African Journal for Physical Activity and Health Sciences (AJPHES), June 2017 (Supplement), pp. 184-197.

Development of a standardised methodology for event impact assessments in the Western Cape, South Africa

D. MARALACK[1], K. SWART[2] AND U. BOB[3]

[1]*School of Management Studies, University of Cape Town, South Africa;*
E-mail: david.maralack@uct.ac.za
[2]*College of Business Administration, American University in the Emirates, Dubai, United Arab Emirates.*
[3] *Research Directorate, University of KwaZulu-Natal, Durban, South Africa.*

Abstract

The Western Cape Government (WCG) developed an Integrated Events Strategy for Cape Town and the Western Cape, supporting events to maximise brand building potential and triple bottom line benefits. WCG acknowledges that assessing the impacts of events in the province has become increasingly complex and there is a lack of a standardised methodology to measure the economic, social and environmental impacts. The WCG thus undertook research to develop a standardised set of indicators and methodological approach by which the impact of five annual, jewel (or iconic) events supported by the WCG could be measured. The first phase of the study focused on the development of the indicators and piloting a range of survey instruments for the various event stakeholders, including the stallholders/ exhibitors, service providers and the event organisers. The second phase of the study covered piloting of attendees' and sponsor surveys as well as refining the surveys piloted during phase one. Phase two of the study also included the validation of the methodology for an event impact assessment tool to be shared with the smaller (incubator) events also supported by the WCG. The findings of the study ill assist policy and decision-makers to develop more effective measuring tools to assist in the systematic evaluation of social, economic, environmental and governance indicators for events. The study contributes to deepening the analysis of the social ecology of a collaborative approach between government departments, private sector and ancillary stakeholders in effective event evaluation. Furthermore, the study analyses the roles, responsibilities and interests of multiple stakeholders in measuring impacts of events in the Western Cape, focusing on advantages, challenges and consequences of an integrated evaluation approach.

Keywords: Event impacts, assessments, standardisation, methodologies, indicators, Western Cape, South Africa.

How to cite this article:
Maralack, D., Swart, K. & Bob, U. (2017). Development of a standardised methodology for event impact assessments in the Western Cape, South Africa. *African Journal for Physical Activity and Health Sciences,* June (Supplement), 184-197.

Introduction

The Western Cape Government (WCG) developed an Integrated Events Strategy for Cape Town and the Western Cape (IES) in 2011.The IES strategy was designed to promote development and management of a portfolio of events and facilities "to achieve growth, development and inclusivity for the people of the

Western Cape" (Platzky, 2016: 1). The IES is also aligned to the WCG's provincial strategic goals (PSG) "to embed good governance, integrated service delivery through partnerships, spatial alignment" and to "create opportunities for growth and job creation." (Swart & Maralack, 2016: 3). The strategy serves as a guide, facilitating decision-making for supporting events and aids all spheres of government and their agencies to work together to maximise brand-building potential and triple bottom line benefits that can be realised from hosting events.

Seeking to develop a coherent suite of events to support and to evaluate its impacts and returns, WCG developed a standardised methodology to conducting event impact assessments, to inform the development of policy, shape the design and implementation of interventions and to improve the management of social, economic and environmental programmes. Platzky (2016), addressing event owners at the annual WCG events symposium, argued that events have become increasingly complex and that the pursuit of a standardised methodology to measure impacts is challenging. WCG commenced with a multi-phased research process between 2015 and 2016 to develop a standardised methodological approach and set of indicators by which the impact of five annual events supported by the WCG could be measured. The annual events are also considered to be "jewel" or signature events that provide the Western Cape with a competitive advantage (WCG, 2011). It is also intended that the methodology and assessment tools will be used to assist "incubator events" that seek WCG support. Incubator events are considered smaller events that have the potential to be jewel events in the future (WCG, 2011)

The research as presented in this paper highlighted the following challenges: first, the existence of multiple stakeholders in events is a reality, and managing data gathering, analysis and production of reports are all complex parts of a political process. Second, multiple stakeholders, including government departments, private sector, service providers, and ancillary stakeholders hold varying briefs and views on the meaning and importance of the findings, which are a potential source of conflict.

Evaluation has taken centre stage in public policy, organisational planning and management in response to increasing calls for transparency and accountability by government departments (Fox, Grimm & Caldeira, 2017). They are expected to deliver programmes and projects that are both "effective and value for money (Fox et al., 2017). Two themes have dominated the event impact research agenda in the past, namely focus on economic impact and large scale sport events (Agha &Taks 2015:200). However recent event impact research has shifted from mega-events such as the Olympic Games and the FIFA World Cup (Maennig & Zimbalist (2012) to smaller events (Taks, Green, Chalip, Kesenne & Martyn 2013). Agha and Taks (2015) note that while smaller events may generate limited economic activities, their outcome and net benefits for the local

community might be more positive. Extending this argument, Getz (2012) emphasises that small events can have 'mega' impacts on a small towns such as inflow of tourists, economic benefits or disruption to daily life. Also, recent research has shifted attention to more intangible returns of events such as social (Heere, Walker, Gibson, Thapa, Geldenhuys & Coetzee, 2013) and environmental impacts (Chappelet, 2008; Hinch, Higham & Sant, 2014), highlighting the potential for social capital through tighter local social networks, sense of ownership among stakeholders and connectedness of the local population with the event (Taks, 2013). However, evaluating these wider links is complex.

Fox et al. (2017) argues that possibly the biggest challenge facing evaluators is how to respond to complexity. Events have multiple and complex needs and services involve collaboration between multiplicities of organisations, requiring investment in human, financial and physical resources (Agha & Taks 2015). Human resources include event owner employees and volunteers required to stage the event. Financial resources include private and government investment, and may be monetary or in-kind contributions. Physical resources comprise aspects that include venues, accommodation, private and public transportation, food services and entertainment. In addition, various regulatory institutions at local and national levels, ensuring compliance with safety, health, environmental and financial regulations influence the ways in which events are staged. Therefore, a variety of interest groups influences the staging and evaluation of events and may influence policies, programme planning, implementation, and the ways programmes are administered.

Examining stakeholders in the "modern corporation", Freeman (1988:38) defines stakeholders as 'those groups who have a stake in or claim on the firm' and in the context of events may be sponsors, government departments, suppliers, customers, employees, local community, as well as pressure groups. Although all stakeholders may not necessarily have a contractual obligation to an organisation or event, their influential power can have a substantial bearing on the staging of the event, effect on the economy, society and environment and in the case of this research in conducting event impact assessments.

Rossi, Lipsey and Freeman (2004) argue that there is considerable evidence that the findings of evaluations do influence policies, programme planning and implementation, and the ways programmes are administered, either in the short or long term. However, simply undertaking well-designed and carefully conducted evaluations of social programmes will not address economic, social and environmental challenges. The evaluation process, through engaging with various partners and recipients also affects critical outcomes of projects, programmes, and in this case, events. Event evaluation is conducted in a real world setting of multiple and often conflicting interests, and therefore two key

factors must be recognised in the evaluation: first, the existence of multiple stakeholders that affect the evaluation process, and second, evaluation is usually part of a political process, balancing the interests and needs of a variety of stakeholders. Currently, no standardised methodology exists to assess the impact of events supported by the WCG. Thus the purpose of this research was to develop a standardised methodological approach and set of indicators by which the impact of five different types of annual events supported by the WCG could be evaluated utilising a triple bottom line perspective, thus moving beyond assessing economic impacts only. Furthermore, the approach undertaken was to develop a methodology that could evaluate the impact across different type of events such as sport, arts and cultural and lifestyle events. It is further anticipated that the methodology and assessment tools developed will also assist incubator (or smaller) events seeking support from the WCG. The approach adopted by the WCG in developing the standardised methodology was that it should be developed in consultation and in collaboration with a key stakeholder group, viz. the event organisers (EO) and should consider the perspectives of variety of events stakeholders, including the attendees, event service providers, stallholders/ exhibitors and sponsors, amongst others.

Methodology

Study design and phases

The study was conducted in two phases, February to August 2015 and March to October 2016. In Phase 1**,** the WCG, in conjunction with the evaluation team comprised of researchers from the Universities of Cape Town, Stellenbosch and the Cape Peninsula University of Technology, developed a set of triple bottom line indicators - economic, social and environmental - (Stoddard, Pollard & Evans, 2012) and supplemented this with a set of good governance indicators as prescribed by WCG policy. The evaluation team agreed to a methodological approach in conjunction with the EOs, guiding the activities of the evaluation team, data gathering, and reporting processes. The steps agreed to were to finalise the draft indicator list, develop survey instruments, develop sampling frameworks, pilot the instruments and finalise the indicators and methodological approach based on the process and results of the pilot, including guidelines for survey implementation to the iconic and incubator events.

Population and sample

The events were purposively selected to represent the different types of annual events supported by the WCG, being the Old Mutual Two Oceans Marathon, the Cape Town Cycle Race, the ABSA Cape Epic Mountain Bike event, the ABSA Klein Karoo Kunstefees (KKNK), and the Cape Town International Jazz Festival. At each of the events different stakeholder groups were surveyed as part

of the piloting methodological approach. In Phase 1 these included the EOs, service providers and stallholder/ exhibitors. In Phase 2, these stakeholder groups were surveyed again in addition to sponsors and attendees (including residents in attendance) at two jewel events – a sport and food festival. In Phase 1, all the EOs were approached to complete the event organiser survey. The service providers were approached via the event organiser who distributed the service provider survey to their respective service providers. The population determined for the service providers from the event organisers was 205 in 2015 and 513 in 2016). Surveys that were adequately completed were included in the sample (77 in 2015 and 88 in 2016 as per Table 1). A similar approach was used for the stallholders in Phase 1. The population of the stallholders/ exhibitors was 639 in 2015 and 535 in 2016. Due to the low response rate in Phase 1 (only 55 stallholders/ exhibitors) responded, a face-to-face interviews with stallholders/ exhibitors at the respective events were implemented in Phase 2 in order to increase the response rate (254 stallholders/ exhibitors responded in 2016 as presented in Table 2. The sponsors were also approached via the event organisers in Phase 2. The population of sponsors as determined by four of the five event organisers was 46; of which 25 responded to the survey. The population for the attendees at the two events was based on estimates provided by the respective EOs. As the surveys were being implemented as a pilot a sample of 100 for each event was agreed to, however one provided additional budget to increase the sample size to 310 attendees. Systematic, spatially-based purposive sampling was utilised to conduct surveys face-to-face with attendees during the duration of each event.

Ethical considerations

All ethical protocols were observed when conducting this study and included anonymity and confidentiality of responses; only overall responses per stakeholder group and per event were used. Voluntary participation was also observed and participants took part in the study without being coerced.

Development of impact assessment tool and data collection procedure

The indicators were used as the basis to engage the five iconic Eos to interrogate and amend the indicators as well as to identify additional indicators appropriate to their unique events. The indicators were used as a basis to develop the various survey instruments. The survey instruments developed and implemented over the two phases were EO, attendees, stallholders/ exhibitors, service providers, sponsors and business (formal and informal business) surveys. In Phase 1, the EO, service provider and stallholder/ exhibitor survey instruments were piloted and in Phase 2 the refined EO, service provider and stallholder/ exhibitor were administered and sponsor survey and attendees survey were piloted at two of the jewel events, as highlighted previously. The surveys were forwarded to the

respective stakeholders (EOs, stallholders / exhibitors, sponsors and service providers) via email and a link was provided for respondents to complete the survey in either the word or online version. In addition, two versions of the survey were distributed to accommodate events based in Cape Town and in Oudtshoorn. The research team corresponded directly with stakeholders only when queries or low response rates were being experienced. In 2015 for example, the response rates for stallholders and exhibitors were deemed to be extremely low and therefore a team of on-site data gatherers embarked on face-to-face surveys with stallholders at the exhibitions as mentioned above. This change in strategy contributed significantly to improved response rates. Thus the consultation with stakeholders proved to be useful to refine survey instruments and methods, and to ensure that questions covered the range of events as well as focused on the type of information relevant for specific stakeholders.

The methodology for the event impact assessment tool was validated through a series of workshops with EOs at the end of both phases and was shared with the incubator events supported by the WCG. National, regional and local government departments, the five iconic EOs as well as 120 incubator events located in the Western Cape participated in the workshops and presentations, critically evaluating assessment processes, outcomes, findings and policy implications. Two feedback sessions were held with EOs on August 2015 and October 2016. During the course of these sessions each survey instrument was discussed. The instruments were validated by experts who were involved in similar studies as well as drawing on the experiences of the EOs during this piloting process. Two public conferences with incubator events and a broad range of event stakeholders were consulted in December 2015 and November 2016.

WCG, the five iconic events, and the incubator events jointly contributed to developing a standardised methodology and set of survey instruments for conducting event impact assessments in the Western Cape. The successful development of the methodology and survey instruments was contingent on the endorsement of the iconic events. Only the business (formal and informal business) surveys were not implemented due to time and resource constraints. Even though EOs supported the process, response rates were mixed for the respective surveys and varied between 2015 and 2016 for reasons presented in the results section below.

Data analysis

The surveys were set up using Excel databases and imported to the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) to generate frequency tables after the data were cleaned. Analysis included actual economic, social, environmental and governance impacts, the process of data collection, its consequent impact on

inputting and brief observations of the influence on policy and EO implementation strategy.

Results

Presented in the following section is a summary overview of responses by EOs, service providers, stallholders, sponsors and attendees. Changes in strategy and resultant outcomes are also highlighted.

EO survey

In Phase 1, all the EOs engaged with the process fully including project initiation, methodology, development of uniform survey instruments, as well as the evaluation workshops. However, in Phase 2, none of the EOs could respond by agreed deadlines. Even though the deadline was extended periodically in consultation with EOs, only three EOs responded with the required feedback and only two EOs provided media impact feedback, which is important for the economic analysis. One EO withdrew from the project whilst another could not provide the necessary information by the extended deadlines.

Nevertheless, EOs provided the following data: financial information (income, expenditure), service providers used (types, location, value, PDI - previously disadvantaged individuals - status), media exposure, sponsorships (cash and in-kind), number of attendees, jobs created (short, medium and permanent), volunteers (number and training provided), social and charitable programmes supported, satisfaction levels, organisational structure and ownership, and compliance with organisational and financial governance protocols (risk assessments, audits).

Shifts are apparent between the EO survey responses between 2015 and 2016. In some instances, a high level of null responses was received in 2015, such as for sponsorships, media, job creation, involvement of previously disadvantaged individuals and company BEE (Black Economic Empowerment) status. The intensive workshops and engagement with EOs at the end of Phase 1 provided significant improvements to the relevance and clarity of questions. In conjunction with the WCG, questions were redefined, revised and more definitions were provided in 2016, which facilitated the gathering of more accurate information.

A few EOs faced challenges responding to the standardised methodology in both phases, requiring the researchers to engage with EOs to clarify and align information gathered by the EOs with the template provided. It was ascertained that challenges were two-fold. First, the lack of response in certain cases such as service provider PDI status, upstream and downstream job creation and value

creation, resulted from EOs not collecting this data on an ongoing basis and could thus not report on these. Second, all EOs reported an increase in the number of service providers contributing to staging of events, because of growth in size and complexity of the events. In addition, more specialised and niche providers are required for services that can no longer be provided in house. Increased outsourcing of functions makes the provision of data within specified timelines challenging. In addition, EOs are reticent to provide data that is self-reported by service providers, raising questions about its reliability. Hence, one EO indicated that they would require service providers to deliver information as a contractual obligation in future as the data are critical for the economic impact assessment.

Evaluating media exposure information is pivotal to ascertaining the contribution of the events in building the brand of Cape Town, the Western Cape and South Africa. In view of the revision and greater clarity of the media questions necessitated by the 2015 review process, EOs reported that they were in a better position to align their media tracking and report to what is required by WCG so that a breakdown of the media value for local, national and international coverage by media type could be provided. One EO provided the current WCG standardised methodology as a framework to their service provider who was then able to present the data analysis in a standardised manner. The data received are therefore more comparable. However, all EOs faced challenges reporting within the timelines as professional service providers who track media impact on behalf of EOs pre-, during and post-event, were still gathering the data during the survey period and only two EOs could provide information to the questions. The results showed a variety of trends, with one EO reporting a significant upward shift in media exposure across all platforms between 2015 and 2016. This EO utilised professional service providers that allowed them to migrate from a traditional media based strategy with limited applications in the digital space to a digital-based strategy that incorporated analysis of traditional media platforms. This had a significant impact on the reach of the event into and tracking of multiple media platforms. The other EO highlighted that TV, radio and print values indicated a gradual increase in media exposure, but that social media such as instagram, facebook and youtube indicated higher levels of activity and hence the EOs will in future add social media to the marketing mix with their own specific media strategy.

Although events included in the study differ in terms of duration, type and size, EOs identified the increasing importance of social and charity-related programmes, but that EOs did not gather or analyse these data. These were included in the revised list of indicators and robust data was received in Phase 2.

Service providers and stallholders/ exhibitors surveys

Service providers, stallholders and exhibitors provided significant inputs to the services, image and quality of events and hence their data are key inputs to social, economic and environmental impact analysis. In 2015, 77 service providers and 56 stallholders responded to the surveys and in 2016, 88 service providers and 254 stallholders / exhibitors provided information for the surveys, thus amounting to 19% and 48% response rates respectively.

Table 1 indicates that the number of service provider respondents differed from event to event with 29 service providers responding at one event and five at another in 2015. Furthermore, when comparing response rates for service providers for some events (Events 2 and 5) in 2015 and 2016, it decreased from 37.7% to 20.5% and from 32.5% to 21.6%, while responses for Event 1 and Event 4 increased from 13.0% to 19.3% and 9.1% to 38.6%, respectively.

Table 1: Service provider survey

	2015 (n=77)		**2016 (n=88)**	
Event	**Frequency**	**Percent**	**Frequency**	**Percent**
No response	1	1.3	-	-
Event 1	10	13.0	17	19.3
Event 2	29	37.7	18	20.5
Event 3	5	6.5	-	-
Event 4	7	9.1	34	38.6
Event 5	25	32.5	19	21.6

Although an improvement on 2015, the response rates for service providers were lower than anticipated given the extended time and additional effort made by EOs and the research team, the response rate is generally acceptable for online surveys. To supplement these data, the impacts of service providers were assessed via the EO survey, which was conducted post-event. EOs speculated that resistance to service providers forwarding information could be related to reluctance to share financial information. It should be noted that where event organisers intervened, the response rates increased. One EO argued that it is critical that EOs move towards contractually obligating service providers to provide the required information.

A significant improvement was experienced for stallholders due to the administration of the surveys on site, while the event was being staged. The shift from the online survey in 2015 to an onsite approach in 2016 was successful as the response rates increased for all three events that had stallholders/ exhibitors as presented in the table. A team of researchers were deployed to the events, resulting in most stallholders/ exhibitors returning the completed surveys at the respective events. An improvement from 3% to 56% for one event and 9% to 53% at another indicates the success of this method of data collection.

Table 2: Comparison between service providers and stallholders/ exhibitors response rates

EVENT	SERVICE PROVIDERS						STALLHOLDERS/ EXHIBITORS					
	Population		Sample		Response Rate		Population		Sample		Response Rate	
	2015	2016	2015	2016	2015	2016	2015	2016	2015	2016	2015	2016
Event1	136	213	25	19	19%	9%	96	93	3	52	3%	56%
Event2	30	134	7	34	27%	25%	543	308	49	162	9%	53%
Event3	39	39	10	17	26%	44%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	N/A
Event4	-	127	29	18	-	14%	-	134	4	40	-	30%
Event5	-	-	5	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-
Total	205	513	77*	88	-	23%	639	535	55	254	-	46 %

Note: * includes one service provider survey without the name of the event included.

Sponsor survey and the attendees' survey at two of the jewel events

The sponsor survey (Table 3) was piloted at four of the five jewel events as one event opted not to participate. The response rates for the sponsor survey were generally good, averaging 52%.

Table 3: Population, sample size and response rates for sponsors (2016 only)

Event	Population	Sample	Response Rate
Event1	9	4	44%
Event2	18	7	39%
Event3	19	13	68 %
Event4	Nil Return	1	Nil Return
Total	46	25	52%

The piloting of the attendees' survey occurred at two events - a sport and a food festival. Surveys were conducted with spectators and participants at the sport exhibition as well as on race day, while the surveys at the food festival were conducted on one day of the Festival. Both EOs facilitated data collection on-site, and one EO provided an additional budget to increase the sample size from 100 to 310 attendees. Thus one EO saw the value of collaborating with the WCG to increase the sample size to beyond that of a pilot by combining budgets and ascertaining a more representative sample.

The attendees' survey worked well generally at both events and surveys contribute a significant proportion of the economic impact analysis. The large sample size provided robust estimates of the local economic expenditure of visitors to the region. Respondents were able to provide spend data, rate their experiences of the event and respond to statements regarding the event and the destination. Further consultation and agreement is required on the questions that will assist in estimating the number of attendees for open events (not ticketed) such as marathons, as this figure directly impacts on the economic impact calculation.

Discussion

Despite the significance of events to the Western Cape economy no standardised methodology exists to assess the impact of events supported by the WCG. Therefore, the purpose of this research was to develop a standardised methodological approach and set of indicators by which the impact of five different types of annual events supported by the WCG could be evaluated utilising a triple bottom line perspective. It was also important that the methodology and assessment tools developed could also assist incubator events seeking support from the WCG. Multiple stakeholder views also needed to be considered when undertaking the event-assessments. The research process and analysis undertaken by the WCG to develop a standardised methodology and set of evaluation instruments underscored three key points.

First, it underlines that evaluations are conducted in real world contexts where multiple and often conflicting interests exist. These interests may be overtly political or simply be actions that serve to protect comparative advantage by events. Given the diversity of groups and individuals who had an interest in the outcomes, the appropriateness of the process and the outcomes, analysing the social ecology of the collaborative approach to this research emphasises challenges faced by stakeholders to negotiate the roles, responsibilities and interests of multiple stakeholders and the research team. Stakeholders included government departments; the respective EOs who are simultaneously collaborators and competitors in the same event space; private sector (sponsors, suppliers, service providers, stallholders, exhibitors); and ancillary stakeholders, such as communities, attendees, participants, environmental pressure groups and sports governing bodies. Developing a common set of survey instruments proved challenging and required a significant amount of negotiation.

The biggest challenge related to response rates, especially among service providers and stallholders, varying from event to event. A key reason highlighted by EOs is that service providers and stallholders were concerned about proprietary knowledge, financial and economic data and apprehension about whose interests would be served by the outcome of the study. EOs also felt that conducting this type of research is a learning process and service providers and stallholders need to be made aware of the importance of this research in relation the sustainability of the event industry. Implementing a standardised approach to assess events also resulted in the changing the way EOs do business with service providers and stallholders which will, in all likelihood, assist in increasing response rates in the future.

Second, developing a standardised methodology and set of survey instruments were merely two elements of a complex process to developing a coherent event impact assessment strategy. Although the research project was aligned to the

strategic goals of the WCG and gathered baseline information on job creation, destination promotion strategies, and good governance, EOs vigorously engaged with government about which perspectives should take precedence. This project confirms that various stakeholders often hold different perspectives on the meaning and importance of the findings and these disparate views could be a potential source of conflict. This resulted in one EO withdrawing from the project and other stakeholders such as service providers, stallholders and sponsors being reticent to provide sensitive information.

Third, these challenges can be mitigated through addressing concerns on an ad hoc basis or planned management. For example, an improvement in governance data input was experienced between Phase 1 and 2 as a result of the clarification of relevant definitions. Formally EOs indicated that they were building new data collection processes into their internal management systems as well as the contractual discussions they had with stakeholders, such as stallholders, suppliers and social impact beneficiaries. This resulted in greater media tracking alignment and collection of data from their stakeholders in a standardised manner. Piloting the methodology over two phases further allowed a comparison not only between different events but of the same event across time. The data received is therefore useful for both the EO and the WCG.

Conclusions

This study examined selected features of the WCG project to develop a standardised set of indicators and methodological approach by which the impact of events supported by the WCG could be measured. The research confirms that assessing impacts of events in the province has become increasingly complex, and the successful development of a standardised approach depends on involving multiple stakeholders in government, private sector and communities. The multiplicities of interests may vary over time, and may influence data collection, analysis, as well as evaluation of the economic, social and environmental impacts. Two factors highlighted in this project are that the evaluators must recognise that the existence of multiple stakeholders will impact on processes and outcomes in various ways and that the event impact assessment is unavoidably part of a political process.

Based on the research, the utility of a standardised methodology to event impact assessments is contingent on four factors. First, the methodology and instruments developed should have relevance for both government as well as the EO. Second, the relevance of the methodology, the process of data gathering, and analysis requires close engagement and constant communication between the research team and primary stakeholders - in this case the WCG and EOs. Whilst it is time consuming and a frustrating process, the utility and relevance of the methodology and the survey instruments was improved. Third, the quality of

data was enhanced by consistent engagement in information sharing and processing between the research team, project sponsor and EOs. Fourth, ongoing EO advocacy and monitoring of data collection and verification is important.

The results of this study demonstrated that developing a standardised set of indicators and methodological approach to assess different types of events in the Western Cape is possible. The consistent and systematic collection of economic, social, environmental and governance data from the range of stakeholders is underscored, thus it is recommended that all the survey instruments developed be maintained and further refined in consultation with the EOs on a continuous basis. In conclusion, evidence suggests that the impact assessment process involves more than simply using appropriate research procedures and standardised methodologies, but it is "a purposeful activity" (Rossi et al., 2004) undertaken by multiple stakeholders to affect the development of policy, to shape effective interventions, and to improve the management of social and economic programmes through sport, arts and culture events.

References

Agha, N. & Taks, M. (2015). A theoretical comparison of the economic impact of large and small events. *International Journal of Sport Finance,* 10, 103-121.

Chappelet, J. (2008). Olympic environmental concerns as a legacy of the Winter Games. *The International Journal of the History of Sport,* 25, 1884-1902.

Fox, C., Grimm, R. & Caldeira, R. (2017). *An Introduction to Evaluation.* London: Sage Publications.

Freeman, R. (1988). A Stakeholder Theory of the Modern Corporation, 38-48. https://businessethics.qwriting.qc.cuny.edu/files/2012/01/Freeman.pdf. [22 May 2017].

Getz, D. (2012). *Event Studies: Theory, Research and Policy for Planned Events.* London UK: Routledge.

Heere, B., Walker, M., Gibson, H., Thapa, B., Geldenhuys, S. & Coetzee, W. (2013). The power to unite a nation: The social value of the 2010 FIFA World Cup in South Africa. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 13, 450-471.

Hinch, T., Higham, J. & Sant, S.-L. (2014). Taking stock of sport tourism research. In A. Lew, C., Michael Hall & A. M. Williams (Eds.). *The Wiley Blackwell Companion to Tourism* (pp. 413–424). Oxford: John Wiley & Sons.

Maennig, W. & Zimbalist, A. (Eds.) (2012). *International Handbook on the Economics of Mega Sport Events.* Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Press.

Platzky, L. (2016). Opening Keynote Address at the Western Cape Government: The Western Cape Government Events Incubation Conference, Cape Town, 17 November 2016.

Rossi, P., Lipsey, M. & Freeman, H. (2004). *Evaluation: A Systematic Approach* (7thed.). Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.

Stoddard, J., Pollard, C. & Evans, M. (2012). The triple bottom line: A framework for sustainable tourism development. *International Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Administration*, at http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15256480.2012.698173.[22 May 2017].

Swart, K. & Maralack, D. 2016 .Development of a standardised methodology to conduct event impact assessment.Western Cape Government Events Incubation Conference, Cape Town, 17 November 2016, at https://www.westerncape.gov.za/ events/sites/events.westerncape. gov.za/ files/attachments/11%20%20Event%20Impact%20 Assessment% 20Study_Current%20 progress _Kamilla%20Swart.pdf. [17 May 2016].

Taks, M. (2013). Social sustainability of non-mega sport events in a global world. *European Journal for Sport and Society,* 10, 121-141.

Taks, M., Green, B., Chalip, L., Kesenne, S. & Martyn, S. (2013). Visitor composition and event-related spending. *The International Journal of Event and Festival Management,* 7, 132-147.

Western Cape Government (WCG) (2011). The Cape of Great Events Strategy Summary for 2014-2030, athttps://www. westerncape.gov.za/ events/files/attachments/ Integrated% 20 Events %20Strategy%20for%20Cape%20Town%20and%20the%20Western%20Cape.pdf.17 May 2016.