

The impacts of a major South African arts festival: The voices of the community

ELMARIE SLABBERT AND PIERRE-ANDRE VIVIERS

North-West University, TREES Programme: Tourism Management, Private Bag X6001, Potchefstroom 2520, South Africa; E-mail: elmarie.slabbert@nwu.ac.za

Received: 24 January 2013, Revision Accepted: 07 June 2013

Abstract

One of the fastest growing segments of tourism globally is that of events and festivals. In the South African arena alone, there are more than 300 annual festivals of which arts festivals especially have grown significantly. These arts festivals aim to provide unique experiences to both tourists and residents. The communities act as the hosts, and to sustain their members' support for their festivals it is important to determine their perceptions of the impacts of these festivals and aspects influencing these perceptions. Ultimately, negative attitudes towards the event and the visitors may create difficulties and endanger the sustainability of any particular festival. The aim of this research is therefore to determine the impacts of an arts festival on the community and identify differences in perceptions based on socio-demographic characteristics. The quantitative research was conducted by means of a survey during the annual Aardklop National Arts Festival (Potchefstroom). A factor analysis was performed to determine the underlying impacts of the festival on the residents, while t-tests and ANOVAs were used to determine differences between various demographic variables and the impact statements. The factor analysis revealed five factors that were labelled: Positive economic impacts; Negative community impacts; Positive community impacts; Community opportunities and Tourism impacts. This study identified very few significant differences between gender, qualification and occupation regarding the impacts which are important in the planning and marketing of the festival. Thus the festival impacts positively on the community but attention can be given to the negative impacts of the festival.

Keywords: Events, arts festivals, resident, perception, tourism impacts.

How to cite this article:

Slabbert, E. & Viviers, P. (2013). The impacts of an arts festival: The voices of the community. *African Journal for Physical, Health Education, Recreation and Dance*, 19(3), 623-638.

Introduction

Festivals play a significant role in communities' lives (Getz, 1993; Huang, Li & Cai, 2010). Staging these special events can be beneficial for the host community, resulting in positive impacts that often include the stimulation of the local economy and promotion of the region. This may influence future tourism activity and lead to long-term benefits for the community (Fredline, Raybould, Jago & Deery, 2004). The success of festivals is thus also dependent on the enthusiasm of the residents (Getz, 1993; Getz, 2010). Triple bottom line reporting has become more important recently as this considers economic, social

and environmental aspects of events which exercise a direct influence on community life. Some of these aspects may be intangible (for example tranquility, destination image, talent development, pride etcetera) yet understanding them is important for festival management (Sims & D'Mello, 2005).

Planned events are spatial-temporal phenomenon created for a specific purpose. Each is unique and one has to be there to enjoy the experience (Getz, 2008). These events and festivals provide an opportunity for community cultural development (Adendorff, 2008; Getz, 2007; Kim, Prideaux & Chon, 2010) as well as direction for communities. The host community has an important stake in events held in its town or city; while often overlooked, the local community is one of the most important role players in determining the success of an event (Andereck & Nyaupane, 2011; Andereck, Valentine, Knopf & Vogt, 2005; Hampton, 2005; Delamere, 2001; Fredline & Faulkner, 2002; Green, 2005).

The event organiser needs to be informed and gain a thorough understanding of the broad trends and forces acting on the wider community, as these will determine the operating environment of the events (Allen, O'Toole, Harris & McDonnell, 2008) and the experience undergone by the tourist. Host communities are often not active involved in the festival management process and therefore do not leverage the authority they might have. These influences are not always noticeable, as they are difficult to measure, depend on value judgments and are often indirect or not identifiable (examples can be the overuse of resources like water and electricity, damage of the environment and pollution and disruption of everyday life). Because of these reasons, it is important to determine the impacts of an arts festival on the community as well as identify differences in perceptions based on socio-demographic characteristics and festival behaviour. These results are very likely to assist in future festival planning and management.

The impacts of events

From a sustainable perspective events affect local communities mostly on three levels: socio-cultural, environmental and economic. Firstly the *socio-cultural impact* of tourism refers to the changes in value systems, norms, beliefs, perceptions, morals and conduct or behaviour, and any impacts that potentially influence the quality of life of local residents (these could be positive or negative). According to Andereck *et al.* (2005), Arcadia and Witford (2007), Yu, Chancellor and Cole (2011) the socio-cultural impact might be positive and include aspects such as improved community services and cultural facilities as well as the encouragement of cultural activities. According to Crandall (1994) the demonstration effect occurs when the local residents adopt the attitudes, consumption patterns and language of the tourists. Slabbert (2000) stated that the

demonstration effect of the socio-cultural impact may be positive, especially if the youth are motivated to improve their quality of life in the rural areas.

However some of the negative socio-cultural impacts include undesirable activities (Haley, Snaith & Miller, 2005) such as gambling and crime, which result in changes in the local value system. Delamere, Wankel and Hinch (2001) asserted that the foreign values, traditions and lifestyles of the tourists influence the local residents' lives and behaviour. This may create social dualism, leading to disruption in local societies. On a negative note the demonstration effect might lead to the locals starting to live above their means as they strive to acquire what the tourists have. The culture of the local residents may also become a marketable commodity and may lose its symbolic meaning.

Studies undertaken by Shaw and Williams (1994), Brunt and Courtney (1999), Tosun (2002), Lindberg and Johnson (1997) and Deery, Jago and Fredline (2012) have shown that the negative impacts of socio-cultural contact include stereotyping of the host and tourist, too many visitors, commodification and exploitation of culture and traditional ways of life, prostitution, conflicts in the host communities, crime, drugs and the crowding of public facilities and resources. All of these are applicable to festivals.

Secondly, the *environmental impact* refers to all the impacts within the external surroundings of the people living in the area of a festival (Saayman, 2009; Stout & Green, 1986). From a tourism perspective only a small number of studies have been carried out on this impact from a community's point of view; this gap therefore needs attention (Laing & Frost, 2010; Collins, Jones & Munday, 2009; Lawton & Weaver, 2010). Tourism can cause significant damage to the environment if not managed properly. Sometimes developers and event organisers only take the tourists' needs into consideration but not those of the environment or the community. The environment might degrade and this could directly affect tourism (related to the event) as well as the host community (Andereck *et al.*, 2005). Aref, Redzuan and Gill (2009) pointed out that negative environmental impacts include the impact of tourism on traffic, litter, damage caused to the area, erosion, water pollution, noise pollution and pedestrian congestion. Simpson (2008) indicated that one of the positive impacts include the improvement of the environment since tourism motivates the management and stewardship of natural resources.

Thirdly, the *economic impact* can be determined by an evaluation carried out 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 a host community in terms of the quantity of money introduced and the directions in which it flows (Fredline *et al.*, 2004). Tourism is well documented for its positive impacts on the economy

of any given destination. According to Andereck *et al.* (2005), Pegg and Patterson (2010) and Kim, Park and Lee (2010) positive economic impacts include an improved standard of living, job opportunities, improved quality of life and more profit for local businesses. However, Haramlambopoulos and Pizam (1996) conclude that the increase in the cost of living, increases in the prices of goods and services and non-residents taking local jobs are just a few of the negative economic impacts of tourism and festivals.

It is clear from the discussion above that a lot of research studies have been conducted on the impacts of festivals on residents and that these can be classified as economic, socio-cultural and environmental. However Gursoy, Kim and Uysal (2004) indicated that comprehensive community studies, beyond economic impacts and motivations, were very few in numbers some years ago. Even more so, South African studies are lacking in the research arena and apart from economic impact studies not much has been done in this regard. The international perspectives might not be applicable to the developing South African festival environment and this factor needs to be explored. Doing so will also allow for international comparisons.

Understanding community attitudes towards events

The positive and negative impacts (including the aforesaid socio-cultural, economic and environmental ones) of festivals on the community can further be analysed by the social exchange theory. This was developed to shape understanding about the ways that a community will react to the development of a tourism product (such as a festival). Andereck *et al.* (2005) and Waitt (2003) describe this theory as a general sociological theory concerned with understanding the exchange of resources between society and the tourism industry, interacting with one another. Haley *et al.* (2005) state that the social exchange theory can be evaluated by residents in terms of perceived benefits (positive impacts) or costs (negative impacts) obtained in return for their services.

Many studies apply the social exchange theory to explore the underlying relationship between perceived impacts, benefit and support extended by residents (Lee, Kang, Long & Reisinger, 2010; Choi & Murray, 2010). If the host community perceives a positive exchange resulting from the event its members will develop positive attitudes towards the event. However if they feel that they or the community as a whole do not benefit or there is no exchange their attitudes could be negative towards the event. The social exchange might further be influenced by the socio-demographic characteristics of residents and their participation in the festival. It is, therefore, imperative to build community support for the event. In areas where this has not been done, feelings of hostility between the local community and the tourists/visitors are heightened, and lack of

community support has been identified as a major reason for failure of events (Getz, 2007). Event organisers need to understand the social exchange taking place in the community, based on the three kinds of impact, leading to positive or negative attitudes. If indicators show that the event is generating more costs than benefits, communities and organisers should seriously reconsider hosting the event.

In spite of understanding that the potential for conflict between the festival, tourists and the community exists and given the dependence of any festival on the goodwill of the community, no event study in South Africa has approached the identification of residents' attitudes based on the three integrated impacts. The determination of such attitudes is, however, of critical importance for both communities and festival organisers (Kreag, 2006; Delamere, 2001; Zou & Ap, 2009). The present study could assist community leaders and festival organisers in becoming more aware of the needs and priorities of the community, capacitating them to better respond to community concerns and collaborate to maintain an appropriate balance between the social, economic and environmental impacts that emanate from arts festivals (Yolal, Centinel & Uysal, 2009; Slabbert, 2004). This could add value to the quality of life of community members, thus leading to economic and social benefits, protection of the natural environment and a high-quality experience for tourists (Choi & Sirakaya, 2006). Ultimately this will assist in sustaining the long-term success of such festivals.

The purpose of this research was consequently to determine the impacts of Aardklop National Arts Festival as perceived by the residents of Potchefstroom in the Tlokwe Municipality, North-West Province, and explore the influence of certain socio-demographic characteristics and festival behaviour of residents on the perceived impacts.

Methodology

This quantitative research was conducted (by means of a survey) in September 2010 during the Aardklop National Arts Festival held in Potchefstroom. This festival has now been in existence for 15 years and is considered as one of the three largest arts festivals in South Africa the focus of which is placed on assisting with the continuation and development of arts and artists. The festival includes both visual and performing arts. More than 150 000 people visit this festival annually and it is thus important to determine the impact of the festival on the community of Potchefstroom (Aardklop, 2012). Stratified random sampling was used for the total sample frame of $N = 128\ 353$ (Statistics SA, 2001). Krejcie and Morgan (1970:608) recommended a sample size of (S) 384 for general research activities, for a population (N) of 1 000 000. Stratification was based on the residential areas close to the festival grounds, including Van der Hoffpark, Potchefstroom Central, The Bult area, The Goue Akker,

Mooivallei, Owersig and the Dam area. Krejcie and Morgan (1970) indicate that as the population increases the sample size increases at a diminishing rate and remains relatively constant at slightly more than 380 cases. Based on the above formula it was decided to distribute 500 questionnaires between the strata, amongst the inhabitants of houses there.

The first point of distribution was randomly selected in the strata, after which every third house was selected in the strata. If the selected respondent did not wish to participate in the survey, either the house on the right or left was selected to participate (Tustin, Ligthelm, Martins & Van Wyk, 2005). Fieldworkers from North-West University distributed the questionnaires. The data were captured in Microsoft Excel and analysed by using the Statistical Programme for Social Sciences (SPSS 19.0). The descriptive statistics (by means of tables) focused on the demographic profile of the community, where frequencies were used to analyse the data. Factor analysis was performed to determine the underlying impacts of the festival on the residents while t-tests and ANOVAs were used to determine differences between various demographic variables and the impact statements.

Results

The results are presented in three sections – demographic characteristics of residents participating in the survey, an analysis of the impacts of the festival and an analysis of the correlations between the impacts and the demographic variables.

Demographic characteristics and festival behavior

More females, participated in the study than males (53%). The festival attracts younger residents with 28% being between 26 and 35 years of age, while 26% are younger than 26 and 19% are between 36 and 45 years of age. These participants were mostly in educational occupations (20%), professional occupations (15%) and self-employed (11%). Most of the respondents (35%) have obtained either Matric (grade 12) or a diploma or degree (33%). Respondents' attendance recorded at the festival, shows that 67% attended the festival in 2010 and had also attended the festival 4 times previously. Respondents are therefore fairly young, educated and have participated previously in the festival, which enabled them to evaluate the impacts of the festival based on real experiences.

Exploring the impacts of the festival

The main focus of this research was to explore the fundamental patterns of the impacts indicated by means of a factor analysis. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin

measure of sampling adequacy was examined for the study and found to be .889, which is highly acceptable. The Bartlett test was also found to be significant ($p < .00001$). A principal axis factor analysis with Oblimin with Kaiser Normalization rotation was thus undertaken. The 33 items yielded 5 factors with eigenvalues greater than 1.0 (See Table 1). These factors explained 62% of the variance and were labelled: Factor 1: Positive economic impacts, Factor 2: Negative community impacts, Factor 3: Positive community impacts, Factor 4: Community opportunities and Factor 5: Tourism impacts. The variables were also subjected to a reliability test (a Cronbach's alpha reliability test) to check the internal consistency of items in each dimension; the results were higher than .77 implying high internal consistency. The mean values for the various factors were very similar with Factor 2 (Negative community impacts) being the most important factor, reporting a mean value of 3.5.

Table 1: Factor analysis of tourism impacts

Factor Domains And Items	Factor Loadings				
	Factor 1: Positive economic impacts	Factor 2: Negative community impacts	Factor 3: Positive community impacts	Factor 4: Community opportunities	Factor 5: Tourism impacts
Due to the Festival					
public transport improved	.811				
the appearance of the area improved	.783				
the maintenance of public facilities improved	.706				
the economy improved	.706				
public money was well spent	.699				
opportunities were offered to have fun with family	.593				
the economy of the surrounding area improved	.529				
the living standards of locals improved	.520				
friends and family visited residents	.480				
there were too many people in the area	.458				
excessive drinking increased		.843			
damage to the environment increased		.798			
rowdy behaviour increased		.767			
crime levels increased		.694			
noise levels in the area increased		.555			
prices of some goods and services increased		.532			
traffic congestion increased		.322			
tourism in and around the area improved			.722		

Factor Domains And Items	Factor Loadings				
	Factor 1: Positive economic impacts	Factor 2: Negative community impacts	Factor 3: Positive community impacts	Factor 4: Community opportunities	Factor 5: Tourism impacts
trading in the area improved			.629		
the image of Potchefstroom improved			.546		
opportunities for shopping were created			.501		
the infrastructure in the area improved			.349		
opportunities for local businesses increased				.837	
entertainment opportunities increased				.836	
employment opportunities increased				.826	
pride of residents improved				.747	
rights of residents increased				.549	
litter in the area increased				.500	
the overall cost of living increased				.395	
more parking was available					.733
there were more interactions Between residents and tourists					.591
Between residents and tourists the turnover of local businesses increased					.577
Cronbach's alpha	.88	.86	.85	.90	.77
Inter-correlations	.42	.47	.49	.53	.54
Mean values \pm sd	3.4 \pm .86	3.5 \pm .86	3.4 \pm .90	3.4 \pm .87	3.3 \pm 1.0

Comparison of residents' perceptions on the impact factors and socio-demographic characteristics

The differences in the importance of the impacts for various socio-demographic groupings are analysed in the next section. One-way-analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to explore the impact of the residents' qualification, occupation, number of visits and level of interest in the festival on the identified factors. An inspection of the mean scores indicates that some impacts were found to be significantly different at the $p < 0.001$ level of significance. Post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated the significant differences. An independent-samples t-test was conducted to compare the impact factors for males and females.

Comparison by gender

An independent-samples t-test was conducted to compare the identified factors, between males and females. Table 2 indicates no significant statistical

differences ($p < 0.05$) in scores for females and males as regards the factors. However results revealed that both males and females regard the negative community impacts as slightly more important than the other identified impacts. It is thus evident that gender does not influence residents' perceptions regarding the impacts of the festival.

Table 2: t-test for comparison of identified factors for females and males

Factor domains	Female (N = 227)	Male (N = 202)	p-value
	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	
Positive economic impacts	3.3(0.82)	3.34 (0.88)	.229
Negative community impacts	3.45 (0.86)	3.49 (0.85)	.404
Positive community impacts	3.42 (0.90)	3.35 (0.90)	.893
Community opportunities	3.41 (0.84)	3.28 (0.90)	.350
Tourism impacts	3.25 (1.00)	3.30 (0.99)	.831

* Significant at $p \leq 0.05$

Comparison by qualification

An ANOVA was carried out to determine statistically significant differences between qualification and the identified factors. Again no significant differences were found; however, respondents with no formal schooling considered both the positive economic impacts and the tourism impacts of the festival to be less important than those respondents with a professional qualification (See Table 3).

Table 3: ANOVA for comparison of identified factors by qualification

Identified factors	No schooling N = 26	Matric/Grade 12 N = 153	Diploma/Degree N = 140	Post-graduate N = 67	Professional N = 44	F-value	p-value
	Mean(SD)	Mean(SD)	Mean(SD)	Mean(SD)	Mean(SD)		
Positive economic impacts	3.04(0.82)	3.35(0.89)	3.33(0.80)	3.47(0.82)	3.54(0.88)	1.72	.142
Negative community impacts	3.32 (0.84)	3.34 (0.88)	3.55(0.86)	3.60 (0.86)	3.61(0.78)	1.97	.098
Positive community impacts	3.39 (0.93)	3.39 (0.89)	3.29(0.87)	3.52 (\pm .91)	3.43 (\pm .97)	.78	.538
Community opportunities	3.37(1.02)	3.29 (0.90)	3.30(0.86)	3.52 (0.78)	3.55 (0.77)	1.51	.197
Tourism impacts	3.00 (0.89)	3.25 (1.01)	3.22(1.07)	3.35 (0.89)	3.60 (0.95)	1.83	.120

* Significant at $p \leq 0.05$

Comparison by occupation

An ANOVA was performed to determine statistically significant differences between occupation and the identified factors (See Table 4). Two significant differences were identified between respondents in educational occupations and respondents in management positions. For both negative community impacts and

community opportunities respondents in management positions rated the impacts of the festival more highly than those in educational occupations. Although not significant on all levels, it is clear that occupation may influence perceptions regarding the impacts of the festival. It might be that those in management positions are more involved in and aware of the festival through the business they work for.

Table 4: ANOVA for comparison of identified factors by occupation

Identified factors	Professional N = 65	Management N = 40	Self-employed N = 46	Education N = 88	F-value	p-value
	Mean(SD)	Mean(SD)	Mean(SD)	Mean(SD)		
Positive economic impacts	3.57 (0.85)	3.42 (0.89)	3.40 (0.94)	3.52 (0.83)	.48	.698
Negative community impacts	3.70 (0.83)	3.86b (0.75)	3.48(0.94)	3.30a (0.81)	5.18	.002*
Positive community impacts	3.55 (0.91)	3.46 (0.93)	3.51 (0.91)	3.33 (0.84)	.92	.430
Community opportunities	3.58 (0.69)	3.65b (0.80)	3.39 (0.84)	3.19a (0.92)	4.16	.007*
Tourism impacts	3.51 (0.88)	3.43 (1.12)	3.14(1.07)	3.33 (0.99)	1.52	.209

* Significant at $p \leq 0.05$

Comparison by number of times attended

An ANOVA was also carried out to determine statistically significant differences between the number of times the Festival was attended and the identified factors. Significant differences were found on four factors. Residents that have attended the festival more than 6 times rated the following impacts, namely positive economic impact, positive community impact, community opportunities and tourism impacts, more highly than those residents that have attended the festival between 0 and 2 times. The number of times visited therefore definitely influences perceptions of impacts. Regular visitors are more aware of the impacts of the festival, especially the positive ones (Table 5).

Table 5: ANOVA for comparison of identified factors by number of times attended

Identified factors	0-2 times N = 135	3-5 times N = 168	More than 6 times N = 129	F-value	p-value
	Mean(SD)	Mean(SD)	Mean(SD)		
Positive economic impacts	3.19a (\pm .95)	3.35 (\pm .86)	3.52b (\pm .72)	4.16	.010*
Negative community impacts	3.36 (\pm .94)	3.46 (\pm .83)	3.60 (\pm .80)	2.70	.069
Positive community impacts	3.20a (\pm .98)	3.37 (\pm .87)	3.58b (\pm .81)	5.94	.003*
Community opportunities	3.20a (\pm .92)	3.36 (\pm .85)	3.50b (\pm .80)	3.90	.021*
Tourism impacts	3.00a (\pm 1.06)	3.34 (\pm .94)	3.47b (\pm .97)	7.64	.001*

* Significant at $p \leq 0.05$

Comparison by level of interest in the festival

An ANOVA was performed to determine statistically significant differences between level of interest in the Festival and the identified factors (Table 6). Significant differences were found on 4 of the identified factors. Residents who are interested in the festival and considered as avid fans rated the positive economic impact, positive community impact, community opportunities and

tourism impacts more highly than those residents who do not attend the festival. Avid festival visitors are more aware of the impacts of the festival but also take cognisance of its positive impacts.

Table 6: ANOVA for comparison of identified factors by level of interest in the festival

	Avid Fan N = 136	Interested N = 150	Not interested but do visit N = 69	Do not attend N = 30	F- value	p-value
Identified factors	Mean(SD)	Mean(SD)	Mean(SD)	Mean(SD)		
Positive economic impacts	3.57b (0.74)	3.32 (0.80)	3.14 (0.92)	2.89a (1.06)	7.72	.000*
Negative community impacts	3.48 (0.80)	3.45 (0.79)	3.36 (0.99)	3.27 (0.99)	.714	.544
Positive community impacts	3.48b (0.86)	3.44b (0.79)	3.11 (0.97)	2.73a (1.08)	8.34	.000*
Community opportunities	3.56b (0.85)	3.33 (0.73)	3.00a (1.03)	2.99a (0.91)	8.76	.000*
Tourism impacts	3.47b (0.98)	3.16 (0.91)	3.10 (1.06)	2.92a (1.17)	4.13	.007*

* Significant at $p \leq 0.05$

Discussion

The following discussion is divided into two sections. The first focuses on the impacts on the community while the second focuses on the differences between selected socio-demographic characteristics and the impacts.

Impacts of the festival on the community

Similarities between the results of this study and the results of previous studies were established. Factor 1 (Positive economic impacts) was also identified by Saayman (2007), Chhabra, Sills and Cubbage (2003). This supports the notion that economic perceptions remain important for the community. Income is one of the most important drivers for hosting events and residents should be aware of the economic value of the Aardklop festival. Residents of Potchefstroom consider the festival to impact positively on the economic growth of the area and this view should be sustained and made visible to the community. The festival management should therefore report on the economic impact of the festival and invest in creating opportunities for residents to benefit from that.

Factor two (Negative community impacts) yielded a slightly higher mean value than the other impacts. This result was also found in other studies (Kreag, 2006; Fredline, Jago & Deery, 2005; Small, Edwards & Sheridan, 2005) where concerns were raised over the negative impacts of the particular festival (excessive drinking, damage to the environment, disruptive behaviour, crime levels, noise levels, prices of goods and services and traffic congestion). The festival management should consult with residents in decreasing the negative impact as this might influence the latter's attitudes towards the festival and towards the attendees and ultimately influence the sustainability of the festival. Management should therefore exercise greater control over these aspects and, by

means of media statements and public meetings, inform the community of the measures that have been put in place to address the negative impacts.

It was however established that residents consider the impacts of the festival to be positive, yielding an increase in economic impacts, affirmative community impacts, community opportunities and tourism impacts. The festival is thus not only contributing to the development of the arts but also to the well-being of residents in Potchefstroom.

Differences between selected socio-demographic characteristics, festival behaviour and the impacts

Studies of this nature are scarce, especially in the South African event industry. Consequently the results should be considered in the planning of other events. It was found that the qualification obtained does influence the perceptions of residents concerning the impacts of the event. This was also determined in a study by King, Pizam and Milman (1993) who reported major perceptual differences between separate groups of students with and without tourism education. Sobczak, Debucquet and Havard (2006) also found that education levels influence perception. Residents with higher qualifications rated the impacts of the particular festival more highly than did those with lower level qualifications. This holds an implication for festival management as those with lower level qualifications should be better informed about the purpose and value of the festival and should be assisted in participating in the event.

The most significant contribution of this study is the finding that the number of times the festival has been attended and the level of interest in it exert a significant influence on the assessment of the impacts of the event. Those who have attended the festival a number of times and those who consider themselves as avid fans of the festival will be more likely to support and participate in the festival. Konecnik and Ruzzier (2006) also established that previous visits to a destination can influence perceptions. The residents realise the value of the festival and what it means to the community. It is thus critical for festival management to increase local participation in the festival and adhere to the needs of the residents. A loyalty club for residents should be considered that could include aspects such as reserved parking and special packages which will then also address the negative impacts of the festival. Similarly, more attention should be given to employ members from the local community even on a temporary basis.

Conclusions

The results of this study revealed that festivals have an impact on the community but that, on the whole, residents consider this festival as making a huge

contribution to community life. The economic and social impacts of the festival were evident. The views of the residents regarding the impacts of the festival could however, be influenced by improving participation of residents, along the lines just proposed. These results clearly have a direct impact on the planning strategy of the festival and could be applied to other festivals as well.

Acknowledgement

The authors hereby acknowledge the contribution of the National Research Foundation in funding the research.

References

- Aardklop (2012). *Wie is ons?* [Online]. Available at www.cloveraardklop.co.za/article/view/wie_is_ons. Date of access 17 July 2012.
- Adendorff, E. (2008). *The social impact of the Klein Karoo National Arts Festival in Oudtshoorn*. Masters Dissertation, Potchefstroom: North West University, South Africa.
- Allen, J., O'Toole, W., Harris, R. & McDonnell, I. (2008). *Festivals and Special Event Management* (4th ed.) (p. 637). New York: Wiley.
- Andereck, K.L., Valentine, K.M., Knopf, R.C. & Vogt, C.A. (2005). Residents' perceptions of community tourism impacts. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 32(4), 1056-1076.
- Andereck, K.L. & Nyaupane, G.P. (2011). Exploring the nature of tourism and quality of life perceptions among residents. *Journal of Travel Research*, 50(3), 248-260.
- Arcadia, C & Whitford, M. (2007). Festival attendance and the development of social capital. *Journal of Convention and Event Tourism*, 8(2), 1-18.
- Aref, F., Redzuan, M. & Gill, S.S. (2009). Community perceptions toward economic and environmental impacts of tourism on local communities. *Asian Social Science*, 5(7), 130-137.
- Brunt, P. & Courtney, P. (1999). Host perceptions of socio-cultural impacts. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 26(3), 493-515.
- Chhabra, D., Sills, E. & Cabbage, F.W. (2003). The significance of festivals to rural economies: estimating the economic impacts of Scottish Highland Games in North Carolina. *Journal of Travel Research*, 41(4), 421-427.
- Choi, C. & Murray, I. (2010). Resident attitudes towards sustainable community tourism. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 18(4), 575-594.
- Choi, H.S.C. & Sirakaya, E. (2006). Sustainable indicators for managing community tourism. *International Journal of Tourism Management*, 27(6), 1274-1289.
- Collins, A., Jones, C. & Munday, M. (2009). Assessing the environmental impacts of mega sporting events: two options? *Tourism Management*, 30(6), 828-837.

Crandall, L. (1994). The social impact of tourism on developing regions and its measurement. In J.R.B. Ritchie, & C.R. Goeldner, (Eds.), *Travel, Tourism and Hospitality Research: A Handbook for Managers and Researchers* (2nd ed.). New York: Wiley.

Deery, M., Jago, L. & Fredline, L. (2012). Rethinking social impact of tourism research: A new research agenda. *Tourism Management*, 33(1), 64-73.

Delamere, T.A. (2001). Development of a scale to measure resident attitudes towards the social impacts of community festivals, part 2: verification of the scale. *Event Management*, 7(1), 25-38.

Delamere, T.A., Wankel, L.M. & Hinch, T.P. (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 Management*, 7(1), 11-24.

Fredline, E. & Faulkner, B. (2002). Residents' reactions to the staging of major motor sport events within their communities: A cluster analysis. *Event Management*, 7(2), 103-114.

Fredline, E., Jago, L. & Deery, M. (2005). Testing of a compressed generic instrument to assess host community perceptions of events: A case study of the Australian Open Tennis Tournament. Paper presented at Event Management Research Conference at the Australian Centre for Event Management, Sydney, Griffith Business School, 13-14 July.

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. Paper presented at the Tourism state of the art II International Scientific Conference, University of Strathclyde, Glasgow, 27-30 June.

Getz, D. (1993). Festivals and special events. In M.A. Khan, M.D. Olsen, & T. Var (Eds.), *VNR's Encyclopedia of Hospitality and Tourism* (pp. 945-955). New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.

Getz, D. (2007). *Events Studies: Theory, Research and Policy for Planned Events*. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.

Getz, D. (2008). Event tourism: definition, evolution and research. *Tourism Management*, 29(3), 403-408.

Getz, D. (2010). The nature and scope of festivals studies. *International Journal of Event Management Research*, 5(1), 1-47.

Green, R. (2005). Community perceptions of environmental and social change and tourism development on the island of Koh Samui, Thailand. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 25, 37-56.

Gursoy, D., Kim, K. & Uysal, M. (2004). Perceived impacts of festivals and special events by organisers: an extension and validation. *Tourism Management*, 25(2), 171-181.

Haley, A.J., Snaith, T. & Miller, G. (2005). The social impacts of tourism a case study of Bath, UK. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 32(3), 647-668.

Hampton, M.P. (2005). Heritage, local communities and economic development. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 32(3), 735-759.

- Haralambopoulos, N. & Pizam, A. (1996). Perceived impacts of tourism: The case of Samos. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 23, 503–526.
- Huang, J.Z., Li, M. & Cai, L.A. (2010). A model of community-based festival image. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 29(2), 254-260.
- Kim, S.S., Park, J.Y. & Lee, J.S. (2010). Predicted economic impact analysis of a mega-convention using multiplier effects. *Journal of Convention & Event Tourism*, 11(1), 42-61.
- Kim, S.S., Prideaux, B. & Chon, K. (2010). A comparison of results of three statistical methods to understand the determinants of festival participants' expenditures. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 29(2), 297-307.
- King, B., Pizam, A. & Milman, A. (1993). Social impact of tourism: Host perceptions. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 20(4), 650-665.
- Konecnik, M. & Ruzzier, M. (2006). The influence of previous visitation on customer's evaluation of a tourism destination. *Managing Transitions*, 4(2), 145-165.
- Kreag, G. (2006). The impacts of tourism. University of Minnesota. [Online] Available at <http://www.seagrant.umn.edu>. Date of access 10 January 2008.
- Krejcie, R.V. & Morgan, D.W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 30(3), 607-610.
- Laing, J. & Frost, W. (2010). How green was my festival? Exploring challenges and opportunities associated with staging green events. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 29(2), 261-267.
- Lawton, L. J. & Weaver, D.B. (2010). Normative and innovative sustainable resource management at birding festivals. *Tourism Management*, 31(4), 527-536.
- Lee, C., Kang, S.K., Long, P. & Reisinger, Y. (2010). Residents' perceptions of casino impacts: a comparative study. *Tourism Management*, 31(2), 189-201.
- Lindberg, K. & Johnson, R.L. (1997). Modelling residents' attitudes toward tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 24(2), 402-424.
- Pegg, S. & Patterson, I. (2010). Rethinking music festivals as a staged event: Gaining insights from understanding visitor motivations and the experiences they seek. *Journal of Convention & Event Tourism*, 11(2), 85-89.
- Saayman, M. (2007). *En Route with Tourism* (3rd ed.). Potchefstroom: Leisure Consultants and Publications.
- Saayman, M. (2009). *Ecotourism: Getting Back to Basics*. Potchefstroom: Leisure Consultants and Publications.
- Shaw, G. & Williams, A.M. (1994). *Critical Issues in Tourism: A Geographical Perspective*. Malden, Mass: Blackwell.
- Simpson, M.C. (2008). Community benefit tourism initiatives: A conceptual oxymoron? *Tourism Management*, 29(1), 1-18.

Sims, W. & D'Mello, L. (2005). Event denizens and the sports tourist. In J. Allen (Ed.), *Proceedings of International Event Research Conference July 2005* (pp. 270-285), Australian Centre for Event Management: University of Technology, Sydney Lindfield.

Slabbert, E. (2000). Socio-cultural impact of tourism. In M. Saayman (Ed.), *En route with Tourism* (2nd ed.) (pp.131-156). Potchefstroom: Leisure Consultants and Publications.

Slabbert, E. (2004). *An integrated tourism model for cultural events*. Unpublished PhD thesis, Potchefstroom: North-West University, Potchefstroom Campus, South Africa.

Small, K., Edwards, D. & Sheridan, L. (2005). A flexible framework for evaluating the socio-cultural impacts of a (small) festival. *International Journal of Event Management Research*, 1(1), 66-77.

Sobczak, A., Debucquet, G. & Havard, C. (2006). The impact of higher education on students' and young managers' perception of companies and CSR: an exploratory analysis. *Corporate Governance*, 6(4), 463-474.

SPSS Inc. (2011). *SPSS® 17.0 for Windows, Release 17.0.0*. Copyright© by SPSS inc., Chicago: SPSS.

Statistics South Africa (Stats SA) (2001). Census. [online]. Available at <http://www.statssa.gov.za/timeseriesdata/pxweb2006/Dialog/Saveshow.asp>. Date of access 2 August 2009.

Stout, G.W. & Green, N.P.O. (1986). *Work Out Biology*. London: Macmillan Education Ltd.

Tosun, C. (2002). Host perceptions of impacts: a comparative tourism study. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 29(1), 231-253.

Tustin, D.H., Ligthelm, A.A., Martins, J.H. & Van Wyk, H.J. (2005). *Marketing research in practice*. Pretoria: University of South Africa.

Waite, G. (2003). Social impacts of the Sydney Olympics. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 30(1), 194-215.

Yolal, M., Centinel, F. & Uysal, M. (2009). An examination of festival motivation and perceived benefits relationship: Eskisehir international festival. *Journal of Convention & Event Tourism*, 10(4), 276-291.

Yu, C., Chancellor, H.C. & Cole, S.T. (2011). Measuring residents' attitudes toward sustainable tourism: a re-examination of the sustainable tourism attitude scale. *Journal of Travel Research*, 50(1), 57-63.

Zou, Y. & Ap, J. (2009). Residents' perceptions towards the impacts of Beijing 2008 Olympic Games. *Journal of Travel Research*, 48(1), 78-91.