500	
the turnover for local businesses has increased	.412			.434	
prices of some goods and services have increased				.407	
the living standards of locals have improved					.519
friends come and visit me				.289	.478
there are too many people in the community					.437
crime levels have increased					.424
the overall cost of living has increased		.360			.277

Again using a Principal Axis Factoring method for extraction and Oblimin rotation with Kaiser normalisation, 5 factors were identified of Port Elizabeth and 57% of the variance was explained. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy was 0.921, which is highly acceptable. The Bartlett test was also found to be significant ( $p < .00001$ ). Factors were labelled as follows: Factor one is Community Services, Factor 2 is Community Problems, Factor 3 is not labelled as only one item loaded on Factor 3, Factor 4 is Community Economy and Factor 5 is Community Life.

**Table 3: Factor analysis: Port Elizabeth (Host-city)**

Factor label	Factor 1: Community services	Factor 2: Community problems	Factor 3: Not labelled	Factor 4: Community economy	Factor 5: Commu nity life
public transport has improved	.849				
the maintenance of public facilities has improved	.805				
public money is well spent	.741				
interactions between locals and tourists have increased	.713				
trading in the area has increased	.706				
infrastructure in the area has improved	.704				
entertainment opportunities have increased	.698				
the appearance of the area has improved	.664				
the economy of the area has improved	.649				
the economy has improved in general	.648				
opportunities for shopping have increased	.637				
parking availability in the area has increased	.634				
the rights and civil liberties of local residents have increased	.607				
the pride that residents have in area has improved	.572				
tourism in and around this area has increased	.505				
public funding for community activities has increased	.499				
there is opportunities for people to have fun with family and friends	.358				
rowdy and disruptive behaviour has increased		.791			
damage to the environment has increased		.706			
excessive drinking and/or drug use has increased		.408			
litter in the area has increased		.405			
noise levels in the area have increased		.256	.408		
traffic congestion in the area has increased				.727	
the image of the city/town has improved				.504	
employment opportunities in the area have increased				.468	
opportunities for local business have increased				.464	
the turnover for local businesses has increased	.448			.394	
prices of some goods and services have increased				.367	
crime levels have increased					.538
friends come and visit me					.496
the living standards of locals have improved					.467
the overall cost of living has increased					.356
there are too many people in the community					.310

The factor analyses for both cities revealed similar factor patterns. In both cases Factor 3 was not labelled as only one item loaded on Factor 3 but this item also loaded on Factor 2 which was considered to be more appropriate in both cases. The shaded blocks indicate loadings on two factors – the most appropriate grouping was selected for those items that loaded on two factors. As the factor analyses for the two data sets were very similar the Cronbach Alpha Coefficients were calculated for the combined dataset (see Table 4). The Cronbach's coefficients were examined to check the reliability of the data and all these values were above 0.60.

**Table 4: Reliability and mean values of factors**

	Factor 1: Community services	Factor 2: Community problems	Factor 4: Community economy	Factor 5: Community life
Cronbach's alpha	.95	.80	.74	.61

### **3.3. COMPARISONS OF THE TWO DESTINATIONS ACCORDING TO THE DEMOGRAPHIC AND BEHAVIOURAL PROFILE OF RESIDENTS**

A Chi-square test for independence indicated no significant associations between gender ( $p=.090$ ), the level of interest in the event ( $p=.054$ ), marketing efforts of the event ( $p=.065$ ), information distribution of the event ( $p=.100$ ), the way the event was organised ( $p=.256$ ), radio advertisements ( $p=.066$ ), newspaper advertisements ( $p=.096$ ) and the two destinations.

However the Chi-square test for independence indicates a significant association between the influence of the event on residents personal quality of life ( $p=.019$ ) where residents from Port Elizabeth experienced a more positive impact on their personal quality of life. A significant association were also found between the perceived benefits from the event for residents ( $p<0.001$ ) and the two destinations where residents from Port Elizabeth strongly thought that residents will benefit from the event. Regarding attendance of the event and the two destinations it was found that residents from Port Elizabeth were more prone to attend the event ( $p<0.001$ ) than residents from Bredasdorp. Significant associations were also found between the two destinations regarding marketing mediums: posters ( $p<0.001$ ), sms ( $p<0.001$ ), e-mail ( $p=0.000!$ ) and websites ( $p=0.000!$ ). Residents from Port Elizabeth utilised these mediums more than residents from Bredasdorp to access information regarding the World Cup.

From the discussions above it is clear that residents from Port Elizabeth as a host city were more involved in the World Cup than residents from Bredasdorp as non-host city. It therefore influences residents' opinions to be part of a host city.

### **3.4. COMPARISONS OF THE TWO DESTINATIONS ACCORDING TO THE EXTRACTED FACTORS**

An independent-samples t-test was conducted to compare the extracted factors for the two destinations. Significant differences were found on all the positive factors ( $p<0.001$ ). Residents of Port Elizabeth agreed more that Community Services (Bredasdorp:  $M=2.4$ ; Port Elizabeth:  $M=2.91$ ), Community Economy (Bredasdorp:  $M=2.45$ ; Port Elizabeth:  $M=3.10$ ) and Community Life (Bredasdorp:  $M=2.31$ ; Port Elizabeth:  $M=2.41$ ) has increased due to the World Cup. A significant difference were also found on the negative factor where residents of Port Elizabeth agreed more that Community Problems (Bredasdorp:  $M=2.35$ ; Port Elizabeth:  $M=2.60$ ) have increased due to the World Cup. A significant difference were found between the number of tickets bought ( $p<0.001$ ) and the two destinations. Residents in Bredasdorp bought on average 0.18 tickets and residents from Port Elizabeth 2.53 tickets for stadium matches. Again it was found that host city residents were in general more positive towards the World Cup and supported the event to greater extent. With the positive impacts the also experienced the negative impacts to a greater extent.

#### 4. CONTRIBUTIONS

This study adds to the body of knowledge regarding the perceptions of event impacts, seen from a community perspective. It also highlights the importance of not only focusing on the needs of the host city residents but also on the non-host city residents and their role in making the event a success. Research regarding host cities and non-host cities are limited, and non-existing in South Africa, even though the country is moving towards the international event arena. The research indicated similarities and differences regarding host city and non-host city resident perceptions. It is clear that the spill-over effects of mega events can benefit peripheral communities and it seems that even though non-host communities are not directly part of the event they are also positive towards South Africa's hosting of mega events.

#### 5. CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this research was to determine the differences between host city and non-host city residents regarding their perceptions of the impacts of the 2010 Soccer World Cup. It was found that both communities identified the following impacts: Community Services, Community Problems, Community Economy and Community Life. Residents from the host city experienced more positive as well as negative impacts than the non-host city but were also more involved in the event. It is clear that being a host-city for such a mega event creates awareness and an atmosphere of participation. More direct benefits were also experienced by the host-city residents.

#### REFERENCES

- DECCIO, C., & BALOGLU, S., (2002), "Nonhost community resident reactions to the 2002 Winter Olympics: the spillover impacts", *Journal of Travel Research*, 41 (1), 46-56.
- FREDLINE, E. (2005), "Host and guest relations and sport tourism", *Sport, Culture and Society*, 8 (2), 263-279.
- KIM, H. J., GURSOY, D., & LEE, S., (2006), "The impact of the 2002 World Cup on South Korea: comparisons of pre- and post-games", *Tourism Management*, 27, 86-96.
- RITCHIE, B. W., SHIPWAY, R., & CLEEVE, B., (2009), "Resident Perceptions of Mega-Sporting Events: A Non-host City Perspective of the 2012 London Olympic Games", *Journal of Sport and Tourism*, 14 (2-3), 143-167.
- RITCHIE, J. R. B., & AITKEN, C. E., (1985) "Olympus II-Evolving resident attitudes toward the 1988 Olympic Winter Games", *Journal of Travel Research*, 23, 28-33.