

Towards an Instrument Measuring Community Perceptions of the Impacts of Festivals

Pierre-Andre Viviers¹ and Elmarie Slabbert^{2*}

Tourism Research in Economic Environs and Society, School of Business Management, North-West University, Private Bag X6001, Potchefstroom, South Africa, 2520
E-mail: ¹< pierre-andre.viviers@nwu.ac.za >, ²< Elmarie.Slabbert@nwu.ac.za >

KEYWORDS Tourism. Social Impact. Residents. Environmental Impact. Economic Impact. Sustainability and Events

ABSTRACT The sustainability of an event depends on the support of the local community. Currently, community instruments do not measure perceptions of the impacts of events in an integrated manner. This paper is the first step in developing such an instrument for events in South Africa. Seventy-five community impact items were identified through a literature study and were reduced to 44 items by using the Delphi technique. The results (44 items) were included in a questionnaire distributed at two festivals in South Africa, the Klein Karoo (N=330) and Grahamstown National Arts Festivals (N=401). A principal components factor analysis was performed, descriptive factors were identified and Cronbach Alfa coefficients calculated. Nine factors were identified of which two were found to be not reliable in this case. This instrument is unique because it is a first step in developing an integrated community perception measuring instrument for events in South Africa.

INTRODUCTION

The South African events industry is in need of an integrated measuring instrument to measure the success and sustainability of arts festivals within the local community (Slabbert 2004). Tourism events have grown to be an activity of worldwide importance and have become a major social and economic force in the world (SAT 2007; Saayman 2001; Deery et al. 2012).

This success story is made possible through the inputs of various role players such as event organisers, governments and communities (Ryan 1998; Ma et al. 2011). The community is one of the key role players as members of the community are actively involved in the planning and management of events. Cook et al. (1999) state that residents within the local communities have to share facilities and services with tourists during festivals (Fourie and Spronk 2011). In this way, the communities become 'hosts' to the tourists. For the smooth functioning of the tourism system, and to ensure mutually beneficial encounters between residents and tourists, hosts must be 'willing partners' (Long et al. 1990; Ma et al. 2011). Experience has taught that the economic benefits delivered by tourism do not always translate into socio-economic benefits and environmental sustainability (Loon and Polakow 2001; Chen 2011).

In evolving the understanding of sustainability, the emphasis is on the inseparability of environmental, social and economic dimensions during the planning and development stages of events (Hall and Richards 2006). To date, the vast majority of research efforts within tourism have been directed at evaluating only the economic impact by means of adequate measuring instruments (Motale 2008). Hence, economic impact evaluation within tourism has reached a point where there is substantial agreement on the most appropriate techniques to be used. However, research, as well as the appropriate instrument to measure the integrated perceptions of residents regarding the economic, social and environmental impacts of tourism and, more specifically festivals, is lacking (Slabbert 2004; Deery et al. 2012).

Early in the development stages of event evaluation research it was recognised that more than just economic impacts needed to be considered. As early as 1974, Ritchie and Beliveau (1974) stated that events do not only impact the economy, but they also affect the attitudes and lifestyles of people and the physical environment within the host communities. Different forms of tourism (for example festivals and events) put a destination on display, including its community, and these events have a very real 'impact' on them, be it positive or negative.

The problem is not that researchers do not recognise the importance of the communities'

* Address for correspondence:

perceptions of the social, environmental and economic impacts of events. It is just that the measurement of perceptions of these impacts is still vague and problematic. Ritchie (1984) proposed a conceptual framework for the evaluation of tourism events more than two decades ago. However, Sherwood et al. (2004) point out that he concluded the study by saying that “this was only a beginning and there was a need for a more comprehensive approach to evaluate impacts of tourism events’ especially on the local community.”

In 1986, Bruns and Mules conducted a study at the Adelaide Grand Prix and subsequently suggested that it would ‘be useful to have a standard format by which the impacts of events can be evaluated and compared with each other’ (Burns and Mules 1986). Other researchers supported this notion and identified the need for a more integrated measuring instrument. Burns and Mules (1986) proposed that social costs such as traffic congestion and property damage needed to be included in this format. Dwyer et al. (2000) suggest that an evaluating framework needs to be designed in which the evaluation moves away from only using dollar figures but encapsulates ‘intangible’ and ‘tangible’ impacts. More recently, Getz (2001) claimed that ‘there is still a need for more standardised instrument for evaluating tourism events and their impacts’.

Measuring instruments were developed by Delamere (2001) and Fredline et al. (2003) which focused mostly on the social impact of events, and although both instruments can be seen as highly subjective assessments, it is argued that social impacts are, by nature, subjective and may have a differential effect on different community members, which cannot be measured objectively (Fredline et al. 2003). Therefore researchers have been developing and testing various methods to measure community perceptions regarding the impacts of events. To date there are no generic and standardised measuring instruments available to measure the community’s perception of economic, social and environmental impacts of events in an integrated manner.

Researchers are currently using unstandardised measuring instruments, which hampers comparative studies. What exacerbates this problem is the fact that there is no consensus as to which elements must be included in such an integrated measuring instrument (Adendorff 2008; Motale 2008; Deery et al. 2012). Another prob-

lem is that although studies have been conducted concerning the impacts of events, most of these are primarily international studies. Few studies have been conducted in South Africa (especially in the events industry) and most of these have focused on one or two of the impacts and not all three impacts simultaneously. With the community playing such an important role in the sustainability of events and the lack of a proper measuring instrument it was important to conduct this study to develop a more integrated measuring instrument that would measure various impacts in a more integrated manner.

The development of an integrated measuring instrument will make a meaningful contribution to event planning as it can lead to the development of sustainable events. Also, data banks can be developed and analysed, and it will be possible to compare the perceptions of the communities at different festivals and to monitor change within the communities’ perceptions. This is important because when a community experiences the festival as negative, there will be a lack of support from their side, and this has been identified as a major reason for failure of events (Motale 2008; Yu et al. 2011).

This article reports on research that was aimed at developing an integrated community perception-measuring instrument to assist successful and sustainable development of South African arts festivals.

Understanding the Impacts of Tourism on the Community

A literature review of data sources was undertaken to analyse different research theories and studies concerning the social, economic and environmental impact of tourism. Emphasis was placed on the different positive and negative socio-cultural, environmental and economic impacts of tourism on the community, research of existing measuring instruments and various theories and models and other factors that influenced the perceptions of the local community.

Sustainable tourism focuses on an integrated approach (Saayman 2009; Ma et al. 2011) related to socio-cultural impacts, environmental impacts and economic impacts (Andereck et al. 2005; Kernel 2005). According to Choi and Sirakaya (2006), sustainable tourism should aim at improving community members’ quality of life

with economic benefits by protecting the natural environment and providing a high-quality experience for tourists. It should create a long-term economic link between communities and industries, minimise negative effects on tourism and improve the socio-cultural well-being of community members. If the principles of sustainability are incorporated in the development of events, tourists are more likely to have a satisfactory experience at the destination (Tosun 2001).

Firstly the *socio-cultural impact* of tourism refers to the changes in value systems, norms, beliefs, perceptions, morals and the conduct or behaviour and any impacts that might have an impact on the quality of life of local residents (this can be positive or negative). Some of these socio-cultural impacts include undesirable activities (Haley et al. 2005) such as gambling and crime, which result in changes in the local value system. Various studies (for example, Shaw and Williams 1994; Tosun 2002; Deery et al. 2012) have shown that the negative impacts of socio-cultural contact include exploitation of culture and traditional ways of life, prostitution, conflicts in the host communities, crime, drugs and the crowding of public facilities. However, according to Andereck et al. (2005), the socio-cultural impact can also be positive and include aspects such as improved community services and cultural facilities and the encouragement of cultural activities. As indicated, researchers differ in opinion about the important social impact elements and therefore, according to the literature captured in Table 1, various social elements can influence the sustainability of an event.

According to Table 1, thirty-four social elements were identified as having a possible influence on the sustainability of the events from the community's perspective. These elements can be divided into different categories such as community facilities, activities, moral values, and community opportunities.

Secondly, the *environmental impact* refers to all the impacts within the external surroundings in which an organism lives (Stout and Green 1986). Since only a few studies have been done on the environmental impact from a tourism perspective, this impact needs attention. Tourism can cause significant damage to the environment if not managed properly (Collins 2009). Brunt and Courtney (as cited by Andereck et al. 2005) state that negative environmental impacts

include the impact of tourism on traffic, litter, erosion, water pollution and noise pollution. According to Simpson (2008) some of the positive impacts, which include the improvement of the environment, motivate the management and stewardship of natural resources. The environmental impact elements that may influence the sustainability of an event have been based on an in-depth literature study. These elements are presented in Table 2.

According to Table 2, the environmental impact elements are fewer than the social impact elements. However, the event can have a severe impact on the environment. Twenty-two elements were identified. These environmental impact elements can be categorised into the following three categories: (1) pollution, (2) damage to biotic components and (3) damage to abiotic components.

Thirdly the *economic impact* can be determined by an evaluation on the basis of macro- and micro- economic measures, employment, balance of payments, price stability and increasing income. Economic impact also refers to the flow of money through the economy of the destination in terms of the quantity of money introduced and the directions in which it flows (Fredline et al. 2004; Saayman and Saayman 2012). Tourism is well documented for the positive impacts it has on the economy of any given destination (Saayman et al. 2012). According to Andereck et al. (2005) positive economic impacts include improved standard of living, job opportunities, improved quality of life and more profit for local businesses. However, Andereck et al. (2005) conclude that the increase in the cost of living, and increases in the prices of goods and services are just a few of the many negative economic impacts of tourism. The most prominent economic impact elements (from the literature study) that can influence the sustainability of an event are presented in Table 3.

Twenty economic impact elements were identified from the literature (Table 3). These economic impacts influence the community directly (personal) or indirectly (community as a whole). These elements can be categorised as personal costs, community costs, trade benefits and economic benefits.

Thus it is clear from the literature that certain social, environmental and economic elements can influence the success and sustainability of an event. It is therefore important to determine

Table 1: Social impact elements that can influence sustainability of events

<i>Social impact elements</i>	<i>Source</i>
Maintenance of public facilities	Gursoy et al. (2004); Wood (2006); Gursoy et al. (2007); Small et al. (2005); Delamere et al. (2001)
Range of activities available	Kreag (2006); Gursoy et al. (2004); Bull and Lovell (2007); Dyer et al. (2007); Slabbert (2000)
The number of people in the area	Tosun (2002); Small et al., (2005); Bignoux (2006); Motale (2008); Fidgen (1996); Ma et al. (2011)
Participation in community activities	Adendorff (2008); Fredline et al. (2004); Dimmock and Tiyce (2001)
Entertainment opportunities	Kreag (2006); Bull and Lovell (2007); Dyer et al. (2007); Van der Wagen (2005); Slabbert (2000)
Pride of residents	Getz (2007); Andereck et al. (2005); Wood (2006); Nunkoo and Gursoy 2012
Opportunities to meet new people	Adendorff (2008); Delamere et al. (2001); Jurowski and Gursoy (2004)
The number of tourists visiting	Delamere et al. (2001); Tosun (2002); Small et al. (2005); Bignoux (2006); Motale (2008); Saayman and Saayman (2012)
The number of people moving to the town	Jurowski and Gursoy (2004); Mason (2003)
Rights and civil liberties of local residents	Fredline et al. (2004); Saayman (2000); Kreag (2006)
Rowdy behaviour	Fredline et al. (2003); Small et al. (2005); Waitt, (2003)
Dinking and drug use	Kreag (2006); Gursoy et al. (2004); Waitt, (2003) Deery et al. (2012)
Crime	Fredline and Faulkner (2002); Adendorff (2008); Delamere et al. (2001); Visser (2005)
Noise levels	Mowforth and Munt (2003); Fredline et al. (2003); Delamere et al. (2001); Small et al. (2005)
Public transport	Kreag (2006); Gursoy et al. (2007)
Interactions between locals and tourists	Fredline and Faulkner (2002); Adendorff (2008)
Facilities available to local residents	Visser (2005); Gursoy et al. (2004); Wood (2006); Delamere et al. (2001)
Social and moral values	Fredline et al. (2004); Delamere et al. (2001)
The skills base for event management	Kreag (2006); Gursoy et al. (2007); Getz (2001)
Compatibility of culture with theme of the festival	Getz (2007)
Opportunity to attend a major event	Shone and Parry (2004); Small et al. (2005)
Opportunity to show other people how special the community is	Small et al. (2005); Getz (2007); Andereck et al. (2005); Wood (2006)
Disruption of the lives of local residents, which causes stress	Delamere et al. (2001); Tosun (2002); Small et al. (2005); Bignoux (2006); Motale (2008)
Too many people come into the community	Delamere et al. (2001); Tosun (2002); Bignoux (2006); Motale (2008); Fridgen (1996)
Parking availability	Kreag (2006); Gursoy et al. (2007); Getz (2001)
Opportunities to have fun with family and friends	Fredline and Faulkner (2002); Adendorff (2008); Delamere et al. (2001)
Friends visit residents	Fredline et al. (2003); Delamere et al. (2001); Waitt, (2003)
Involvement of residents in planning and management	Fredline and Faulkner (2002); Adendorff (2008); Delamere et al. (2001)
Opportunities to develop local talent	Adendorff (2008); Delamere et al. (2001)
Prostitution	Howie (2003); Kreag (2006); Saayman (2007)
Tourism influences the local culture	Fredline et al. (2004); Delamere et al. (2001); Saayman (2000)
The festival scares the local community away	Fredline et al. (2003); Delamere et al. (2001); Waitt, (2003)
The local community feels left out	Jurowski and Gursoy (2004); Motale (2008); Getz (2001)
Educational value	Kreag (2006); Gursoy et al. (2007); Getz (2007)

Source: Authors own compilation

the perceptions of the local community in terms of these impacts. The question remains: Which of the above elements must be included in such an integrated measuring instrument? It is not wise to include all the possible impact statements

(mentioned above) into the measuring instrument because one of the leading causes of non-response in research is the length of the survey instrument (Delamere 2001). Therefore the next step is to pare down the list.

Table 2: Environmental impact elements that can influence the sustainability of events

<i>Environmental impact elements</i>	<i>Source</i>
Damage to the environment	Andereck et al. (2005); Simpson (2008); Collins, Jones and Munday (2009)
Appearance of the area	Andereck et al. (2005); Simpson (2008)
Traffic congestion	Kreag (2006); Gursoy et al. (2007); Getz (2000)
Water pollution	Shone, (2001); Saayman (2009)
Noise pollution	Mowforth and Munt, 2003; Fredline et al. (2003); Delamere et al. (2001); Waitt, (2003); Nunkoo and Gursoy (2012)
Air pollution	Shone (2001); Saayman (2009); Holden (2003)
The smell in the area	Myburgh and Saayman (2002)
Plant life	Shone (2001); Yu et al. (2011)
Animal life	Myburgh and Saayman (2002); Yu et al. (2011)
Erosion levels	Clayton (2002); Zhong et al. (2011)
Soil compression	Myburgh and Saayman (2002); Conroy (2001);
Energy consumption	Getz (2001); Slabbert (2000)
Disruption of tranquillity	Page and Dowling (2002); Shackley (1996)
Littering	Haley et al. (2005); Fredline et al. (2004)
Carrying capacity	Conroy (2001); Getz (2001); Slabbert (2000); Zhong et al. (2011)
Water consumption	Shone (2001); Saayman (2009); Collins et al. (2009)
Soil pollution	Sutherland (2000); Goodwin (2001)
Waste handling	Myburgh and Saayman (2002); Chen (2011)
Event spoils natural beauty of area	Simpson (2008); Font and Tribe (2001); Deery et al. (2012)
Negative impact on the natural resources	Getz (2007); Slabbert (2000); Hiller (2010); Chen (2011)
Space availability	Getz (2007); Fredline et al. (2004); Deery et al. (2012)
Sewage problems	Simpson (2008); Saayman (2009)

Source: Authors own compilation

Table 3: Economic impact elements that can influence sustainability

<i>Economic impact elements</i>	<i>Source</i>
Employment opportunities	Visser (2005), Saayman (2007), Goldblatt (1997); Mossberg (2000); Chhabra et al. (2003); Logar (2010)
Property values	Goeldner and Ritchie (2003); Kreag (2006); Slabbert (2000)
Opportunities for local business	Goeldner and Ritchie (2003); Kreag (2006); Saayman (2007)
Public funding for community activities	Allen et al. (2005); McHone and Rungeling (2000)
Prices of goods and services	McHone and Rungeling (2000); Tyrrell and Johnston (2001); Goeldner and Ritchie (2003); Adendorff (2008)
The overall cost of living	Fredline et al. (2004); McHone and Rungeling (2000); Tyrrell and Johnston (2001); Adendorff (2008); Saayman et al. (2012)
Money spent by tourists stimulates the economy	Goeldner and Ritchie (2003); Kreag (2006); Saayman (2007); Slabbert (2000) ; Saayman and Saayman (2012)
Media coverage promotes development	Ohmann et al. (2006)
Spending of public money	Saayman (2007); Goeldner and Ritchie (2003); Goldblatt (1997); Mossberg (2000)
Social inequity	Visser (2005), Saayman (2007), Goldblatt (1997); Mossberg (2000); Chhabra et al. (2003)
Turnover for local businesses	McHone and Rungeling (2000); Tyrrell and Johnston (2001); Goeldner and Ritchie (2003); Saayman and Saayman (2012)
Values	Livtin (2000); Weaver and Lawton (2001)
Rent rates in the surrounding areas	Fredline et al. (2004); McHone and Rungeling (2000); Tyrrell and Johnston (2001); Adendorff (2008)
Living standards	Visser (2005); Saayman (2007); Goeldner and Ritchie (2003); Goldblatt (1997); Mossberg (2000)
Opportunities for shopping	McHone and Rungeling (2000); Goeldner and Ritchie (2003)
Construction costs	Fredline et al. (2004); Goeldner and Ritchie (2003); Adendorff (2008)
Range of goods and services	McHone and Rungeling (2000); Tyrrell and Johnston (2001)
Number of people that benefit	Saayman (2007), Goeldner and Ritchie (2003); Goldblatt (1997); Mossberg (2000)
Infrastructure and facilities	Visser (2005); Gursoy et al. (2004); Wood (2006); Gursoy et al. (2007); Small et al. (2005)
Trade	McHone and Rungeling (2000); Goeldner and Ritchie (2003); Adendorff (2008); Slabbert (2000); Saayman (2007)

Source: Authors own compilation

METHODOLOGY

The first empirical research method that was used was the Delphi technique, a method that has been used to gather and analyse the data. Therefore this research design was exploratory in nature. The Delphi technique can be described as qualitative but with quantitative elements. It is a systematic method of collecting opinions from a group of experts through a series of questionnaires, in which feedback on the group's opinions distribution is provided between question rounds while preserving the anonymity of the respondents (Topper 2006). The Delphi process has been comprehensively reviewed, amongst others by Adler and Ziglio (1996) and Linstone and Turloff (1975). The basic method and application to this research project are described next.

Step 1: Develop the Research Question: A review of the literature was conducted to determine whether a theoretical gap exists. The lack of an integrated measuring instrument was identified and, based on the principles of sustainability, literature was reviewed and analysed. Seventy-five elements (economic, environmental and social) were identified and included in a questionnaire.

Step 2: Design the Research: Selecting research participants is a critical component of Delphi research, since it is their expert opinions upon which the output of the Delphi is based (Bolger and Wright 1994; Parente et al. 1994). For this purpose, 15 tourism lecturers from different universities in South Africa (all experts on social and/or environmental and/or economic impacts of events) were selected. These lecturers can be regarded as experts in either the economic and/or social and/or environmental field of tourism management as they teach one or more of these modules and participate in research projects in this regard. During the initial contact, the nominated lecturers were contacted via e-mail, informed about the research process and invited to participate in the process. They were assured of anonymity in the sense that none of their statements will be attributed to them by name.

Step 3: Develop Delphi the Round One Questionnaire: Respondents were asked to rate the importance of each of the 75 elements in measuring the sustainability of the event based on

its economic, environmental and social impacts. The question was formulated by using a 5-point Likert scale with the options varying from 'Not important at all' to 'Extremely important'. These statements referred to the positive and negative economic, social and environmental impacts of festivals.

Step 4: Release and Analyse Round One Questionnaire: The questionnaires were distributed via e-mail to the 15 Delphi participants, who completed them and returned them to the researcher. The results of round one were then analysed according to the Delphi elimination system (Linstone and Turloff 1975). This was done to test and adjust the Delphi questionnaire to improve comprehension, and to correct any procedural problems. The participants were allowed to add elements to the questionnaire (even though they did not). All the participants rated the importance of the elements on the Likert scale and returned it to the researcher. The results of step four were analysed according to the research paradigm and 17 elements were eliminated from the list by means of eliminating the elements/items with a median of lower than 3.5. Most of the items that were eliminated were *environmental factors* such as water consumption (2.47), soil pollution (2.53), erosion levels (2.79), soil compression (3.29), plant life (3.33), space limitation (3.36), affecting animal life (3.36), energy consumption (3.40) and air pollution (3.47).

The *economic elements* that the panel of experts felt could be eliminated were public funds spent in the area (3.14), property values (3.27) and the element stating that public money spent on the festival would be better spent on other things (3.47). The five *social elements* that were eliminated were people moving permanently to the destination (2.40), scaring the community away from the area (3.07), interaction between locals and tourists (3.20), number of people in the area (3.29) and the theme of the festival fitting in with the local culture (3.33). All 17 elements (mentioned above) were removed from the list and a new questionnaire containing the remaining 58 elements was sent for evaluation again (round two).

Step 5: Develop the Round Two Questionnaire: The purpose of this round was to pare down the list from round one (Schmidt 1997). The questionnaire for round two contained 58 elements and the format of the questionnaire stayed the same.

Step 6: Release and Analyse the Round Two Questionnaire: The same procedure was followed as for round one and all 15 respondents completed the questionnaires and returned them for analysis. They were also asked to give their opinions on the second round questionnaire and they had the opportunity to change or expand the questionnaire. After analysis, 14 elements were eliminated from the questionnaire by making use of the median values. All elements with a median below 3 were eliminated. This time mostly *social impacts* were eliminated: the opportunity to attend a major event (1.80), opportunities for friends to visit (2.10), disrupts lives of locals (2.20), too many people in area (2.20), number of tourists in area (2.20), show how special the community is (2.20), rights and civil liberties of locals (2.80). The following *economic elements* were eliminated: increase in rent rates (1.90), cost of living (1.90), social inequity (2.10), construction costs (2.80) and values promoted (2.90). Only two *environmental elements* were eliminated in this round: affecting natural beauty (2.00) and littering (2.20).

Step 7: Develop the Round Three Questionnaire: In the final phase, a list of the remaining 44 elements was e-mailed to the participants. The research participants were again given the opportunity to change their answers and to comment on the emerging and collective perspective of the research participants. During this phase consensus was reached and participants agreed that the included 44 elements would measure the impacts (social, environmental and economic) that can influence the sustainability of festivals/events. These results were then adapted into a questionnaire to be completed by community members.

The Questionnaire

After completion of the pre-testing and elimination phase done by means of the Delphi technique, 44 impact statements survived and were paired as expectancy-value statements in the questionnaire. Each item was expressed in a way the respondents could relate to the perception they held as to whether or not the specific (social, environmental or economic) impact within their communities increased, decreased or remained the same.

Distribution of the Questionnaires

The questionnaire was first distributed at the Klein Karoo National Arts Festival from 3-11 April 2009, amongst the residents of Oudtshoorn. A stratified random sampling procedure was followed where stratification was based on the different residential areas of Oudtshoorn (Westbank, South, North and Central Oudtshoorn). For this sampling method, participating households were chosen at regular intervals after a random start (Tustin et al. 2005). After the starting point had been randomly selected, residents were systematically selected and every third household was included in each sample. If the selected respondent did not want to participate in the survey, the house on either the right or the left of the respondent's house was selected to participate. The same method was followed in Grahamstown, where questionnaires were distributed from 3-11 July 2009 in the various residential areas (Grahamstown East, West and Central).

The data collection was done by fieldworkers who were trained by the researcher to complete the questionnaire correctly. In most cases, the fieldworkers waited for the participant to complete the questionnaire.

Study Regions

The Klein Karoo National Arts Festival (KKNK) takes place annually during April in the town of Oudtshoorn in the Eden District Municipality, Western Cape Province, in South Africa. Originally, the main aims of the festival were, firstly, to encourage cultural and linguistic freedom of expression of the Afrikaans-speaking community during the post-apartheid era and, secondly, to give the local residents of Oudtshoorn a financial boost by using the festival as a main attraction (Slabbert et al. 2007). Each year the festival attracts approximately 1000 artists, who take part in more than 200 productions and exhibitions over a period of eight days (Slabbert et al. 2008). Approximately 38,122 people attended the festival in 2009 (Slabbert et al. 2009).

The Grahamstown National Arts Festival, the oldest arts festivals in South Africa, has been hosted annually for the past 35 years in Grahamstown during June/July. Grahamstown is situated in the Eastern Cape Province in South Africa. It is well known for the number of shows and the

entertainment offered during the festival. The shows range from theatre to dance, fine art, poetry reading, classical or jazz music and carnivals and more than 600 productions are presented. The predominant language is English. The Grahamstown National Arts Festival was attended by 36 671 visitors in 2009 (Kruger et al. 2009).

As these festivals are held in the residential and business areas of the different towns, the communities become inherently part of the events. These communities are therefore exposed to the impacts of these festivals and are able to assess the impacts based on their experiences and perceptions.

Sampling Framework

Krejcie and Morgan (1970) indicated for general research activities a sample size of (S) 384 for a population (N) of 1000 000. However, these authors also indicate that, as a rule of thumb, the law of diminishing returns will apply when the sample size increases above 300. The Greater Oudtshoorn Municipal District has a total population of 84 692 (Statistics South Africa 2001). A complete questionnaire is representative of the household and each household has an average of four people, therefore, $84\ 692/4 = (N) 21\ 173$ households (Department of Water and Forestry 2005) in Oudtshoorn. The Oudtshoorn (phase C) sample consisted of 330 questionnaires.

Grahamstown is a fairly small town. At the time of the most recent census it had a population of approximately 60 000 people (Statistics South Africa 2001). The same formula was applied where one questionnaire is representative of the household and each household has an average of four people, therefore $60\ 000/4 = (N) 15\ 000$ households in Grahamstown (Statistics South Africa 2001). The sample for Grahamstown consisted of 401 questionnaires.

Reliability of the Scale

After the results were obtained from the KKNK survey, a factor analysis was applied to the data to determine the reliability of the data. Based on the results, small changes were made to the questionnaire, which was then distributed at the Grahamstown National Arts Festival. The purpose of this phase was to determine the reliability of the data. After completion of the

second survey, the two data sets were merged and a final factor analysis was performed to synthesise the large amount of data. This was done on the impact statements to determine smaller and more descriptive social, economic and environmental factors.

The 44 survey items were subjected to an exploratory factor analysis to test the reliability of the scale items. A principal components factor analysis was performed with a varimax rotation, as there were very few and small correlations between the factors. After the descriptive factors were identified, Cronbach Alfa coefficients were calculated for each factor. This was done since previous research indicated that one construct, for example social impact, may possess other distinct dimensions such as benefits and costs (Delamere 2001). The factor analysis was therefore carried out to identify the underlying dimensions of the impacts of the festival on the community.

Items to be retained for further analysis achieved a corrected item-to-total correlation of .05 or higher. The Kaiser-Meyer measure of sampling adequacy was used to gauge whether or not the data were appropriate for factor analysis and the KMO value was found to be 0.777. Loadings of .30 and higher were used for item inclusion. Ten items were eliminated from the list due to low Alpha coefficients and therefore 34 items survived the item analysis. The Eigen Values for these factors ranged from 1.47 to 2.63. Cronbach's coefficient Alpha was examined for each factor to check the reliability of the data and to serve as a measure of internal consistency among the items. All the Cronbach Alpha values were above 0.5 for the factor analysis, thereby indicating validity.

RESULTS

The factor analysis revealed the following results:

The factor analysis resulted in nine factors as can be seen in Tables 4 - 11, of which two factors were found to be not valid. The other seven factors were labelled according to similar characteristics. For the factor analysis, factors were labelled as community facilities and activities (Factor 1), positive economic impacts (Factor 2), negative environmental impacts (Factor 3), community pride and opportunities (Factor

Table 4: Factor Analysis – Factor 1

<i>Factor 1 – Community facilities and activities</i>			
<i>Impact item</i>	<i>Factor loading</i>		
The maintenance of public facilities in the area	0.666		
Employment opportunities in the town	0.654		
Participation in the community activities	0.590		
The range of things to do in the town	0.570		
Entertainment opportunities	0.549		
The facilities available to local residents during the festival	0.549		
The appearance of the area	0.316		
Alpha coefficient	0.72	MSA	
0.80			
Eigen Value	2.63	Explained variance	37.60%
N	730		

Source: Authors own compilation

Table 5: Factor analysis – Factor 2

<i>Factor 2 – Positive economic impacts</i>			
<i>Impact item</i>	<i>Factor loading</i>		
The turnover of local businesses	0.639		
The image of the town	0.616		
The economy of the town	0.568		
Tourism in and around the town	0.529		
Trading in the area	0.402		
The variety of goods and services	0.374		
Alpha coefficient	0.72	MSA	
0.78			
Eigen Value	2.63	Explained variance	37.60%
N	730		

Source: Authors own compilation

Table 6: Factor analysis – Factor 3

<i>Factor 3 – Negative environmental impacts</i>			
<i>Impact item</i>	<i>Factor loading</i>		
Sewage problems in the area	0.771		
Water pollution in the area	0.746		
The negative impacts on natural resources	0.740		
Waste in the area	0.592		
Alpha coefficient	0.72	MSA	
0.74			
Eigen Value	2.20	Explained variance	54.93%
N	730		

Source: Authors own compilation

Table 7: Factor analysis – Factor 4

<i>Factor 4 – Community pride and opportunities</i>			
<i>Impact item</i>	<i>Factor loading</i>		
The opportunities to meet new people	0.640		
Opportunities for local businesses	0.618		
The pride that the residents have in their town	0.589		
Opportunities to develop talent in the community	0.407		
The number of people that benefit from the festival	0.322		
Alpha coefficient	0.60	MSA	
0.73			
Eigen Value	2.04	Explained variance	40.83%
N	730		

Source: Authors own compilation

Table 8: Factor analysis – Factor 5

<i>Factor 5 – Negative social impacts</i>			
<i>Impact item</i>		<i>Factor loading</i>	
Crime levels			0.631
Prostitution			0.606
Prices of goods and services			0.532
Noise levels			0.518
Traffic			0.432
Alpha coefficient	0.60	MSA	0.68
Eigen Value	1.93	Explained variance	38.65%
N	730		

Source: Authors own compilation

Table 9: Factor analysis – Factor 6

<i>Factor 6 – Positive Social impacts</i>			
<i>Impact item</i>		<i>Factor loading</i>	
The education level of the community			0.647
Infrastructure of the town			0.616
Living standards of residents			0.327
Alpha coefficient	0.50	MSA	0.59
Eigen Value	1.47	Explained variance	50%
N	730		

Source: Authors own compilation

Table 10: Factor analysis – Factor 7

<i>Factor 7 – Negative behaviour</i>			
<i>Impact item</i>		<i>Factor loading</i>	
Damage to the environment			0.736
Bad behaviour			0.675
Excessive drinking and/or drug use			0.421
Tranquillity in the area			0.372
Alpha coefficient	0.57	MSA	0.67
Eigen Value	1.77	Explained variance	44.32%
N	730		

Source: Authors own compilation

Table 11: Factor analysis – Factors 8 and 9

<i>Factor 8 - General negative impacts on local community</i>			
<i>Impact item</i>		<i>Factor loading</i>	
Parking availability			0.684
The carrying capacity of the area			0.537
Alpha coefficient			0.29
<i>Factor 9 – Positive impacts on the community</i>			
Opportunities for shopping			0.619
Quality time spent with friends and family			0.580
Public transport			0.576
Alpha coefficient			0.41

Source: Authors own compilation

4), negative social impacts (Factor 5), positive social impacts (Factor 6) and negative behaviour (Factor 7).

From Table 4, is it clear that Factor 1 mostly consists of social impact items that indicate possible changes in the social environment of local

communities. During these festivals there are more things to do in the town and locals get an opportunity to participate, entertain themselves and communicate with one another or with visitors. As a result of the festival, the facilities and their maintenance improve, which leads to the improvement of the appearance of the whole area. It is important that community members are positive towards Factor 1 as it directly impacts on them as community and individuals. The mean value for factor 1 was 1.6, indicating that the community felt community facilities and activities had either increased or remained unchanged due to the festival.

Factor 2 is dominated by economic impacts. In the literature, this is considered to be the most important impact of festivals and, if community members are negative towards this impact, it will influence the sustainability of the event. During the festival, there is an influx of visitors which leads to increased spending and improves the economic impact. The latter leads to improved trade of different goods and services (Table 5). The mean value for Factor 2 was 1.47 indicating that the positive economic impacts had increased due to the festival.

Factor 3 mainly contains environmental items. People tend to assess environmental impacts differently in the sense that they do not view them as being very important unless they affect them directly or the degradation is visible (Table 6). The mean value for Factor 3 was 2.29, which indicates that the community felt the festival did not lead to any changes in the environmental impacts.

Table 7 indicates that festivals bring a variety of new opportunities to the town, both on a social and economic level. This enables the community to develop as individuals and as a community. It also leads to the added benefits of pride amongst residents. If community members are proud of their town, they will be more willing to welcome visitors, which will lead to a more sustainable festival. The mean value for Factor 4 was 1.46 indicating that community pride and opportunities in the community had increased.

Social impacts are difficult to measure. However, these affect the community and change their attitudes towards the festival. Festivals can cause negative aspects in the host community, including crime, prostitution, price increases, higher noise levels and traffic congestion, which may cause community members to become negative towards the festival (Table 8). The mean

value for Factor 5 was 2.50, indicating that the negative social impacts had decreased due to the festival or remained unchanged.

Positive impacts resulting from these festivals are, for example, improvement of infrastructure and education levels as well as living standards. Perceptions concerning the improvement of social impacts can improve the quality of life of residents (Table 9). The mean value for Factor 6 was 1.74 indicating that residents felt the positive social impacts of the festivals had remained unchanged.

Factor 7 is a combination of statements between negative environmental and social impacts. Excessive drinking and drug use at festivals can lead to bad behaviour and damage to the environment and will also disrupt the tranquillity in the area. This type of behaviour has long-term consequences and the community considers negative behaviour as unacceptable. If residents experience a drastic increase in these impacts, they will not support the festival because the outcome of this type of behaviour is experienced at home (Table 10). The mean value for factor 7 was 2.29 indicating that negative behaviour had decreased due to the festival. It is clear from Table 11 that two factors (Factors 8 and 9) were eliminated due to low Alpha coefficients.

The following items were also eliminated due to only one item loading per factor:

- ♦ The smell in the area
- ♦ Social and moral values
- ♦ Tourist influence on culture
- ♦ The skill base for event management
- ♦ Residents' say and involvement in the planning and management of the festival

Ten items were therefore eliminated from the questionnaire for future use.

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this research was to develop an integrated community perception-measuring instrument to ensure successful and sustainable development (social, environmental and economic) of events within South Africa. Based on the results the following findings were made:

- ♦ The community is an important role player in events as these people are actively involved in planning and managing events and also act as hosts to tourists. Their opinion regarding the impact of events is there-

fore important and needs to be researched because it can influence the sustainability of an event or festival.

- ♦ The lack of an integrated measuring instrument creates difficulties in conducting quality research and does not allow comparisons between destinations. The development of an integrated measuring instrument will make a tremendous contribution to sustainable event planning as it can lead to the development of more successful and sustainable events. It will also be possible to compare the perceptions of the communities at different festivals with each other.
- ♦ Economic impact elements are still seen as a very important indicator of sustainability as most of the economic items survived the elimination. Economic items were also considered as important by Ritchie (1984), Faulkner (1993), Getz (2001), Delamere (2001), Fredline et al. (2003), Logar (2010) and Deery et al. (2012), Saayman and Saayman (2012), as they all included economic elements in their measuring instruments. The most important economic impact element was 'Employment of locals' with a mean value of 4.80.
- ♦ Only 11 environmental impact elements survived the elimination rounds. Environmental impact was thus seen as the least important factor of the three during the measurement of sustainability. This might be because it is very difficult to form accurate perceptions regarding this factor and the community has no control over these impacts. Environmental elements such as water consumption, soil compression, pollution, and erosion levels are very difficult for local residents to measure. The most important environmental impact element that derived from this study was 'traffic congestion' with a mean value of 4.80.
- ♦ The highest number of impact elements was selected from the social impact list. This correlates well with previous studies. Most of the elements included in previous measuring instruments (with the main focus on community perceptions) were social/cultural elements (Ritchie 1984; Faulkner 1993; Getz 2001; Delamere 2001; Fredline et al. 2003; Yu et al. 2011; Deery et al. 2012).
- ♦ The factor analysis revealed nine factors of which seven were valid. These seven factors were labelled as community facilities and activities (Factor 1), positive economic impacts (Factor 2), negative environmental impacts (Factor 3), community pride and opportunities (Factor 4), negative social impacts (Factor 5), positive social impacts (Factor 6) and negative behaviour (Factor 7). All the Cronbach Alpha values of these seven factors were above 0.5, thereby indicating validity. The two factors 'general negative impacts on local community' and 'positive impacts on the community' were eliminated due to the low Cronbach Alpha values.
- ♦ The seven factors that resulted from the factor analysis compare well with other research. Previous research by Delamere (2001) also resulted in factors divided by benefits and costs or, in this case, negative and positive impacts.
- ♦ The factors resulted in a prominent split between social, environmental and economic statements and this makes this measuring instrument unique. This measuring instrument measures one impact at a time. Most of the other measuring instruments to date measure a combination of these elements within one factor (Delamere 2001; Faulkner 1993; Fredline and Faulkner 2002). This measuring instrument allows either the measurement of community perceptions as a whole or the separate measurement of the three impacts. Clearer guidelines can therefore be developed to improve the sustainability of events where problems are experienced.
- ♦ It is important to monitor negative impacts because if festivals are negatively experienced by the host community this may influence the sustainability of the festival. In the case of these two festivals, most of the negative impact statements were positively assessed. This is very positive because it shows that the local community supports the festivals and it is also an indication of good festival management. It is important to keep measuring these opinions to prevent possible issues in the future.
- ♦ The final questionnaire consists of 34 items (14 economic, 19 social and 11 environmental). Therefore a very good balance exists between the measurements of the three impacts (economic, environmental and social)

Table 12: The final measuring instrument

<i>NR</i>	<i>Because of the festival ...</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>
1	the maintenance of public facilities in the area has ...	Increased	No change	Decreased
2	employment opportunities in the town have ...	Increased	No change	Decreased
3	the range of things to do in the town has ...	Increased	No change	Decreased
4	the facilities available to local residents during the festival have ...	Increased	No change	Decreased
5	participation in community activities has ...	Increased	No change	Decreased
6	entertainment opportunities have ...	Increased	No change	Decreased
7	the pride that residents have in their town has ...	Increased	No change	Decreased
8	the opportunities to meet new people have ...	Increased	No change	Decreased
9	opportunities for local business have ...	Increased	No change	Decreased
10	opportunities to develop talent in the community have ...	Increased	No change	Decreased
11	the variety of goods and services has ...	Increased	No change	Decreased
12	the appearance of the area has ...	Improved	No change	Worsened
13	the educational levels of the community have ...	Improved	No change	Worsened
14	infrastructure in the town has ...	Improved	No change	Worsened
15	trading in the area has ...	Improved	No change	Worsened
16	the living standards of locals have ...	Improved	No change	Worsened
17	tranquillity in the area has ...	Improved	No change	Worsened
18	tourism in and around the town has ...	Improved	No change	Worsened
19	the town's image has ...	Improved	No change	Worsened
20	the economy of the town has ...	Improved	No change	Worsened
21	the turnover for local businesses has ...	Increased	No change	Decreased
22	the number of people that benefit from the festival has ...	Increased	No change	Decreased
23	rowdy and disruptive behaviour has ...	Decreased	No change	Increased
24	damage to the environment has ...	Decreased	No change	Increased
25	excessive drinking and/or drug use has ...	Decreased	No change	Increased
26	crime levels have ...	Decreased	No change	Increased
27	prices of some goods and services have ...	Decreased	No change	Increased
28	noise levels in the area have ...	Decreased	No change	Increased
29	traffic congestion in the area has ...	Decreased	No change	Increased
30	prostitution in the area ...	Decreased	No change	Increased
31	the waste in the area has ...	Decreased	No change	Increased
32	sewage problems in the area have ...	Decreased	No change	Increased
33	the negative impact on natural resources has ...	Decreased	No change	Increased
34	water pollution in the area has ...	Decreased	No change	Increased

Source: Authors own compilation

that influence sustainability. The fact that there are more social items than environmental or economic items also correlate well with previous research, since most of the items in the perception-measuring instruments to date are social in nature (Faulkner 1993; Delamere 2001; Fredline and Faulkner 2002; Deery et al. 2012).

CONCLUSION

The purpose of this research was to develop an integrated community perception-measuring instrument to ensure sustainable and successful development of events in South Africa. The measuring instrument was developed from a literature study and the use of the Delphi technique. The measuring instrument was tested at

two different arts festivals and 34 items were found to be valid in the measurement of sustainability of these events. This measuring instrument can thus be used at festivals in South Africa to determine its impact on the community because it assesses the appropriate items.

RECOMMENDATIONS

With the items being reliable the next step is to standardise the questionnaire. It is therefore recommended that this measuring instrument be tested at various other events and tourism products to measure the perceptions of the local community to enhance the sustainability of these products. This will allow for comparative research. This research made a meaningful contribution to the development of a validated ques-

tionnaire to be used when measuring the impacts of events. This instrument (Table 12) is unique because it is currently the only integrated community perception-measuring instrument in South Africa that measures the sustainability of festivals from a community perspective. The measuring instrument will however always take into account the unique context of each research environment where it is applied by including some open impact statement questions together with the basic measuring instrument.

REFERENCES

- Adendorff E 2008. *The Social Impact of the Klein Karoo National Arts Festival in Oudtshoorn*. Magister Dissertation, Unpublished. Potchefstroom: North West University.
- Adler M, Ziglio E 1996. *Gazing into the Oracle: The Delphi Method and its Application to Social Policy and Public Health*. Jessica Kingsley Publishers: London.
- Allen J, O'Toole W, Harris R, McDonnell I 2005. *Festivals and Special Event Management*. Wiley: Australia.
- Andereck KL, Valentine KM, Knopf RC, Vogt CA 2005. Residents' perceptions of community tourism impacts. *Annals Tour Resear*, 32(4): 1056-1076.
- Bignoux S 2006. Short-term strategic alliances: A social exchange perspective. *Manage Deci*, 44(5): 615-627.
- Bolger F, Wright G 1994. Assessing the quality of expert judgment: Issues and analysis. *Deci Sup Sys*, 11(1): 1-24.
- 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. *J Sport Tour*, 12(3-4): 229-248.
- Burns J, Mules T 1986. A framework for the analysis major special events. In: J Burns, HJ Mules (Eds.): *The Adelaide Grand Prix: The Impact of Special Events*. Adelaide: The Centre for South Australian Studies, pp. 5-38.
- Chen SC 2011. Residents' perception of the impact of major annual tourism events in Macao: Cluster analysis. *J Con and Event Tour*, 12(2): 106-128.
- Chhabra D, Sills E, Cabbage FW 2003. The significance of festivals to rural economies: Estimating the economic impacts of Scottish Highland Games in North Carolina. *J Trav Resear*, 41(4): 421-427.
- Choi HSC, Sirakaya E 2006. Sustainable indicators for managing community tourism. *Int J Tour Manage*, 27(6): 1274-1289.
- Clayton A 2002. Strategies for sustainable tourism development. *Soc Econ Stu*, 51(1): 61-98.
- Collins A, Jones C, Munday M 2009. Assessing the environment impacts of mega sporting events: two options? *Tour Manage*, 30: 828-837.
- Conroy A 2001. The philosophy of game ranching in South Africa. In: H Ebedes, B Reilly, W van Hoven, B Penzhorn (Eds.): *Sustainable Utilization-Conservation in Practice*. Paper presented at the 5th International Wildlife Ranching Symposium, Pretoria, South Africa, pp. 2-23.
- Cook RA, Yale LJ, Marqua JJ 1999. *Tourism the Business of Travel*. Prentice Hall: Upper Saddle River, N.J.
- Deery M, Jago L, Fredline L 2012. Rethinking social impacts of tourism research: A new research agenda. *Tour Manage*, 33: 64-73.
- Delamere TA 2001. Development of a scale to measure resident attitudes towards the social impacts of community festivals, part 2: Verification of the scale. *Event Manage*, 7(1): 25-38.
- Delamere TA, Wankel LM, Hinch TP 2001. Development of a scale to measure resident attitudes towards the social impact of community festivals, part 1: Item generation and purification of the measure. *Event Manage*, 7(1): 11-24.
- Department of Water and Forestry. From <<http://search.msn.co.za/results.aspx?q=oudtshoorn+number+of+householdsZ+FORM=CBPW&first+1>> (Retrieved August 29, 2008).
- Dimmock K, Tiyce M 2001. Festivals and events: Celebrating special interest tourism. In: N Douglas, N Douglas, R Derret (Eds.): *Special Interest Tourism*. Wiley: Brisbane, pp. 335-383.
- Dwyer L, Mellor R, Mistilis N, Mules T 2000. A framework for evaluating and forecasting the economic impacts of special events. In: J Allen, R Harris, L Jago, A Veals (Eds.): *Paper presented to Events Beyond 2000: Setting the Agenda*, Sydney. Sydney: UTS Printing Services.
- Dyer P, Gursoy D, Sharma B, Carter J 2007. Structural modelling of resident perceptions of tourism and associated development on the Sunshine Coast, Australia. *Tour Manage*, 28(2): 409-422.
- Faulkner B 1993. *Evaluating the Tourism Impacts of Hallmark Events*. Canberra: Bureau of Tourism Research.
- Font X, Tribe J 2001. Promoting green tourism: The future of environmental awards. *Int J Tourism Res*, 3: 9-21.
- Fourie J, Spronk K 2011. South Africa mega-sport events and their impact on tourism. *J Sport and Tour*, 16(1): 75-97.
- Fredline E, Deery M, Jago L 2003. Testing of a compressed generic instrument to assess host community perceptions of events: A case study of the Australian Open Tennis Tournament. *Event Management Research Conference*. Australian Centre for Event Management. Sydney: Griffith Business School.
- Fredline E, Faulkner B 2002. Variations in residents' reactions to major motor sport events. *Event Manage*, 7(2): 115-125.
- Fredline E, Jago L, Deery M 2003. The development of a generic scale to measure the social impact of events. *Event Manage*, 8(1): 23-37.
- Fredline E, Raybould M, Jago L, Deery M 2004. Triple Bottom Line Evaluation: Progress Towards a Technique to Assist in Planning and Managing an Event in a Sustainable Manner. *Tourism: State of the Art II International Scientific Conference, University of Strathclyde*, Glasgow, 23-27 June 2004.
- Fridgen JD 1996. *Dimensions of Tourism*. 2nd Edition. USA: Educational institute of the American Hotel and Motel Association.

- Getz D 2001. Developing a Research Agenda for the Event Management Field. *Events Beyond 2000: Setting the Agenda*, Sydney.
- Getz D 2007. Event tourism: Definition, evolution, and research. *Tour Manage*, 29(3): 403-428.
- Goeldner CR, Ritchie JRB 2003. *Tourism Principles, Practices and Philosophies*. 9th Edition. Hoboken, N.J.: Wiley.
- Goldblatt JJ 1997. *Special Events: Best Practices in Modern Event Management*. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.
- Goodwin H 2001. Contribution of Ecotourism to Sustainable Development in Africa. Presented at WTO Seminar on Planning, Development and Management of Ecotourism in Africa. Maputo, Mozambique, 5-6 March 2001.
- Gursoy D, Kim K, Uysal M 2004. Perceived impacts of festivals and special events by organisers: An extension and validation. *Tour Manage*, 25(2): 171-181.
- Gursoy D, Sharma B, Carter J 2007. Structural modelling of resident perceptions of tourism and associated development on the sunshine coast, Australia. *Tour Manage*, 28(2): 409-422.
- Haley AJ, Snaith T, Miller G 2005. The social impacts of tourism a case study of Bath, UK. *Annals Tour Resear*, 32(3): 647-668.
- Hall D, Richards G 2006. *Tourism and Sustainable Community Development*. Abington: Taylor and Francis Publishers.
- Hiller HH 2010. Assessing the impact of mega-events: A linkage model. *Cur Iss Tour*, 1(1): 47-57.
- Holden A 2003. In need of new environmental ethics for tourism? *Annals Tou Resear*, 30(1): 94-108.
- Howie F 2003. *Managing the Tourist Destination*. London: Continuum.
- Jurovski C, Gursoy D 2004. Distance effects on residents' attitudes toward tourism. *Annals Tour Resear*, 31(2): 293-312.
- Kernel P 2005. Creating and implementing a model for sustainable development in tourism enterprises. *J Cleaner Prod*, 13: 151-161.
- Kreag G 2006. The Impacts of Tourism. University of Minnesota. From <<http://www.seagrant.umn.edu>> (Retrieved January 10, 2008).
- Krejcie RV, Morgan DW 1970. Determining sample size for research activities. *Edu Psych Meas*, 30: 607-610.
- Kruger M, Saayman M, Saayman A, Viviers P, Oberholzer S 2009. Profile and socio-economic impact of visitors to Grahamstown National Arts Festival. Retrieved from North-West University Potchefstroom: Institute for Tourism and Leisure Studies.
- Linstone H, Turliff M 1975. *The Delphi Method: Techniques and Applications*. London: Addison-Wesley.
- Livtin SW 2000. Revisiting tourism and understanding. *Annals Tour Resear*, 27(2): 526-529.
- Logar I 2010. Sustainable tourism management in Crikvenica, Croatia: An assessment of instruments. *Tour Manage*, 31: 125-135.
- Long PT, Perdue RR, Allen L 1990. Rural resident tourism perceptions and attitudes by community level of tourism. *J Trav Resear*, 28(3): 3-9.
- Loon RM, Polakow D 2001. Ecotourism ventures: Rags or riches. *Annals Tour Resear*, 28(4): 892-907.
- Ma S, Egan D, Rotherham I, Ma S 2011. A framework for monitoring during the planning stage for a sport mega-event. *J Sus Tour*, 19(1): 79-96.
- Mason P 2003. *Tourism Impacts, Planning and Development*. London: Elsevier Butterworth-Heinemann.
- McHone WW, Rungeling B 2000. Practical issues in measuring the impact of a cultural tourist event in a major tourist destination. *J Trav Resear*, 38(3): 299-302.
- Mossberg LL 2000. Event evaluations. In: LL Mossberg (Eds.): *Evaluation of Events: Scandinavian Experiences*. New York: Cognizant Communication Corporation, pp. 1-13.
- Motale MDB 2008. *The Social Impact of Arts Festivals: A Case Study of the ABSA Klein Karoo National Arts Festival*. Magister Dissertation, Unpublished. Potchefstroom: North West University.
- Mowforth M, Munt I 2003. *Tourism Sustainability: Development and New Tourism in the Third World*. 2nd Edition. London: Routledge.
- Myburgh E, Saayman M 2002. *Ecotourism in Action: Practical Guidelines and Principles*. 2nd Edition. Potchefstroom: Leisure Consultants and Publications.
- Nunkoo R, Gursoy D 2012. Residents' support for tourism, an identity perspective. *Annals Tou. Resear*, 39(1): 243-268.
- Ohmann S, Jones I, Wilkes K 2006. The perceived social impacts of the 2006 Football World Cup on Munich residents. *J Sport and Tour*, 11(2): 129-152.
- Page SJ, Dowling RK 2002. *Ecotourism*. Harlow: Prentice Hall.
- Parente FJ, Anderson JK, Myers P, O'Brien T 1994. An examination of factors contributing to Delphi accuracy. *J Forecas*, 3(1): 173-183.
- Ritchie B 1984. Assessing the impact of hallmark events: Conceptual and research issues. *J Trav Resear*, 23(1): 2-11.
- Ritchie B, Beliveau D 1974. Hallmark events: An evaluation of strategic response to seasonality in the travel market. *J Trav Resear*, 14(1): 14-20.
- Ryan C 1998. Economic impacts of small events: Estimates and determinants - a New Zealand example. *Tour Econ*, 4(4): 339-352.
- Saayman M 2000. *En route with Tourism*. Potchefstroom: Leisure Consultants and Publications.
- Saayman M 2001. *Tourism Marketing in South Africa*. 2nd Edition. Potchefstroom: Leisure C Publications.
- Saayman M 2007. *En route with Tourism*. 3rd Edition. Potchefstroom: Leisure Consultants and Publications.
- Saayman M 2009. *Ecotourism: Getting Back to Basics*. Potchefstroom: Leisure consultants and Publications.
- Saayman M, Rossouw R, Krugell W 2012. The impact of tourism on poverty in South Africa. *Develop South Africa*, 29(3): 462-487.
- Saayman M, Saayman A 2012. Determinants of spending: An evaluation of three major sporting events. *Int J Res*, 14: 124-138.

- Schmidt R 1997. Managing Delphi surveys using non-parametric statistical techniques. *Decis Scien*, 28(3): 763-774.
- Shackley M 1996. *Wildlife Tourism*. London: Biddles.
- Shaw G, Williams AM 1994. *Critical Issues in Tourism: A Geographical Perspective*. Malden, Mass: Blackwell.
- Sherwood P, Jago L, Deery M 2004. Triple bottom line evaluation of special events: Does the rhetoric reflect reporting? In: P Tremblay, A Boyle (Eds.): *Paper Presented to Annual Council of Australian Tourism and Hospitality Educators' Conference*, Alice Springs, 8-10 February 2004.
- Shone A 2001. *Successful Event Management*. London: Continuum.
- Shone A, Parry B 2004. *Successful Event Management – A Practical Handbook*. 2nd Edition. London: Thomson Learning.
- Simpson MC 2008. Community benefit tourism initiatives: A conceptual oxymoron? *Tour Manage*, 29(1): 1-18.
- Slabbert E 2000. Socio-cultural impact of tourism. In: M Saayman (Ed.): *En route with Tourism*. 2nd Edition. Potchefstroom: Leisure Consultants and Publications.
- Slabbert E 2004. *An Integrated Tourism Model for Cultural Events*. Ph. D Thesis, Unpublished. Potchefstroom: North-West University.
- Slabbert E, Kruger M, Viviers P, Saayman M, Saayman A 2009. *The Socio-economic Impact of Visitors to the Klein Karoo National Arts Festival*. Potchefstroom: Institute for Tourism and Leisure Studies.
- Slabbert E, Saayman M, Saayman A, Viviers P 2007. *The Social Impact of Visitors to the ABSA KKNK*. Potchefstroom: Institute for Tourism and Leisure Studies.
- Slabbert E, Saayman M, Saayman A, Dreyer A 2008. *The Socio-economic Impact of Visitors to the Klein Karoo National Arts Festival*. Potchefstroom: Institute for Tourism and Leisure Studies.
- Small K, Edwards D, Sheridan L 2005. A flexible framework for evaluating the socio-cultural impacts of a (small) festival. *Int J Event Manage*, 1(1): 66-77.
- South African Tourism 2007. Annual Tourism Report. From <<http://www.southafrica.net/satourism/research>> (Retrieved October 16, 2008)
- Statistics South Africa 2001. Census. From <<http://www.statssa.gov.za/timeseriesdata/pxweb2006/Di-alog/Saveshow.asp>> (Retrieved August 2, 2009)
- Stout GW, Green NPO 1986. *Work Out Biology*. London: McMillian Education Ltd.
- Sutherland WJ 2000. *The Conservation Handbook: Research Management and Policy*. Cambridge: Blackwell Science.
- Topper WW 2006. Leadership change in privately controlled businesses: A Delphi study of succession planning best practices. *Digi Abst Int*, 67: 1-21.
- Tosun C 2001. Challenges of sustainable tourism development in the developing world: The case of Turkey. *Int J Tour Manage*, 22(3): 289-303.
- Tosun C 2002. Host perceptions of impacts: A comparative tourism study. *Annals Tour Resear*, 29(1): 231-253.
- Tustin DH, Ligthelm AA, Martins JH, Van Wyk HJ 2005. *Marketing Research in Practice*. Pretoria: University of South Africa.
- Tyrrell TJ, Johnston RJ 2001. A framework for assessing direct economic impacts of tourist events: Distinguishing origins, destinations and causes of expenditure. *J Trav Resear*, 40(1): 94-100.
- Van Der Wagen L 2005. *Event Management for Tourism, Cultural, Business and Sporting Events*. 2nd Edition. Malaysia: Pearson.
- Visser G 2005. Let's be festive: Exploratory notes on festival tourism in South Africa. *Urb Forum*, 16(2-3): 155-172.
- Waitt G 2003. Social impacts of the Sydney Olympics. *Tour Manage*, 30(1):194-215.
- Weaver DB, Lawton LJ 2001. Residents perceptions in the urban-rural fringe. *Annals Tour Resear*, 28(2): 439-458.
- Wood EH 2006. Measuring the social impacts of local authority events: A pilot study for a civic pride scale. *Int J Non-profit Volunt Sec Market*, 11: 165-179.
- Yu C, Chancellor HC, Cole ST 2011. Measuring residents' attitudes towards sustainable tourism: A re-examination of the sustainable tourism attitude scale. *Jour Travel Res*, 50(1): 57-63.
- Zhong L, Deng J, Song Z, Ding O 2011. Research on environmental impacts of tourism in China: Progress and prospect. *J Environ Manage*, 92: 2972-2983.