

# Reflections on government engaging business in planning initiatives for the 2010 FIFA World Cup: a case of a non-host area

Ncedo Jonathan Ntloko\* and Kamilla Swart  
Department of Tourism and Events Management  
Cape Peninsula University of Technology  
Cape Town, South Africa  
[ntlokon@cput.ac.za](mailto:ntlokon@cput.ac.za)

\*Corresponding author

## Abstract

Successful hosting of mega-events requires careful planning. The size and magnitude of the event strengthens the importance of planning and recognising the role played by relevant stakeholders - in this case, business. The significance of planning is largely due to the benefits and costs associated with mega-event hosting, and is not limited to the host areas, but extends to non-host areas as well. With the 2010 FIFA World Cup being a historical event, not only for South Africa but the continent, non-host areas developed planning initiatives to position themselves so as to leverage from the event. This article focuses on how government (Cape Winelands District Municipality), a region located in proximity to one of the host areas (Cape Town), South Africa reflected on its engagement processes with business on planning initiatives for 2010 FIFA World Cup. A purposive sampling approach was used to administer the key informant interview schedules with the 2010 FIFA World Cup coordinators in the respective Local Municipalities of the Cape Winelands District Municipality. The results revealed challenges in engaging with business which is as an important stakeholder in the realisation of the planning initiatives. The latter also reflected as having contributed towards the challenge of government fostering partnership, achieving cooperation and collaboration. For future engagement with business, and not limited to mega-event hosting, it is recommended that it is through awareness, extensive communication, aroused interest in participation, and stakeholders finding value in the engagement processes that partnerships, cooperation and collaboration can be achieved.

**Keywords:** government, business, planning, 2010 FIFA World Cup, non-host area

## Introduction

Hosting mega-events has become an important element of destination development (Wilde & Cox; 2008; Sadd, 2010; Giampiccoli, Lee & Nauright, 2015; Pike 2015). The important role that sport mega-events play at a destination underscores the importance of destination planning and management as being key in the hosting of such events. Destination management allows the resources of a destination to be linked to tourism/tourist activities, so that the potential visitor gains the impression of a coherent visit experience, rather than of a series of disjointed resources (Morgan, Pritchard & Pride, 2010). The link between mega-events and destination development is largely due to the expectations associated with hosting such events (Bigne, Herrera & Garcia, 2010; Fyall, Fletcher & Spyriadis, 2010; Mills & Rosentraub; 2013; Getz & Page, 2016). Several authors have cited expectations of hosting mega-events as inclusive of partnership and investments (Lee & Taylor, 2005); destination promotion (Sainaghi, 2010); destination branding (Gyimothy & Mykletun, 2010); competitiveness (Decrop, 2010; Polese & Minguzzi, 2010); improved stakeholder relations (Lawrence, 2010) and legacy impacts (Swart & Bob, 2012). Other authors (Sherwood, 2007; Susic & Doedevic, 2011; Ma, Egan, Rotherham & Ma 2011; Anderson & Lundberg, 2013) have demonstrated the link between the hosting of mega-events and various social, economic and environmental impacts. In view of these

expectations and associated impacts, the hosting of an event at a destination, particularly in terms of a sport tourism event, tends to be a demanding task that is difficult to execute and that requires a wide range of stakeholders for the attainment of success. This demonstrates the importance of destination managers and those who manage sport tourism events advocating for integrated and coordinated development in the planning of sport tourism events, particularly mega-events.

Realisation of the expectations previously highlighted may not only be limited to the hosting areas, but also spread to non-host areas, especially those in close proximity to the host area/s. The potential spill-over impacts are cited as a possibility for non-host areas to plan to leverage benefits from the event (Deccio & Baloglu, 2002; Atkinson, 2009). Hinch and Higham (2004) explain that the scale of sport tourism events might have an impact on the carrying capacity of the event location to accommodate and absorb the flow of tourists, resulting in possible displacement effects. As noted by Atkinson (2009), the displacement effect takes place when those holidaying in a host city are discouraged from visiting the location as a result of the mega-event, in which case they might prefer to spend time at a quieter location or in areas that are situated away from the activities of the host city. Atkinson (2009: 153) further asserts that:

non-host areas have several advantages over host cities: they do not have to invest in major and expensive infrastructure, unlike host cities, they are unlikely to have displacement effects [as non-host areas are likely to be less affected by negative spill-overs of mega-events, such as crime, traffic, congestion, crowding and high prices] and in fact, their tourism demand may increase; and their improvements do not require a long lead time for major infrastructural projects such as stadiums.

The manner in which government (at different spheres – national, provincial and local) communicate the benefits linked to the hosting of mega-events such as the World Cup may also spread the expectations beyond the host areas. This may also be the reason why non-host areas plan to leverage benefits linked to mega-events. Furthermore, the rotational nature of mega-events may present an opportunity that cannot be guaranteed again, hence everyone from host and non-host areas would want to take an advantage in order to benefit. Even if an opportunity to host the same mega-event again avails itself, it is very unlikely to be in the near future. Several issues such as safety and security, corruption in the bidding processes, availability of infrastructure and evaluation of history of hosting successful mega-events could be among the determining factors to host again.

Countries bid to host these events as means of providing guarantees to the sport governing bodies, in this case Federation de International Football Association (FIFA), that they will host these events successfully if considered. Although it is the organising associations that are at the centre stage of the bidding processes, they do this with the support of their governments. When South Africa hosted the 2010 FIFA World Cup, the government of South Africa, through the South African Football Association (SAFA) provided the world football governing body with 17 guarantees in demonstrating its ability to host a successful World Cup (South Africa. Department of Sport and Recreation South Africa, 2013). As noted by the South Africa. Government Communication and Information System (2010), the 17 guarantees provided by various government departments covered access to South Africa, a supportive financial environment, intellectual property and marketing rights, safety and security, healthcare services, transport and telecommunications. The scope of SAFA to deliver on these guarantees places government at the centre of planning and delivery of a successful mega-event, as government was required to allocate billions of rands to these commitments.

From the guarantees listed above, it is evident that successful hosting of mega-events such as the 2010 FIFA World Cup requires careful planning. It is also apparent that the ability to deliver on such guarantees necessitates the involvement and participation of relevant stakeholders. The need for the involvement and participation of relevant stakeholders in hosting of mega-events, projects planning and delivery of a successful event not as a prerogative of government, but a collective effort of all stakeholders. Gardiner and Chalip (2006) argue that the success of an event for non-host areas rests on the economic development policies of the region, on how tourism, events and sport are valued in local economies, and on the importance of fostering linkages and alliances with stakeholders from within the community, as well as with external stakeholders, considering the complexity of the planning processes involved.

For stakeholder participation to yield the anticipated results, integrated and coordinated planning is required. In the context of this study, the Cape Winelands District Municipality (CWDM) played a coordinating role in the planning initiatives linked to the hosting of the 2010 FIFA World Cup. The stakeholder in question is business, as the article focuses on governments' reflections on engaging business in planning initiatives linked to the 2010 FIFA World Cup. Business plays a very important role in delivering an experience to the visitors at a destination.

The CWDM is located in close proximity to Cape Town (host area). The district is also known to contribute to the bringing about of the recognition of tourism in the Western Cape, in terms of its rich historical heritage, wine routes, natural beauty, and its well-equipped and quality establishments (CWDM, 2005). The CWDM is comprised of five local municipalities (LMs) (Langeberg, Breede Valley, Witzenburg, Drakenstein and Stellenbosch), with Stellenbosch and Drakenstein LMs being the closest to Cape Town. The CWDM is classified as a medium-capacity municipality that pursues the goals of a high-capacity municipality, and it is a destination with the potential to lure tourists, and to attract business people and conference delegates alike (CWDM, 2009). The hosting of the 2010 FIFA World Cup in South Africa afforded Cape Town an opportunity to host five round-robin matches, one round of sixteen, quarterfinal and a semi-final (FIFA, 2009). It is on this basis that the CWDM planning initiatives linked to 2010 FIFA World Cup exist.

Key issues emerging from this study, as identified in the introduction, literature review, results and conclusion section of this article, do not only contribute to an understanding of the topic but also in addressing gaps in literature and practice on planning for mega-events, specifically in non-host areas. The lack of studies on events in relation to non-host areas suggests the existence of a gap in the body of knowledge regarding this research area.

## **Literature review**

The literature presented in this section draws government to the centre stage of destination planning and mega-event hosting. Even though the literature portrays government as responsible for destination development, desired objectives can be fully attained if engagement with relevant stakeholders takes place. Stakeholder participation, collaboration and cooperation are presented as pillars of stakeholder engagement, and reflected upon within the context of this study.

## **The role of government: facilitating and coordinating stakeholders planning**

Government plays a very crucial role in the successful hosting of mega-events such as the FIFA World Cup. This can be understood by giving recognition to the relationship that exists between

sport, tourism and events. South Africa's White Paper on the Development and Promotion of Tourism in South Africa developed by the Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism (DEAT) (South Africa. DEAT, 1996) notes that the development of sport tourism and the provision of facilities, training, marketing and promotion should be encouraged so as to strengthen the development of this segment of the industry. This view presented in the policy document serves as an indication that hosting of mega-events cannot be seen as an isolated activity from other components such as sport and tourism. It also places government at the centre of destination development. The Tourism Centre (2001: 129) indicates that "tourism touches all aspects of a community – business, government services, the natural environment, and residents". The success or failure of planning rests very much on the shoulders of the government, as the leader of development in the country (South Africa. DEAT, 1996; Camay & Gordon, 2004), and engagement with relevant stakeholders.

Successful hosting of mega-events does not only rely on available infrastructure, facilities and good destination image but also on the ability of the government to engage with relevant stakeholders. Gutierrez, Lamoureux, Matus and Sebunya (2005) support this argument by stating that involving various stakeholders, encompassing the government, the tourism industry and, most importantly, the community, in the planning and implementation process that is undertaken in terms of tourism development is critical, and could enhance the likelihood of long-term success. As supported by several authors (Watkins & Bell, 2002; Aas, Ladkin & Fletcher, 2005), stakeholder engagement is presented as providing a suitable grounding for participation, collaboration and cooperation of relevant and affected parties.

On participation, Bhatt, Chaudhury, Singh and Bisht (2003) acknowledge that bringing together stakeholders from different formations for a common purpose might be a challenging task. If this is the case, there should still be no reason for failing to invest in planning for the engagement of stakeholders. Stressing that nothing should hinder stakeholder participation, the opportunities for their engagement should be made available, in terms of which they can interrelate and communicate objectives among one another (Gutierrez *et al.*, 2005). This notion suggests that no justification can be accepted for failing to provide a platform for stakeholders to participate in an endeavour, hence emphasis is placed on their availability. In the context of this study, such a responsibility lay in the hands of the CWDM and its respective LMs, as they were central to the 2010 FIFA World Cup planning initiatives in the CWDM. Even if there are large numbers of stakeholders, which Hall (2008) cites as making satisfactory outcomes difficult to achieve, there should be no reason to fail to provide a platform for their participation. The author cautions that, where legitimate stakeholders are excluded or ignored, the quality and degree of acceptance of any recommendations will be highly suspect.

In relation to collaboration, Gray (1989) refers to it as being an interactive process wherein the stakeholders concerned examine common and relevant issues, with the process being driven to promote problem-solving through the collective efforts of all those involved (Hall, 2008). The process begins with stakeholders recognising that they have mutual interests, and that their problems are too complex and too extensive for organisations to manage alone (Gunn & Var, 2002). The grounds for collaboration can also be informed by communication among the stakeholders. As noted by Miller and Twining-Ward (2006), communication has become one of the most strategically important activities that is performed among stakeholders. Communication is crucial to the raising of awareness, to the creation of interest, and to the influencing of the desire for stakeholders to participate in joint endeavours. Communication among stakeholders contributes to the continuity of the planning process, resulting in ongoing stakeholder involvement. Jamal and Jamrozy (2006) underscore the importance of establishing the principles of collaboration so as to achieve integrated planning.

Concerning cooperation, Rogerson (2007: 52) denotes cooperation as “a productive factor that is necessary and able to harness the energies of all who are involved with local development”. Cooperation acknowledges that the stakeholders participating in tourism planning processes are different. Despite the different groups that they represent, with their attendant varying interests and expectations, the success of stakeholder engagement processes requires the stakeholders to complement one another, hence there is a need for cooperation among them. The complementarity of stakeholders might facilitate the attainment of success at a destination in relation to an event held there. In the context of this study, for cooperation to be realised, the robust involvement and engagement of stakeholders is necessary. This is likely to yield joint planning, and to promote the prevailing levels of participation and collaboration, with possibilities for partnerships. Gunn and Var (2002) project cooperation as an important step in stakeholder engagement, as it removes or ameliorates barriers to development, resulting in the commitment to tourism endeavours of the constituencies in the affected area(s). The authors further assert that the key players must be ready, willing and able to cooperate. Cooperation among the stakeholders is perceived by Watkins and Bell (2002) as contributing maximally to the development and sustaining of partnership.

In the context of this study, stakeholder engagement on planning initiatives in the CWDM was necessary in order to achieve strategic thrust for the event. Although a non-host area, the CWDM is located in close proximity to Cape Town (the host area), being situated within a drive to Cape Town of less than 45 minutes. The CWDM was suitably positioned to capitalise on Western Cape 2010 by creating a community benefit legacy, aligning its thrust to that of the following elements of the Western Cape Province:

- integrated long-term strategic coordination for the CWDM;
- infrastructure development;
- community mobilisation;
- marketing and communication; and
- systemic budgeting for the above (Swart & Lombard, 2009a).

It is important to highlight that there is a degree of alignment with the national imperatives of hosting the 2010 FIFA World Cup (creating an Africa-wide legacy; football development in Africa; creating a South African legacy; enhancing the African diaspora) and the Western Cape provincial legacy thrust areas for 2010 (Swart & Lombard, 2009a). The thrust areas concerned are:

- economic legacy;
- safety and security legacy;
- infrastructure legacy; and
- social legacy (Swart & Lombard, 2009b).

The legacy thrust and national imperatives cited above reflect a critical need for integrated and coordinated planning and management. Such planning and management should result in the realisation of the plans, as well as translating into maximisation of benefits, and minimisation of costs. Considering the voluminous work that requires coverage, stakeholder engagement, involvement and management should be central to the implementation processes. Atkinson (2009) notes the encouragement of the private sector to take the opportunity to invest in the tourism infrastructure, as dependent on the government facilitating the networking of the relevant role players. In relation to the 2010 event, the local government was expected to play a more leading function in the promotion of economic development in the various localities than it

had done in the past (CWDM, 2005). However, Jamal and Getz (1995) portray the achievement of coordination among government agencies, between the public and the private sector, and in the private sector as a daunting task. They argue that collaboration and cooperation, including the recognition of diverse elements of the tourism system, is important. Although Jamal and Getz depict the multi-stakeholder approach as challenging, the involvement of each stakeholder is highly significant, and therefore cannot be undermined, in particular when the issue of sustainability is seen as being at the centre of planning.

Caffyn and Jobbins (2003) classify a stakeholder as including any individual or organisation, such as the government, a private business, a local person and an NGO with an interest in a particular area. The literature review discussed in this article presents planning through a multi-stakeholder approach as an important and evolving aspect of mega-event hosting. On one hand, it acknowledges multi-stakeholder planning as challenging. On the other hand, it acknowledges the importance of a multi-stakeholder approach to planning as not being limited to host but also non-host areas. Additionally, recent literature depict responsive planning (Mason, 2008), proactive strategies (Suarez-Alvarez, Diaz-Martin & Vazquez-Casieles, 2010), foundation for the success of the plans (Litman, 2011), contribution to pre-event planning design (Bijkerk et al., 2012) and sustainability (Muller, 2014) as among issues which can be seen as advancing the importance of multi-stakeholder planning in relation to mega-events hosting. The study will focus on the engagement between two stakeholders (government and business – private sector) by reflecting on how government engaged with business on planning initiatives linked to 2010 FIFA World Cup.

## **Methodology**

After consultation with the CWDM 2010 FIFA World Cup coordinator and senior officials in the CWDM, approval for the study was granted. The study employed both quantitative and qualitative research methods. Quantitative research methods were applied because of its association with analytical research (Altinay & Paraskevas, 2008), relying on numerical data (Veal, 2006). In addition, qualitative research methods allow the researcher to study selected issues in-depth (Durrheim, 2011). The combination of the quantitative and qualitative research methods are also known as mixed methods (Creswell, 2008; Bergman, 2010). A questionnaire, comprising of both closed- and open-ended questions, was used to collect data. Closed-ended questions provided quantitative data, whereas open-ended questions provided qualitative data. Questionnaire items focused on engagement with businesses as a relevant stakeholder toward the realisation of the CWDM 2010 FIFA World Cup planning initiatives. Questions asked included business involvement, level of participation in planning, cooperation between business and government and collaboration with government. In the initial planning, six key informants (CWDM 2010 FIFA World Cup coordinator and five coordinators from their respective LMs) were targeted. Self-administered electronic questionnaires were sent via email to all 2010 FIFA World Cup coordinators. No response was received from the CWDM 2010 FIFA World Cup coordinator. However, the response received from the LMs ( $n=5$ ) of the CWDM, were used to provide a district-wide perspective. The key informant interviews schedules provide a pre-event analysis. A purposive sampling approach was used to administer the key informant interview schedules.

As noted by Rule and John (2011), when using purposive sampling, the researcher has to choose respondents who can shed the most light on a case. They further assert that research participants are deliberately chosen due to their suitability in advancing the purpose of the research. Quantitative data was analysed using Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) version 22. Due to the low number of the respondents ( $n=5$ ) and less information provided in the

open-ended section, qualitative data was analysed using the identification of common themes emerging from the data, in instances where there was only one respondent, the response was cited verbatim. A mixed method interpretation and analysis of data was applied to provide more meaning to the results. Even though it is not within the full scope of this article, it is important to highlight that CWDM residents and business formed part of the broader study, utilising various research instruments. Where appropriate, the views of business in the CWDM ( $n=108$ ) are integrated with the findings from the key informant interviews as involvement of a range of stakeholders in the broader study underpins the principle of a multi-stakeholder approach on CWDM planning initiatives linked to the 2010 FIFA World Cup is pivotal. The integrative approach to data analysis contributes to an understanding of confirmation and discordance in the data.

## **Results and discussion**

In this section, findings of the study are presented with specific focus on reflections of government on engaging business in planning initiatives linked to the 2010 FIFA World Cup in the CWDM, a non-host area.

### **Profile of the respondents**

The respondents included one coordinator from each LM of the CWDM (Langeberg, Breede Valley, Witzenburg, Drakenstein and Stellenbosch) giving each LM an equal representation. In line with the sampling approach selected, the respondents' relevant knowledge, interest and experience in the subject of the research case allowed for a full, in-depth and trustworthy account of the case concerned. In this paper, the CWDM officials served as the custodians of the 2010 FIFA World Cup planning initiatives in the district. These were the accounting officials on the event planning initiatives associated with the event projects in their respective municipalities.

### **CWDM engagement with business**

In assessing the role of the district in engaging with business in the 2010 FIFA World Cup planning initiatives, respondents were required to use the indicators 'poor', 'satisfactory', 'good' and 'excellent'. Whenever the respondents provided a poor or satisfactory response, the respondents were further asked to provide reasons for them having done so. This was done in an attempt to obtain qualitative data and also to bring to the fore the realities of the challenges to the multi-stakeholder approach to planning in the 2010 FIFA World Cup planning initiatives in the CWDM. Codes (LM1 = Drakenstein; LM2 = Breede Valley; LM3 = Witzenburg; LM4 = Langeberg and LM5 = Stellenbosch) have been developed to assist in providing more meaning in the interpretation and analysis of the qualitative data.

### **The district role in engaging business as a potential stakeholder**

The respondents' rating of the district's role in engaging business as a potential stakeholder in the 2010 FIFA World Cup planning initiatives taking place, most of the respondents (three out of five) rated the level of engagement as good (two out of five, for the Drakenstein and Stellenbosch) to excellent (one out of five, for the Witzenburg), while a considerable proportion (two out of five, for the Langeberg and the Breede Valley) gave the statement a rating of poor. Even though Witzenburg is at a distance from the host area, close proximity of Drakenstein and Stellenbosch to the host area can be seen as having influenced their views on the level of engagement with business, as they were better positioned to leverage benefits from the event.

Despite the engagement being rated as good to excellent, in a study conducted by Bijkerk, Radder and Donaldson (2012) the Drakenstein Municipality acknowledges that government has failed to involve the local business sector. Deducing from the latter, and in view of the results presented, it is evident that even though the engagement processes were given a positive rating, failure for such engagement processes to yield the desired outcome actually translates such engagements as poor or insufficient. Parallel to the study conducted by Bijkerk et al. (2012), in the current study, business in its majority indicated their low level of awareness on the event planning initiative.

Of the two out of five respondents who rated the activity of engaging with businesses as poor, they contextualised their responses by explaining that “no discussion took place with business” – LM2, and that “organised business were only once called to meet on the CWDM 2010 FIFA World Cup planning initiatives” – LM3.

Paraphrasing the results presented above on the district level of engagement between the CWDM and business, the district role of engaging businesses seems to have been a complex issue. With the results projected, and the explanation provided by the respondents, the businesses were left with an option of developing their own plans and perhaps of being able to commit to joint planning (partnerships) among the different businesses in their jurisdictions if they wanted to leverage more benefits from the event. As these were the responses of the LM officials, clearly only minimal dialogue was entered into in this respect. This amounted to a failure to provide platforms for businesses in some parts of the district from which they might have been able to supply input for the plans. This failure compromised the integrity of the CWDM 2010 FIFA World Cup stakeholder planning processes. The challenge of the government has been noted by Hall (2008) as that of being able to bring various organisations and agencies together to work for a common purpose. Apropos to the context of the study, Daniels and Swart (2012) proposes the leveraging opportunities linked to the hosting of future mega-events as being dependent on the regions, so as to establish clear programmes through which interested parties and stakeholders can become involved in future planning. These assertions denote the existence of structured engagement programmes for the relevant stakeholders, and the provision of necessary support towards the realisation of such programmes.

### **The district's role in facilitating partnerships between the public and private sector**

In relation to the district's role in engaging business and the facilitation of partnerships between the public and private sector, the results respectively project a facilitation process that has not been immune to challenges. Drawing from the facilitation of partnerships between the public and private sector were rated as good (two out of five, for the Drakenstein and the Witzenberg), and two out of five rated as satisfactory (for Stellenbosch and Breede Valley), with a small proportion of the respondents (one out of five) rated the role of the district in facilitating partnerships for both the businesses as being poor (in the Langeberg). With the majority of business having indicated no integration of their plans with those of government (CWDM and LMs) also contributed to the complexity of facilitating partnership between the public and private sectors. Public-private partnerships have been cited as being an area requiring improvement in the development of tourism in South Africa, as a previously low success rate is noted (South Africa. NDT, 2011). The respondents concerned justified their satisfactory response by citing that:

“only a selected group of businesses were identified to collaborate in the planning initiatives linked to the 2010 FIFA World Cup” – LM5 and LM3 stating that “we had meeting with

representatives from business and small medium and macro enterprise (SMME) sector to inform them on progress of the programme but did not really involve them as partners in the execution of the project”.

The satisfactory response by Stellenbosch reflects the facilitation of partnership between public and private sector as one sided. The identification of a selected group of business by the CWDM could translate to the broader business fraternity not identifying with the 2010 FIFA World Cup planning initiatives. In such an approach, those excluded may be discouraged to participate. The response provided by Breede Valley presents the facilitation process on partnership between public and private sector as informative rather than that of seeking partnership. The latter suggests that it could have been difficult for business to find value in such engagements. The delivery of the objectives linked to 2010 FIFA World Cup cannot be fully achieved if partnership between public and private sector is not encouraged.

For the poor response rating, the respondent stated that “no formal discussion with business took place” – LM2. This explanation projects minimal effort by the CWDM to bring business to the centre stage of 2010 FIFA World Cup planning initiatives. Formalisation of structures for engagement could have been prioritised as business is an important partner in achieving the desired objectives linked to planning associated with the event. Similar assertions were made by business when reflecting on the facilitation of partnership between the public and private sector.

### **The district's role in facilitating cooperation**

The district's role in facilitating cooperation among the local businesses was highlighted by most of the respondents as being an activity with challenges. Most respondents (three out of five, with the three being the Langeberg, Stellenbosch and the Breede Valley) rated the activity as poor, with two out of five, (with the two in question being the Drakenstein and the Witzenberg) giving an indication that the activity had been well conducted. The respondents revealed that the poor response was due to the district “doing nothing” – LM2 and LM3 to facilitate the spirit of cooperation among the stakeholders in certain areas, with it also being due to the “late involvement of the local businesses in certain programmes (i.e. in legacy projects)” – LM5. The sense of cooperation among the local businesses could have helped them to identify a common interest so as to advance their businesses and to influence the 2010 FIFA World Cup planning initiatives, in line with the district plan. Doing so would have also given the local businesses a collective voice. Despite the challenges cited by the respondents in the attainment of a sense of cooperation among the local businesses, competition is likely to have hindered any efforts that were made by the district to achieve cooperation, as individual businesses might have relied on their own plans to gain leverage benefits from the event. Since the district role was that of a facilitator and a coordinator, the established businesses needed to define the value of attaining cooperation among the businesses towards the planning for the 2010 FIFA World Cup, to the level of their comprehension. As noted by Baum (2006: 131) “success of any destination [...] initiative depends on stakeholders who are able to balance the ‘importance’ of destination priorities”. While facilitating cooperation among the local businesses by the district was challenging, efforts to achieve cooperation among business by business was rated positively.

The responses provided on the district's role in facilitating cooperation between businesses and the district posit the process as not having been a smooth one. Of the respondents, two out of five rated the activity as poor (i.e. the Langeberg and the Breede Valley) and good (i.e. the Drakenstein and the Witzenberg), respectively, with one out of five (Stellenbosch) rating it as satisfactory. Langeberg substantiated its poor response by stating that “no discussion with

business took place”, with Breede Valley not being able to shed light on this matter. On the satisfactory response, Stellenbosch alluded that the “CWDM only communicated with the local municipality and tourism in its district area”. In view of the results obtained, the respondents expanded the rationale of the results by stating that extensive communication between the DM and LM was important. Gunn and Var (2002) project the attainment of cooperation as being an important step in stakeholder engagement, as it removes or ameliorates the barriers to development.

### **The district’s role in facilitating collaboration**

In a way similar to the district’s role in facilitating cooperation, its role was explored from a business perspective. Among the local businesses, the respondents indicated a relatively high level of dissatisfaction with the manner in which the district was facilitating collaboration among the local businesses in terms of the 2010 FIFA World Cup planning initiatives. Most of the respondents (three out of five, with the three in question being the Langeberg, Stellenbosch and the Breede Valley) rated the activity as having been conducted in a poor manner, while two out of five (i.e. the Drakenstein and the Witzenberg) rated the activity as being well conducted. The poor response rate reflected in relation to the district’s role in facilitating collaboration among the local businesses presumed the facilitation of collaboration by the district among the businesses as being difficult. They confirmed their responses by highlighting that “no discussion took place with business” – LM2 and LM3, further stating that “business were not widely consulted, mainly those in the guest house, bed and breakfast and people in the wine industry” – LM5. The lack of collaboration among the businesses might have resulted in a loss of such benefits linked to collaboration as integrative thinking, healthy competition, a profitable environment of cooperation (Edgell, Allen, Smith & Swanson, 2008), and tourism networks (Parra-Lopez & Calero-Garcia, 2010). Business also projected collaboration amongst businesses as a challenge. Despite the positive indication of cooperation amongst business in the previous section, it has become evident that finding common ground for collaboration among business was problematic.

### **Conclusions**

The findings of this study underscore the adoption of a multi-stakeholder approach to planning for such events as pivotal. The failure to recognise the importance of adopting such an approach might have undermined not only the principles linked to this approach (i.e. multi-stakeholder planning) but also have led to a failure in the realisation of the envisaged plans. As the benefits of mega-events such as the 2010 FIFA World Cup extend beyond the event hosting period, a stakeholder approach ensures sustainability of such initiatives. This translates the value of involvement of a stakeholder like business beyond planning and implementation.

As a minimal amount of involvement can be seen as to having been one of the major concerns when engaging with business in relation to the 2010 FIFA World Cup planning initiatives, greater expectations of the facilitation of partnerships between the CDWM and business proved to be challenging. It was through robust engagement that the stakeholders concerned could have identified the need and the importance of partnering in terms of leveraging opportunities linked to the event, provided that they found value in the engagement processes. Linked to the facilitation of partnership was the facilitation of cooperation. On this matter, the study further revealed the facilitation of cooperation between business and the CWDM to have been rated as satisfactory to poor, and when it came to the district’s role in facilitating collaboration among the local businesses. With business challenges in relation to the engagement and facilitation of

cooperation between the CWDM and business, and among business, the grounds for partnership might have been minimal. Even when it came to the CWDM facilitating a spirit of collaboration, the study projected such facilitation among the local businesses as being difficult to achieve. If the grounds for engagement with the businesses were minimal, in the light of the challenges encountered in facilitating engagement, cooperation and partnership, it may have been expected that the lack of facilitation of an interactive process by the CWDM might have failed to yield possible collaborative efforts towards ensuring that the local businesses were central to the 2010 FIFA World Cup. These were, in fact, mostly indicated as poor. Collaborative efforts in relation to the 2010 FIFA World Cup planning initiatives would have reflected a degree of commitment from businesses in relation to the plans concerned.

Successful engagement with business as an important stakeholder in hosting mega-events ensures harmonisation of plans as stakeholders will identify with – a missed opportunity for the CWDM. The implications of the disjointed plans between the CWDM and business might merely have translated to the failure by CWDM to maximise benefits linked to the hosting of event. It might also have reflected poor planning from the municipality, thus making it difficult for the stakeholders in the district to partner with, and to trust the CWDM as an able player in the coordinating of multi-stakeholder plans beyond the 2010 FIFA World Cup. Although the municipality was entrusted with such a coordinating role, the implications of the lack of coordination, integration and harmonisation in planning might not only have hindered multi-stakeholder participation, but it might also have negatively affected the established businesses as they might have had expectations related to the plans.

The failure to engage fully, and at acceptable levels, with the business may have negative implications for the future. Business is a major role player in the local economy, and failure to engage with it might translate into poor economic growth for the region and its people. The local businesses were pivotal in the development and the implementation of the plans, as they were a crucial stakeholder in such, in their capacity as service providers of the tourism product geared towards meeting the needs of the tourists at the time. Such initiatives by the CWDM should have adopted the principles of the multi-stakeholder approach to planning, with a clear approach to and intention of how such planning would have achieved a spirit of cooperation, partnership and collaboration.

The achievement might have been made possible through the creation of a platform from which to engage on a continuous basis with the CWDM and from which business might have been able to contribute to devising integrated and coordinated plans. For future engagement with business, and not limited to mega-event hosting, it is recommended that it be through awareness, extensive communication, aroused interest in participation, and stakeholders finding value in the engagement processes that partnerships, cooperation and collaboration is achieved.

### **Limitations**

Although no response was received from the 2010 FIFA World Cup coordinator located in the office of the CWDM, the information received from the 2010 FIFA World Cup coordinators in the respective municipalities of the CWDM has been sufficient to contribute to an understanding of this study.

### **References**

Aas, C., Ladkin, A. & Fletcher, J. (2005). Stakeholder collaboration and heritage management. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 32 (1), 28-48.

Altinay, L. & Paraskevas, A. (2008). *Planning research in hospitality and tourism*. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.

Anderson, T.D. & Lundberg, E. (2013). Commensurability and sustainability: triple impact assessments of a tourism event. *Tourism Management*, 37, 99-109.

Atkinson, D. (2009). The 2010 World Cup and the rural hinterland: maximising advantage from mega-events. (eds). In Pillay, U., Tomlinson, R. & Bass, O. (eds). *Development and dreams: the urban legacy of the 2010 Football World Cup*. Cape Town: HSRC Press: 153-173.

Baum, T. (2006). The future of work and employment in tourism. In Buhalis, D. & Costa, C. (eds). *Tourism management dynamics: trends, management and tools*. Oxford, Butterworth-Heinemann: 130-136.

Bergman, M.M. (2010). On concepts and paradigm in mixed methods research. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 4 (3), 171-175.

Bhatt, R., Chaudhury, M., Singh, K. & Bisht, N. (2003). Community based tourism in Corbett National Park and Binsar Wildlife Sanctuary (India): a case study of multi-stakeholder tourism planning for The Corbett National Park and Binsar Wildlife Sanctuary, Nainital landscape. <http://pub.iges.or.jp/contents/APEIS/RISPO/inventory/db/pdf/0033.pdf> [17 June 2016].

Bigne, E., Herrera, A.A. & Garcia, I.S. (2010). Research in tourism marketing: an analysis of topics and methodologies. *Advances in Tourism*, 3-14.

Bijkerk, C., Ridder, R.D. & Donaldson, R. (2012). An assessment of a non-host city on fringe of the FIFA World Cup: the planning, benefits and failure of the Drakenstein Municipality. *African Journal for Physical, Health Education, Recreation and Dance*, 18 (1), 81-92.

Caffyn, A. & Jobbins, G. (2003). Governance capacity and stakeholder interactions in the development and management of coastal tourism: examples from Morocco and Tunisia. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 11 (2), 224-245.

Camay, P. & Gordon, A.J. (2004). *Evolving democratic governance in South Africa*. Johannesburg: Co-operative for Research and Education.

Cape Winelands District Municipality. (2005). *The Cape Winelands District information booklet*. <http://www.capewinelands.gov.za/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=zkhUQsTiNOs%3d&tabid=80> [17 June 2016].

Cape Winelands District Municipality. (2009). *Cape Winelands District Municipality*. <http://www.capewinelands.gov.za> [16 June 2016].

Creswell, J.W. (2008). *Research design: qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approach*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Daniels, T. & Swart, K. (2012). The 2010 FIFA World Cup and the Eden District Municipality. *African Journal for Physical, Health Education, Recreation and Dance*, 18 (1), 152-161.

Deccio, C. & Baloglu, S. (2002). Non-host community resident reactions to the 2002 Winter Olympics: the spillover impacts. *Journal of Travel Research*, 41 (8), 46-56.

Decrop, A. (2010). The formation of destination choice sets: an interpretive approach. *Advances in Tourism*, 183-194.

Durrheim, K. (2011). Research design. In Terre Blanche, M., Durrheim, K. & Painter, D. (eds). *Research in practice*. Cape Town: UCT Press: 33-59.

Edgell, D.L., Allen, M.D., Smith, G. & Swanson, J.R. (2008). *Tourism policy planning: yesterday, today and tomorrow*. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.

Fédération Internationale de Football Association (FIFA). (2009). *Match schedule for 2010 FIFA World Cup South Africa*. <http://www.fifa.com/worldcup/matches/index.html> [16 June 2016].

Fyall, A., Fletcher, J. & Spyriadis, T. (2010). Diversity, devolution and disorder: the management of tourism destinations. *Advances in Tourism*, 15-26.

Gardiner, S. & Chalip, L. (2006). *Leveraging a mega-event when not a host city: lessons from pre-Olympic training*. Australia: Cooperative Research Centre for Sustainable Tourism.

Getz, D. & Page, S.J. (2016). Progress and prospects for event tourism research. *Tourism Management*, 52, 593-631.

Giampiccoli, A., Lee, S.S. & Nauright, J. (2015). Destination South Africa: comparing global sports mega-events and recurring localised sports events in South Africa for tourism and economic development. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 18 (3), 229-248.

Gyimothy, S. & Mykletun, R.J. (2010). Destinations as gadgets: co-creating a supportive identity for Voss. *Advances in Tourism*, 99-110.

Gray, B. (1989). *Collaborating: finding common ground for multi-party problems*. San Fransisco: Josey Bass.

Gutierrez, E., Lamoureux, K., Matus, S. & Sebunya, K. (2005). *Linking communities, tourism and conservation: a tourism assessment process*. Washington: Conservation International.

Gunn, C.A. & Var, T. (2002). *Planning tourism: basics, concepts and cases*. 4<sup>th</sup> ed. New York: Routledge.

Hall, C.M. (2008). *Tourism planning: policies, processes and relationships*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. London: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Hinch, T. & Higham, J. (2004). *Sport tourism development*. England: Channel View Publications.

Jamal, T.B. & Getz, D. (1995). Collaboration theory and community tourism planning. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 22 (1), 186-204.

Jamal, T. & Jamrozy, U. (2006). Collaborative networks and partnerships for integrated destination management. In Buhalis, D. & Costa, C. (eds). *Tourism management dynamics: trends, management and tools*. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann: 164-172.

Lawrence, M. (2010). Exploring stakeholder roles in destination management networks. *Advances in Tourism*, 138-154.

Lee, C.K. & Taylor, T. (2005). Critical reflection on the economic impact assessment of mega-event: the case of 2002 FIFA World Cup. *Tourism Management*, 26 (4), 596-603.

Litman, T. (2011). *Planning principles and practices*. Victoria: Victoria Transport Policy Institute.

Ma, S.C., Egan, D., Rotherham, I. & Ma, S.M. (2011). A framework for monitoring during the planning stage for a sports mega-event. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 19 (1), 79-96.

Mason, P. (2008). *Tourism impacts, planning and management*. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.

Miller, G. & Twining-Ward, L. (2006). Monitoring as an approach to sustainable tourism. In Buhalis, D. & Costa, C. (eds). *Tourism management dynamics: trends, management and tools*. Oxford, Butterworth-Heinemann: 51-56.

Mills, B.M. & Rosentraub, M.S. (2013). Hosting mega-events: a guide to the evaluation of development effects in integrated metropolitan regions. *Tourism Management*, 34: 238-246.

Morgan, N., Pritchard, A. & Pride, R. (2010). *Destination branding*. Elsevier: Oxford.

Muller, M. (2014). (Im-)Mobile policies: why sustainability went wrong in the 2014 Olympics in Sochi. *European Urban and Regional Studies*, 1-19.

Parra-Lopez, E. & Calero-Garcia, F. (2010). Success factors of tourism networks. *Event Tourism*, 27-39.

Pike, S. (2015). *Destination marketing Essentials*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. New York: Routledge.

Polese, F. & Minguzzi, A. (2010). Networking approaches for sustainable development. *Advances in Tourism*, 113-124.

Rogerson, C.M. (2007). Tourism routes as vehicle of local economic development in South Africa: the example of the Magaliesberg Meander. *Urban Forum*, 18, 49-68.

Rule, P. & John, V. (2011). *Your guide to case study research*. Pretoria: Van Schaik.

Sadd, D. (2010). What is event-led generation? Are we confusing terminology or will London 2012 be the first games to truly benefit the local existing population? *Event Management*, 3 (4), 265-276.

Sainaghi, R. (2010). Strategic positioning and performance of tourism destinations. *Advances in Tourism*, 40-55.

Sherwood, P. (2007). A triple bottom line evaluation of the impact of special events: the development of indicators. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Victoria University, Melbourne.

South Africa. Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism (DEAT). (1996). *White Paper - Development and Promotion of Tourism in South Africa*. Pretoria: Government Printer.

South Africa. Department of Sport and Recreation South Africa. (2013). *2010 FIFA World Cup Country Report*.  
<http://www.srsa.gov.za/MediaLib/Home/DocumentLibrary/SRSACountryReport2013-withcover.pdf> [16 June 2016].

South Africa. Government Communication Information System. (2010). "Ke Nako: celebrating Africa's humility".  
[http://www.gcis.gov.za/sites/www.gcis.gov.za/files/docs/resourcecentre/multimedia/sa2010\\_gov\\_prep.pdf](http://www.gcis.gov.za/sites/www.gcis.gov.za/files/docs/resourcecentre/multimedia/sa2010_gov_prep.pdf) [16 June 2016].

South Africa. National Department of Tourism. (2011). *National Tourism Sector Strategy*.  
[http://www.gauteng.net/campaigns/uploads/gallery/Final\\_National\\_Tourism\\_Sector\\_Strategy.pdf](http://www.gauteng.net/campaigns/uploads/gallery/Final_National_Tourism_Sector_Strategy.pdf) [16 June 2016].

Suarez-Alvarez, L., Diaz-Martin, A. & Vazquez-Casieles, R. (2010). Effects of complaint management on loyalty versus probability of ending relationship. In Kozak, M. (eds). *Advances in tourism destination marketing: managing networks*. London, Routledge: 244-254.

Susic, S. & Dordevic, D. (2011). The place and role of events in tourist development of the Southwest Siberia. *Economic and Organisation*, 8 (1), 69-81.

Swart, K. & Bob, U. (2012). Mega sport event legacies and the 2010 FIFA World Cup. *African Journal for Physical, Health Education, Recreation and Dance*, 18 (1), 1-11.

Swart, K. & Lombard, C. (2009a). Creating a community benefit legacy for Cape Winelands District Municipality: roll out plan, 27 November 2008.

Swart, K. & Lombard, C. (2009b). Cape Winelands District Municipality 2010 FIFA World Cup business plan. 04 February 2009.

Tourism Center. (2001). *Community tourism development*. Minnesota: Tourism Center, University of Minnesota.

Veal, A.J. (2006). *Research methods for leisure and tourism: a practical guide*. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. New York. Pearson Education.

Watkins, M. & Bell, B. (2002). The experience of forming business relationships in tourism. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 4, 15-28.

Wilde, S.J. & Cox, C. (2008). Linking destination competitiveness and destination development: findings from a mature Australian tourism destination. *Proceedings of The Travel and Tourism Research Association European Chapter Conference – Competition in Tourism Business and Destination Perspectives*, Helsinki, Finland, 467-478.