

SPORT TOURISM EVENT IMPACTS ON THE HOST COMMUNITY: A CASE STUDY OF RED BULL BIG WAVE AFRICA

Ncedo Jonathan NTLOKO & Kamilla SWART

Cape Peninsula University of Technology, Cape Town, Republic of South Africa

ABSTRACT

The focus of this article is on the management and social impacts of sport tourism events on the host community. This article specifically evaluates the Red Bull Big Wave Africa (RBBWA) event as a case study. Of cognisance is the host community's involvement, perceptions, attitudes and an understanding of costs and benefits linked to the event, at the same time providing a critical view on the management aspects of the event and impacts evident from the host community's point of view. Survey questionnaires, interviews and direct observations were carried out as methods of obtaining data. Altogether 200 residents, two community leaders and one organiser took part in the investigation. The results indicated the event has entertainment value; provides economic benefits in particular for local businesses; promotes community pride and act as regional showcase. On the other hand, the analysis indicated the event as causing minimal disruption to local residents including use of public facilities, mainly for residents in close proximity to the event. In addition, negative environmental impacts and social inequalities became evident. The article reflects a strong link between management and impact of events as a measure to maximise the positive impacts and minimise the negative impacts.

Key words: Event Impacts; Sport tourism events; Host community.

INTRODUCTION

Worldwide, events have been recognised as a strong component of sport tourism that draw people from different places (Getz, 1997; Gammon & Robinson, 2003; Penot, 2003; Sofield, 2003; Zauhar, 2004), and are becoming an integral and major part of tourism development and marketing strategies (Tassiopoulos, 2005). In South Africa, Swart (1998) highlights the country's sport tourism campaign as being launched in 1997. Several authors (Swart, 1998; Burnett & Uys, 2000; Turco *et al.*, 2003; Saayman 2004; Swart *et al.*, 2005) have contributed to the development and understanding of sport tourism and its imperatives in South Africa. "Sport tourism events refer to those sport activities that attract tourists of which a large percentage are spectators ... [they] have the potential to attract non-residents, media, technical personnel, athletes, coaches and other sporting officials" (Kurtzman & Zauhar, 2003: 44), with the primary purpose for travel being participating in or viewing sport (Turco *et al.*, 2002).

Sport tourism and sport tourism events are viewed as a growing niche market, reflecting South Africa's sport tourism contribution to the country's economy to be in the range of 4% (Ritchie, 2005), with South African Tourism (SAT, 2006) estimating the country's tourism contribution to 122,49 bn to the GDP (direct and indirect). Hosting of major international events like the 1995 Rugby World Cup, 2003 Cricket World Cup and the upcoming 2010 Federation International de Football Association (FIFA) have contributed to this growth. With the

increasing reliance on the staging of events as an ingredient of tourist destination development and promotion, their impacts within the host community have become an issue for consideration (Fredline & Faulkner, 2002b). The host community relates to people or residents who are staying at the event location or at close proximity to the event location and are the most people who are likely to understand the event and impacts better, by virtue of their proximity and hosting of the event (Delamere, 2001; Burkner, Page & Meyer, 2002). Consideration of sport tourism events on the host community is an effort to understand the different ways in which local residents react to the hosting of the events and its impacts and the reasons for their reactions. As noted by Delamere (2001) awareness of the event impacts and of residents attitudes towards the event impacts, may enable action that could lead to a reduction of unwanted disruption of local community life, thereby encouraging a balance between social and economic development. This means, hosting the event is not good enough until recognition is given to the resources used, and at the same time people (host communities) should identify with the participatory processes. Involvement of people in the host community as an integral part of both sport and tourism, directly or indirectly is vital for the continuing existence of these activities. Following this trend negative event impacts could be minimised. Event impacts are the effects and implications of how the event impinge on local residents' quality of life and their reactions thereof (Fredline & Falkner, 2002a). Taking into consideration the nature of the impacts discussed underneath, Dwyer *et al.* (2000) provide a summary of tangible cost and benefits of events, as a reflection of the latter view in Table 1 below.

TABLE 1. RECOGNITION OF TANGIBLE COSTS AND BENEFITS (Dwyer *et al.*, 2000: 35)

Social Benefits	Social Costs
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community development • Civic Pride • Event production extension 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disruption to resident lifestyle • Traffic congestion • Noise • Vandalism • Crowding • Property damage
Economic Benefits	Economic Costs
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Long term promotional benefits • Induced development and construction expenditure • Additional trade and business development • Increased property values 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resident's exodus • Interruption of normal business • Under-utilised infrastructure

The reflection presented in the table underscores the importance of management of events, as reflected by several studies (Bowdin & Church, 2000; Weed & Bull 2004; Bohlman & Heerden, 2005; Kurtzman & Zauhar, 2005; Swart & Smith-Christensen, 2005). It is widely recognised that events have the power to have impacts of a socio-cultural, economic and environmental nature on their host destination and within the affected community (Swart & Smith-Christensen, 2005). Hede *et al.* (2002) suggest that events are usually evaluated from

an economic perspective and largely driven by the needs of government and tourism agencies to justify the staging of special events based on their economic contribution to the host economy. This is because of the benefits or economic stimulus associated with sport tourism events (Hautbis *et al.*, 2003) linking sport tourism and local economic development.

Denoting from Table 1, several studies (Urgan & Mule, 2001; Turco *et al.* 2003; Tassiopoulos, 2005; Shone & Parry, 2005; Horne & Whitson, 2006;) on the costs and benefits and impacts of events, suggests the tangible costs and benefits presented above can be used as the basis of understanding and assessing some of the impacts linked to events. Looking at the nature of the impacts that are evident in Table 1, sport tourism events could be beneficial or detrimental to the host destination. Measuring these impacts depends on the scale and the nature of the event. It also cannot be disputed that when providing a sport tourism experience, utilisation of resources in the entire organisation of the event remains crucial. Thus, proper planning, taking cognisance of both management and impacts of sport tourism events could result in the maximisation of positive impacts. "It is critical that the impacts of ... events be managed effectively so that benefits accrue not only to select stakeholders, but to all of the host community" (Tiyce & Dimmock, 2000: 222). For the practical understanding of Table 1 in relation to the study, the table can be linked to the results section.

This study presents a broader understanding of the management and social impacts of sport tourism events on the host community in relation to the Red Bull Big Wave Africa (RBBWA). It is important to note that since the inception of the event in 1999, this is the first study to be conducted. Similar to Reid and Arcodia (2002), the study used a holistic stakeholder approach composed of residents, community leaders and event organisers. This study had the following objectives: firstly, to determine how local residents respond to and perceive the event; secondly, to assess the current management practices and impacts towards the development of a sustainable sport tourism event; and finally attempt to strengthen and contribute to the creation of a sustainable sport tourism industry in the Western Cape, as well as South Africa. The event is part of a broader, comparative study of the management and impacts of sport tourism events in the Western Cape and KwaZulu-Natal.

METHODOLOGY AND DESIGN

In order to achieve the objectives of the study, known and acceptable methods of obtaining data were used – qualitative and quantitative. A literature study was used to provide background to the study, presenting a holistic understanding of sport tourism events, at the same time placing in context what the study sought to achieve and informed questions for interviews, questionnaire survey and observations. Survey questionnaires, interviews and direct observations were used in the collection of data.

The residents' survey was based on the survey developed by Fredline (2000) and Fredline and Faulkner (2000; 2002a; 2002b). Once approval was given, the survey was adapted to the South African context. The data was collected from residents of Hout Bay a week after the event. Two hundred (200) questionnaires with close and open-ended questions were administered using face to face interviews with the residents of the host community. A stratified purposive sampling approach was deployed taking cognisance of low, medium and high income areas to provide a broad representation of the respondents. A Geographical Information System (GIS) map was used to determine these areas within the scope of 1 to 5

km radius, with the intention to evaluate variance associated with proximity to the event. Areas which were part of the study included: Hungberg; Imizamo Yethu; Mount Rhodes; Llandudno; and Hout Bay Heights. A Likert-type scale was used, ranging from strongly disagree (SD), disagree (D), neutral (N) and agree (A) to strongly agree (SA). For an overall interpretation of the results, presentation of results in some instances are grouped (disagree and strongly disagree and agree and strongly agree).

In addition to this, interviews were conducted with the event organiser (1) and leaders of the communities (2). The interviews ranged from unstructured to semi-structured interviews. Unlike completely structured interviews, unstructured and semi-structured interviews allow the interviewer to use probes with a view to clearing up vague responses, or to ask for elaboration of incomplete answers (Welman & Kruger, 2000: 161). The purpose of these personal interviews was to gain a greater understanding of sport tourism event initiatives in relation to the RBBWA, including planning, management and implementation, which might not be captured in the surveys.

Furthermore, direct observations were carried out throughout the event. This was done to capture supporting evidence for the study. This method was chosen because of its ability to excavate and expose the underlying areas of the investigation. As highlighted by Bailey (1987: 239) "observation can provide a picture of overall ... [of] all persons present at a given time rather than the more fragmented and isolated information provided by a survey respondent". In addition, careful observation of what is happening at a particular facility or type of facility or among particular groups can be a more appropriate research approach than the use of questionnaires or even informal interviews (Veal, 1992).

For this study, the Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) was used as a tool for data inputting and analysis (descriptive), using correlation as an instrumental measure. The research approach was chosen on the basis that it will contribute to the understanding of sport tourism event impacts on the host community in relation to the RBBWA.

AN OVERVIEW OF THE RED BULL BIG WAVE AFRICA

Red Bull Big Wave Africa (RBBWA) is a professional surfing event. It is an event for those who participate in extreme sport, namely riding/surfing the 'Big Wave'. RBBWA is not an ordinary surfing event, it is unique. The event takes place in close proximity of the Hungberg community in Hout Bay, Cape Town, and in an environmentally sensitive area (Sentinel), which is part of the Cape Peninsula National Park (Botha, 2005b). The Sentinel (peak of the mountain) point allows one to view the biggest and most radical surf break on the African continent (Red Bull Big Wave Africa, 2005). The distance is between 1 and 2 kms from the harbour. One needs to pass through the Hungberg community in order to view the 'Big Wave' event from the land. The harbour is also an integral part of the event location, as it can be viewed as a base of the RBBWA and boasts the National Sea Rescue Institute (NSRI) which is the headquarters of the event. The harbour is also the departure point for participants, using their boats and jet skis. In addition, the harbour provides access to view the surfers/event in action from the water. Finally, it can be seen as a departure point for those who opt to use transport to the Sentinel and watch the event at the tip of the Sentinel (park and ride).

The event is organised and sponsored by Red Bull hence called the Red Bull Big Wave Africa and sanctioned by Surfing South Africa. Other sponsors include Sensi Threads for the biggest wave award, Engen as a partner and sponsor of the event, Canon for the best tube award, Von Zipper for the deep throat award and Billabong as the official clothing supplier of the crew. The RBBWA is an annual event and takes place over a period of about two weeks. There is no specified date for this contest as it depends on the size of the waves at a given period. Since its inception in 1999, the RBBWA contest took place twice (2000 and 2006) with waves reaching a required height (5 meters) for the contest to begin. The actual surfing takes place at the Dungeon. Bertish (2005) describes the Dungeon as an open ocean reef located under the towering cliffs of the Sentinel Mountain at the mouth of Hout Bay, on the west coast of the Cape Peninsula at the southern tip of Africa. The Dungeon has become part of the international wave circuit (Pike, 2001).

The inception of the RBBWA event in 1999 was not only a highlight for South African waters but also a highlight for the African continent. The event has attracted quite a number of well-known, top surfers of the “Big Wave” across the globe. Initially, RBBWA was a contest between South African surfers and there were no international invitees. Due to growth of this event, the event now hosts seven international invitees and seven nationals (Botha, 2005a). Even if the contest does not take place, the prizes and awards are distributed based on the call made for the trial sessions within the 21-day waiting period. Whether the contest takes place or not, a contest format is in place for this event:

“The 14 man field will be divided into two semi-final heats of seven competitors each and a draw will be conducted at the opening function to decide which heat will surf first. The duration of these heats will be 60 minutes and each surfers’ best two rides during that period will be tallied to determine his total for the heat. The three competitors with the highest tallies in each semi-final will advance to the final. The six man final will start approximately 30 minutes after the completion of the second semi to allow for scores to be tallied and for the top three competitors in the second heat to change their contest vests and get some sustenance. The duration of the final will depend on the surf and weather conditions on the day, but is likely to be a minimum of 60 minutes with each surfers’ best two rides counting. The highest scorer in the final will be crowned the 2005 Red Bull Big Wave Africa champion” (Red Bull Big Wave Africa, 2005).

This was the prescribed contest format for the 2005 RBBWA.

RESULTS, ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

The results and analysis of the residents survey is presented in the next section, and enhanced by interview comments and direct observations where necessary.

Location and demographic profile of respondents - Most of the respondents (32.5%) were from Hungberg – an important area that gives access to view the event from the land, followed by 28.5% of respondents from Imizamo Yethu and 25.5% of respondents from Hout Bay Heights. A further 10.5% and 3% of the respondents were from Mt. Rhodes and Llandudno respectively. Out of the sample ($n=200$), 59% of the respondents were males and 41% females. In terms of their racial representation, 58% of the respondents were Coloureds, 26%

Africans, 15% Whites and 1% Indian. This is not surprising as Hungberg is a traditional “Coloured community” created by the apartheid dispensation. The age distribution was from 31-40 years (31.5%), 21-30 years (22.5%), 41-50 years (22%) and 51-60 years (10.5%). These were the most prominent groups representing 86.5% of the respondents.

Event attendance and awareness - The majority of the respondents (84%) did not attend the event of which 16% indicated that they have attended the event before. Out of the sample (n=200), only 17.5% of the respondents did not provide reasons as to why they did not attend the event. Reasons highlighted by the respondents (82.5%) for not attending the event included: Unaware (31.5%); Didn't have time (24%), Working (8%); Didn't want to go (7.5%); Didn't know (5%); Didn't know the location (1.5%); Too expensive (1.5%); Not around (1%); Too old to attend (1%); Too racial (1%) and Children too small (0.5%).

The responses of 37.5% (31.5% unaware, 5% didn't know and 1.5% didn't know the location) of people who were unable to attend the event because they were unaware, raises concern. Emanating from the interviews, community leaders and residents in general have a strong view that they should be more informed about the RBBWA event, as it takes place in their backyard. Even on the day of the practice session, about 25 people attended, out of which 16 were respondents, equating to 64% of attendees. Before the event, it was anticipated that the event would attract about (300) spectators. Based on this representation by the organisers, a population of n=200 was targeted. Despite the turn out, all respondents came specifically to the location for the event. It is also interesting to note that 87.5% of the respondents were local residents and 12.5% day tripper. The low number of attendance could have been influenced by the nature of the event being a media-type sport tourism event.

The efforts made by the organisers distributing letters to 50 households in close proximity to the event, seems not enough, as they appear to have left the rest of the community unaware of the event. Contributing to the low level of awareness could be the low and targeted marketing approach used by the organisers, as an attempt not to make RBBWA a spectator event, since the event takes place in an environmentally sensitive area. For common understanding, broader circles of communication between the organisers and the community are important.

Perceptions and attitudes - Emphasising the importance of residents' perceptions and attitudes, Soutar and Mcleod (1993: 537) note that events give rise to a variety of expectations in the local community. Table 2 presents a summary of residents' perception, attitudes and reaction to impacts of the event. Getz (1997) notes that attention to community wishes and impacts is essential.

TABLE 2. PERCEPTIONS AND REACTIONS TO IMPACTS OF THE EVENT - RESIDENTS (n=200)

Event as entertainment	SD	D	N	A	SA
The event provided an opportunity to attend an interesting event	6.5	7	24.5	47	15
The event provided an opportunity to have fun with family and friends	6.5	8	20.5	51	14
The event provided an opportunity to meet new people	4	7	15.5	60	13.5
The event increases entertainment opportunities for	8.5	10	13	53	15.5

locals					
Use of public money					
The event was a waste of public money	17.5	35	30.5	10.5	6.5
Too much money was spent on the event that could be spent on other activities	10	29	29.5	20	11.5
The event assists in increasing public spending for sport	11	14.5	30	34	10.5
Economic benefits of the event					
The event is good for the economy since it creates jobs	9.5	17.5	16	42	15
The event is good for local business (increases turnover)	9.5	12	17.5	47.5	13.5
Event disruption to local residents					
The event disrupted the lives of local residents and created inconvenience	21.5	48.5	16.5	10	3.5
The event caused traffic congestion and parking difficulties	19	37	18	21	5
The event created excessive noise	25	48	17	8.5	1.5
The event increased crime	21.5	47.5	16.5	11	3.5
The event was associated with some people behaving inappropriately such as excessive drinking or drug use	23	34	30	10	3
Use of public facilities					
The event promoted the development and better maintenance of public facilities such as roads, parks, sporting facilities and/ or public transport	26	18.5	26	26	3.5
The event denied local residents access to public facilities such as roads, parks, sporting facilities and/ or public transport because of closure or overcrowding	24	27.5	29	17	2.5
The event and promotion of community pride					
The event made locals feel more proud of the city/ country	3.5	5.5	8	57	26
The event made locals feels good about themselves and their community	3	5	12	54.5	25.5
Ordinary residents get a say in the planning and management of the event	39.5	23	17	18.5	2
Environmental impact of the event					
The event had a negative impact on the environment through excessive litter	17	40.5	28	12	2.5
The event had a negative impact on the environment through pollution	18	42.5	29	9.5	1
The event had a negative impact on the environment through damage to natural areas	17.5	41	25.5	15	1
The event as a regional showcase					
The event showcased the area in a positive light	4	4.5	11	57.5	23
The event attracts tourists to the area	1.5	5	8.5	62.5	22.5
The event attracts future business to the area	5	9	21	50	15

The event has increased media coverage of the area	5	9.5	19.5	51.5	14.5
Impact of the event on price					
The event leads to increases in the price of some things such as food, transport and property values	19.5	31.5	29	18	2
As a result of the event, more people are buying holiday homes in the area	8	18.5	39.5	26.5	7.5
During the event period, the overall cost of living has increased	20	31	33	15	1
Community benefits in relation to the event					
The community benefited directly from the event	31.5	30	20.5	16.5	1.5
Only some members of the community benefited from the event/ event increases social inequity	9	15.5	28	37	10.5
The event increases interaction between locals and tourists	10.5	14	22	45	8.5

Strongly Disagree = SD; Disagree = D; Neutral = N; Agree = A and Strongly Agree = SA

Event as entertainment - According to Table 2, 73.5% agreed that the event provided a chance to meet new people, increases entertainment opportunities for locals (68.5%), provided an opportunity to have fun with family and friends (65%) and provided an opportunity to attend an interesting (62%). These results show that the event has an entertainment value. As noted by Fredline and Faulkner (2002b) entertainment and social opportunities are part of the range of tangible benefits.

Use of public money - As shown in Table 2, more than half of the respondents (52.5%) indicated the event was not a waste of public money, 44.5% agreed that the event assists in increasing public spending for sport while 39% indicated their disagreement (strongly disagreed and disagreed) with the statement that too much money spent on the event could have been spent on other activities. It is important to note that in all the statements above, the majority of the respondents were from Hungberg (20.5%, 13% & 14.5%) followed by Hout Bay Heights (13.5%, 13% & 10%) indicating the majority of the shared response to the statements as Coloured (30.5%, 24.5% & 24.5%) respectively. This is not surprising as these areas are very close to each other, with Hungberg being one of the event locations and that both these communities are coloured dominated terrains. It is also important to note that the majority of the respondents came from those who do not have income (9%, 5% & 6.5%) and those earning between R1–R1 000 (8.5%, 8.5%) and > R12 000 (6.5%) which are a proportion to the responses of the statements respectively. Based on these findings, there seems to be a mixed response from the respondents about the use of public money. High levels of neutral responses of the statements could merely mean that the respondents are not aware of: how the event is organised or managed; who is involved and the status of their involvement; and how much money is involved and the source of money involved in the event?

Economic benefits of the event - Reflecting on the economic benefits of the event, 61% of the respondents were of the view that the event is good for local business (increases turnover) with 57% percent giving an indication that the event is good for the economy since it creates jobs. In line with this finding, Chalip *et al.* (2003: 230) put emphasis on the importance of events on the host community by arguing that the increasing demand for accountability

requires event organisers to demonstrate that their events add value to the life of the community in which they are held.

Event disruption to local residents - Relating to the event disruption to local residents, there seemed to be a high level of disagreement with the statements. The respondents disagreed to strongly disagreed that the event created excessive noise (73%), disrupted the lives of local residents and created inconvenience (70%), the event increased crime (69%), the event was associated with some people behaving inappropriately such as excessive drinking or drug use (57%) and the event caused traffic congestion and parking difficulties (56%). It is important to note that these are positive responses, as they reflect minimal disruption to local residents. Observations carried out also provide supporting evidence, as there were few spectators at this event due to the contest not taking place. However, this issue (event disruption to local residents) needs greater attention, especially when the contest takes place, as it affects residents of the Hungberg community negatively. Vehicles were parked on the side of the street adjacent to the residents' houses and in some instances parked in front of the houses. Overall, since the contest did not take place, it could be argued that less negative impacts than expected were observed.

Use of public facilities - In terms of public facilities it is disconcerting to note that 44.5% of the respondents indicated their disagreement with the statement that the event promoted the development and better maintenance of public facilities such as roads, parks, sporting facilities and/ or public transport while 29.5% agreed to strongly agreed as per Table 2. Only 19.5% of respondents agreed to strongly agreed that the event denied local residents access to public facilities such as roads, parks, sporting facilities and/ or public transport because of closure or overcrowding while 51.5% of the respondents provided an opposite view of the statement. The study contends that in this event, lack of access to public facilities because of closure or overcrowding could have had an impact on the respondents at close proximity to the event, hence the 19.5% response agreed to the statement. There is always going to be some disruption and inconvenience in hosting of events, however, management and understanding of the impacts is crucial. As presented by Delamere (2001: 25) "awareness of these social impacts, and of residents' attitudes towards those impacts, may enable action that could lead to a reduction in the unwanted disruption of local community life ... thereby encouraging a balance between social and economic development forces within the community".

The event and promotion of community pride - On issues relating to the event and promotion of community pride, the respondents indicated a high level of agreement with the event impacting on community pride, with the majority (83%) expressing that the event made locals feel more proud of the city/country and the event made locals feel good about themselves and their community (80%). However, the high level of disagreement (62.5%) that ordinary residents get a say in the planning and management of the event raises concerns. The organisers highlighted that efforts to involve the community in the event were made. This was done by involving some members of the community in the cleaning programme of the Sentinel before, during and after the event as well as the distribution of pamphlets or letters to the fifty households mentioned earlier. Despite this, community leaders have indicated great concern on the role of community or ordinary residents having a say or their involvement in the planning and management of this event (James, 2005; Ngetu, 2005). The interviews conducted with community leaders and comments by the community members revealed an

element of hostility against this event, with residents claiming the event as taking place in their community, hence the hostility if this aspect is ignored.

These interviews indicate contradicting views and expectations when it comes to community involvement in the event. They present a lack of awareness on part of the organisers on community issues in relation to the event. This aspect suggests that better relations between the organisers and the community at large, is an important aspect for the future of this event. Though there seemed to be a positive impact of the event on community pride, the relations between the event organisers and the community is an important aspect for future consideration. Community consultation, participation and involvement in planning and management of the event are a basis for the sustainable future of the event. As Reid and Arcodia (2002) indicate, involving community leaders and the key stakeholders within the host community in the planning process is also a way for the event organisers to ensure that the community participates in and has ownership of the event.

Environmental impact of the event - Though the majority (57.5%, 60.5% and 58.5%) of the respondents strongly disagreed with the three statements on environmental impact of the event respectively as indicated in Table 2, high levels of neutrality could be based on the fact that few of the respondents have attended the event. Contributing to this view, could also be based on the contest not taking place. Despite the level of disagreement and neutrality, observations revealed that there were no facilities such as waste bins/bags and toilets provided at the event site or near to, for the entire duration of the event, including the days when the practice session was held. This may have played a part in negative or irresponsible behaviour of some spectators such as dumping of bottles and cigarette butts which could have resulted in fire risk and safety.

Though the respondents (16%) indicated a low level of agreement with the statement of negative impact on the environment through damage to natural areas, observations revealed that there was no one to direct spectators away from 'no go' areas, as they were moving freely without restrictions at the Sentinel area which is regarded as an environmentally sensitive area under Cape Peninsula National Park. This has the potential to cause damage to the natural environment, taking into consideration that toilets, waste bins/bags and restrictions on 'no go' areas were not provided at the event location or near the event location, which is environmentally sensitive one. Even when it comes to the entrance to the Sentinel, there was no single entrance to the area as spectators were using different entrances, as they wished. There are different paths on your way to the peak of the mountain which indicate a poor level of control in order to minimise damage to the natural vegetation. In some instances paths were not used, with spectators trampling over the natural vegetation. Despite the organiser's point of view of limiting crowds by not undertaking extensive marketing to prevent environmental damage, observations suggest more measures for crowd and environmental control as crucial in this event, not only when the contest takes place but also during the practise sessions.

The event as a regional showcase - As outlined in Table 2, 85% agreed that the event attracts tourists to the area, the event showcased the area in a positive light (80.5%), the event has increased media coverage of the area (66%) and the event attracts future business to the area (65%). Lee (2001) denotes that increasing community visibility, positive income, and enhancing community image are all common and acceptable postulations in hosting events. Putting the respondents' reflection into context, there seemed to be a strong view that the

event is a regional showcase. Arguing that the event is one element of a destination's overall product or service mix, Chalip (2004) contends that events can be useful beyond the period of the event itself if they are built into the destination's marketing communication mix. The findings in this section demonstrate the role the RBBWA has in profiling the area. Hout Bay can use this event to create a strong profile for the destination. Jago *et al.* (2002) note that the importance of events in a destination will only be achieved if marketers and event managers have a good understanding of brand theory and how it can be used to achieve maximum visitation to the destination.

Impact of the event on price - On impacts of the event on price as displayed in Table 2, the relatively high response rate reflecting neutral responses suggest that the event is fairly small hence it would need a huge increase in demand to have any effect, even a temporary one on both food or property prices.

Community benefits in relation to the event - Considering the community benefits in relation to the event, 61.5% of the respondents disagreed to strongly disagreed with the statement that the community benefited directly from the event, with a further 18% agreeing with the statement. Highlighting the importance of relations between the organisers and the host community in hosting events, Waitt (2003: 195) posits that "a positive perception is suggested to occur only when both [community and organisers] actors have a high level of social power within the exchange relationship". Nearly half of the respondents (47.5%) agreed to strongly agreed that only some members of the community benefited from the event, while 53.5% agreed to strongly agreed that the event increased interaction between locals and tourists. It is important to note that in all the statements above, the majority of the respondents were from Hungberg (23.5%, 17.5% & 16.5%), reflecting the majority of the shared responses to the statements as Coloured (36.5%, 27% & 30%) respectively. The majority of the respondents came from those who do not have income (12%), and those earning between R1–R1 000 (10.5% & 9.5%) which are a proportion to the responses to the statements respectively. Contextualising the responses on community benefits in relation to the event, speculations can be drawn that: i) The respondents do not know who in their communities benefits from this event. ii) Even though they highlighted that certain members of the community benefit, it is not clear how they go about doing so and there is no evidence in their communities which reflect direct or indirect community benefits from or as a result of this event. Presenting the importance of social impacts of events and in line with the outcome presented above, Fredline *et al.* (2003) deduce that understanding the social impacts of events on residents and being able to measure or monitor such impacts is critical to the event vitality. Common understanding amongst residents of the host community regarding community benefits of the event could prevent potential conflicts and issues of social inequality.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In relation to the objectives of the study, the results present both negative and positive responses and perceptions of the event by community. Amongst issues emerging as critical are lower levels of awareness and attendance of the event by the host community. The event has the potential of creating more positive economic, social and cultural benefits provided it is organised in a manner that will promote tourism development in Hout Bay. However, it is important to note that the marketing approach used by the organisers is an attempt to bring

balance between the spectatorship of the event and the environment, as the event takes place in an environmentally sensitive area.

What has been the crux of the study is the community involvement in the planning and organising of the event and community benefits in relation to the event (direct benefits, social inequalities, host and guest relations). For the community benefits to be addressed, the results indicate a dire need for community involvement. In addition to this, if the host community is aware of the event particularly the community in close proximity to the event (Hungberg), visitors could expect better host and guest relations. It is therefore paramount that organisers of the event get the buy-in of residents to host a successful event. Broad public or community consultation and participation with the local community using available and recognised community structures in order to: determine the views and understanding of the public about the event and assess the community's understanding of impacts which are associated with the event and educate them where necessary is recommended. Their involvement will also ensure that there is common understanding of costs and benefits associated with the event and minimise potential conflicts between the organisers and the community. Addressing the possible conflicts will present a more 'willing community' and a 'willing organiser', ensuring the future of this event. This in turn may give recognition to members of the community and reflect truly on the: participation of the community; ownership of the event by the community; community pride in hosting of the event and empowerment.

An assessment of current management practice, based on the evaluation of the impacts of the event on the host community, including the entire organisation of the RBBWA indicates a strong need for the development of a sound and an acceptable sport tourism event practice. The event has an element of isolation or exclusivity to the host community, as highlighted by the community leaders and the residents. This exclusivity could pose a threat to the event if ignored. Based on the findings of this study, the organiser's involvement of the host community as a stakeholder in the event, was not enough. A holistic plan which takes into consideration development issues at the same time incorporating all role players in this event is a step towards the success and the future of this event. The issues presented above are key in strengthening and contributing to a sustainable sport tourism industry in the Western Cape, as well as South Africa.

This approach can also be used for other sport tourism events in Western Cape. By doing so, the event organisers including everyone who is involved in sport tourism events will be in a better position to understand the management implications, opportunities and mutual benefits of sustainable sport tourism development.

REFERENCES

- BAILEY, K.D. (1987). *Methods of social research* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Free Press.
- BERTISH, C. (2005). *Red Bull Big Wave Africa*.
[http://www.redbullbwa.com/event_location.php?id=210]. Retrieved by 24 June 2005.
- BOHLMANN, H.R. & VAN HEERDEN, J.C. (2005). The impact of hosting a major sport event on the South African economy. *Journal of Tourism*, 26(4): 595-603.
- BOTHA, P. (2005a). Personal interview with the organiser on 18 May 2005, Cape Town.
- BOTHA, P. (2005b). Personal interview with the organiser on 24 May 2005, Hout Bay.

- BOWDIN, G.A.J. & CHURCH, I.J. (2000). Customer satisfaction and quality costs: towards a pragmatic approach for event management. *Proceedings of event evaluation, research and education, Sydney, July 2000* (186-200). Sydney: Australian Centre for Event Management.
- BURKER, M.; PAGE, S.J. & MEYER, D. (2002). Evaluating the impact of the 2000 America's Cup on Auckland, New Zealand. *Event Management*, 7: 79-72.
- BURNETT, C. & UYS, W.T. (2000). Sport development impact assessment: towards a rationale and tools. *South African Journal for Research in Sport, Physical Education and Recreation*, 22(1): 27-40.
- CHALIP, L.; GREEN, B.C. & HILL, B. (2003). Effects of sport event media on destination image and intention to visit. *Journal of Sport Management*, 17(3): 214-234.
- CHALIP, L. (2004). Beyond impact: a general model for sport event leverage. In B.W. Ritchie & D. Adair (Eds.), *Sport tourism: interrelationships, impacts and issues* (226-252). Clevedon (England): Channel View Publications.
- DELAMERE, T.A. (2001). Development of a scale to measure residents attitudes toward the social impacts of community festivals, part II: verification of the scale. *Event Management*, 7: 25-38.
- DWYER, L.; MELLOR, R.; MISTILIS, N. & MULES, T. (2000). A framework for evaluating and forecasting the impacts of special events. *Proceedings of event evaluation, research and education, Sydney, July 2000* (31-45). Sydney: Australian Centre for Event Management.
- SOUTH AFRICAN TOURISM. (2006). 2006 Annual tourism report [<http://www.southafrica.net/satourism/research/viewResearchDocument.cfm?ResearchDocumentID=461>]. Retrieved by 24 February 2008.
- FREDLINE, E. (2000). Host community reactions to major sporting events: Gold Coast Indy and the Australia formula One Grand Prix in Melbourne. Unpublished PhD dissertation. Southport, Queensland: Griffith University, Gold Coast.
- FREDLINE, E. & FAULKNER, B. (2000). Community perceptions of the impacts of events. *Proceedings of event evaluation, research and education, Sydney, July 2000* (60-74). Sydney: Australian Centre for Event Management.
- FREDLINE, E. & FAULKNER, B. (2002a). Residents' reactions to the staging of major motorsport events within their communities: a cluster analysis. *Event Management*, 7: 103-114.
- FREDLINE, E. & FAULKNER, B. (2002b). Variations in residents' reactions to major motorsport events: why residents perceive the impacts of event differently. *Event Management*, 7(2): 115-126.
- FREDLINE, L.; JAGO, L. & DEERY, M. (2003). The development of a generic scale to measure the social impacts of events. *Event Management*, 8: 23-37.
- GAMMON, S. & ROBINSON, T. (2003). Sport and tourism: a conceptual framework. *Journal of Sport Tourism*, 8(1): 21-26.
- GETZ, D. (1997). *Event management and event tourism*. New York, NY: Cognizant Communication Corporation.
- HAUTBIS, C.; REVENEL, L. & DURAND, C. (2003). Sport tourism and local economic development: the importance of an initial diagnosis of supplier's geographical concentration: a case study of France. *Journal of Sport Tourism*, 8(4): 240-259.
- HEDE, A.M.; JAGO, L. & DEERY, M. (2002). Special event research 1990-2001: key trends and issues. *Event and place making: Business Event Research Conference, Sydney, 15-16 July 2000* (305-338). Sydney: Australian Centre for Management.
- HORNE, J. & WHITSON, D. 2006. Underestimating cost and overestimated benefits? comparing the outcomes of sport mega-events in Canada and Japan. *The Sociological Review*, 54(2): 71-89, Dec.
- JAGO, L.; CHALIP, L.; BROWN, G.; MULES, T. & ALI, S. (2002). The role of events in helping to brand a destination. *Event and place making: Business Event Research Conference, Sydney, 15-16 July 2000* (111-143). Sydney: Australian Centre for Management.

- JAMES, I. (2005). Personal interview with Hungberg community leader on 25 May 2005, Hout Bay.
- KURTZMAN, J. & ZAUHAR, J. (2003) A wave in time: the sport tourism phenomenon. *Journal of Sport Tourism*, 8(1): 35-47.
- KURTZMAN, J. & ZAUHAR, J. (2005). Sport tourism consumer motivation. *Journal of Sport Tourism*, 10(1): 21-31.
- LEE, S. (2001). A review of economic impact study on sport events. *The Sport Journal*, 4(2) Online. [<http://www.thesportjournal.org/2001Journal/Vol4-No2/economic-sport.asp>]. Retrieved by 26 October 2005.
- NGETU, M. (2005). Personal interview with the community leader and vice-chairperson for Hout Bay Business Opportunity Forum (HBBOF) on 29 May 2005, Hout Bay.
- PENOT, J. (2003). Sport tourism and tourism generated by sporting events. *Journal of Sport Tourism*, 8(2): 100-101.
- PIKE, S. (2001). *Surfing in South Africa*. Cape Town: Compress.
- RED BULL BIG WAVE AFRICA. (2005). *Red Bull Big Wave Africa*. [<http://www.redbullbwa.com>]. Retrieved by 24 June 2005.
- REID, S. & ARCODIA, C. (2002). Understanding the role of the stakeholder in event management. (ed.). *Event and Place Making: Business Event Research Conference, Sydney, 15-16 July 2000*. Australian Centre for Management: 479- 515.
- RITCHIE, B. (2005). Small-scale sport event tourism: the changing dynamics of the New Zealand masters game. In M. Novelli (Ed.). *Niche tourism: contemporary issues, trends and cases* (157-170). London: Elsevier.
- SAAYMAN, M. (2004). *An introduction to sport tourism and event management* (2nd ed). Potchefstroom: Institute for Tourism Leisure Studies.
- SHONE, A. & PARY, B. (2005). *Successful event management: a practical handbook*. (2nd ed.). London: Thomson Learning.
- SWART, K. (1998). Visions for South African sport tourism. *Visions in leisure and business*: 17(2): 4-12, Summer.
- SWART, K.; BOB, U. & HEATH, E. (2005). Developing a strategic framework for leveraging community benefits associated with hosting 2010 Soccer World Cup in South Africa. *Embok imbizo conference proceedings, Johannesburg, July 2005* (108-123). Event Management Body of Knowledge Global Alignment Summit.
- SWART, K. & SMITH-CHRISTENSEN, C. (2005). Contributing towards a research culture in the South African event industry: the development of communi-serve. *Embok imbizo conference proceedings, Johannesburg, July 2005* (124-134). Event Management Body of Knowledge Global Alignment Summit.
- SOFIELD, T.B.H. (2003). Sport tourism: from binary division to quadripartite construct. *Journal of Sport Tourism*, 8(3): 144-146.
- SOUTAR, G.N. & McLEOD, P.B. (1993). Residents' perception on impacts of the America's cup. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 20: 571-582.
- TASSIOPOULOS, D. (2005). *Event management: a professional and development approach* (2nd ed.). Cape Town: Juta.
- TIYCE, M. & DIMMOCK, K. (2000). Nimbin Mardi grass festival. *Proceedings of event evaluation research and education, Sydney, July 2000* (222-230). Sydney: Australian Centre for Event Management.
- TURCO, D.M.; RILEY, R. & SWART, K. (2002). *Sport Tourism*. Morgantown, WV: Fitness Information Technology.
- TURCO, D.M.; SWART, K.; BOB, U. & MOODLEY, V. (2003). Socio-economic impacts of sport tourism in Durban unicity, South Africa. *Journal of Sport Tourism*, 8(4): 223-239.

- URGAN, B. & MULE, T. (2001). Reconciling cost-benefit and economic impact assessment for event tourism. *Tourism Economics*, 7(4): 321-330.
- VEAL, A.J. (1992). *Research methods for leisure and tourism: a practical guide*. London: Longman.
- WAITT, G. (2003). Social impacts of the Sydney Olympics. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 30(1): 194-215.
- WEED, M. & BULL, C. (2004). *Sport and tourism: participants, policy and providers*. Oxford: Elsevier Butterworth-Heinemann.
- WELMAN, J.C. & KRUGER, S.J. (2000). *Research methodology* (2nd ed.). Cape Town: Oxford University Press.
- ZAUHAR, J. (2004). Historical perspective of sport tourism. *Journal of Sport Tourism*, 9(1): 5-101.

Mr. Ncedo Jonathan Ntloko: Cape Peninsula University of Technology, Cape Town, Republic of South Africa and Human Sciences Research Council, Cape Town, Republic of South Africa. Postal address: 22 Devonshire Close, Parklands 7441, Republic of South Africa. Tel.: +27 (0)21 466 7908 (w), +27 (0)21 557 1377 (h), Fax.: +27 (0)21 5571377 (h) / +27 (0)21 461 2696 (w), E-mail: ncedo@webmail.co.za

(Subject editor: Prof. M. Saayman)